11-2-2000

Greenberg, Sanford D. "Sandy" oral history interview

Don Nicoll

Interview with Sanford D. "Sandy" Greenberg by Don Nicoll

Summary Sheet and Transcript

Interviewee
Greenberg, Sanford D. "Sandy"

Interviewer
Nicoll, Don

Date
November 2, 2000

Place
Washington, D.C.

ID Number
MOH 242

Biographical Note

Sanford D. Greenberg was born on December 13, 1940 in Buffalo, New York where he lived for seventeen years. His father was a Polish immigrant who worked as a tailor, and his mother worked at a variety of jobs (including in the home). He went to college at Columbia, where he majored in American History and then concentrated on international affairs for his graduate work at Harvard. When he was nineteen, he lost his eyesight and this inspired him to become an inventor. After graduate school, however, he accepted two jobs: one at Harvard where he was a research assistant at the Center for International Affairs, and one at Columbia, where he taught as an assistant professor in the department of law and government. He began Law School at Harvard but ended up leaving after one year to serve on the White House staff under President Johnson, as an assistant to the president's science advisor. There, in 1968, he met Ed Muskie and became fast and very close friends. In 1972, he worked on Muskie's presidential campaign. He remained close friends with Muskie in later years.

Scope and Content Note

Interview includes discussions of: similarities in family backgrounds to Ed Muskie's; education; the loss of his eyesight at age nineteen; his father's background as a refugee during and around World War II; initial career moves; meeting Ed Muskie in 1968; anecdote about golfing with Ed

Muskie; Muskie's commitment to the environment; Muskie's shared interest in history; Holocaust studies with Muskie; Muskie hypnotizing lobsters; Muskie's commitment to Jane and their children; his work on Muskie's 1972 campaign; rumors about Muskie having anti-Semitic prejudices; the campaign in terms of the Middle East; Ambassador Rabin; Arnold Picker; Jane Muskie; Hubert Humphrey; his post-political relationship with Ed Muskie and his family; Muskie's death; Muskie's temper; Vietnam War; Chadbourne & Parke; and an anecdote from 1988 illustrating Muskie's thoughtfulness.

Indexed Names

Beckett, John "Jack"
Benjamin, Richard "Dick"
Bernhard, Berl
Camus, Albert, 1913-1960
Carter, Jimmy, 1924-
Clifford, Clark
Ford, Gerald R., 1913-
Greenberg, Bertha
Greenberg, Sanford D. "Sandy"
Greenberg, Sue
Humphrey, Hubert H. (Hubert Horatio), 1911-1978
Johnson, Lyndon B. (Lyndon Baines), 1908-1973
Kennedy, John F. (John Fitzgerald), 1917-1963
Krim, Arthur
Lincoln, Abraham, 1809-1865
Milton, John, 1608-1674
Mitchell, George J. (George John), 1933-
Muskie, Edmund S., 1914-1996
Muskie, Jane Gray
Nicoll, Don
Picker, Arnold
Rabin, Yitzhak
Rockefeller, David
Valenti, Jack
Vance, Cyrus R. (Cyrus Roberts), 1917-2002
Warnke, Paul

Transcript

Don Nicoll: It is Thursday, the 2nd day of November, the year 2000 and we are at the offices of Sanford Greenberg at 12pm, at 600 New Hampshire Avenue Northwest, Suite 1250. Sanford, would you please state your full name, spell it, and give us your date and place of birth?

Sanford Greenberg: Sanford David Greenberg, more commonly known as Sandy, S-A-N-F-

O-R-D, D-A-V-I-D, G-R-E-E-N-B-E-R-G. I was born on December 13th, 1940 in Buffalo, New York.

DN: Did you grow up in upstate New York?

SG: Yes, I did, I grew up and lived there until I was about seventeen years old.

DN: Did you have brothers and sisters?

SG: Yes, I have three younger siblings, one brother who's a year and a half younger than I am, and two sisters who are anywhere from six to thirteen years younger than I am.

DN: And what was your father's occupation and your mother's occupation if she worked outside the home?

SG: Well, my father was, as was Senator Muskie's, an immigrant tailor from Poland, and when he came to this country, that's how he earned a living. And my mother raised us but also worked in a variety of jobs, particularly at Curtis Wright which was an effort to help in the, in WWII.

DN: Now, you not only had a father who was a tailor from Poland, but who also grew up in the city where Senator Muskie's mother's folks had lived.

SG: That's correct. We spent many hours talking about that.

DN: Now, did you go to the schools in Buffalo through high school?

SG: Yes, I did.

DN: And then you went to Columbia.

SG: That's correct.

DN: What was your major at Columbia?

SG: American history.

DN: And did that carry through your graduate work?

SG: No, my graduate work largely involved international affairs, in the field of government, international affairs, international economics.

DN: But you've become an inventor. When did you develop your interest in technology?

SG: I think it's fair to say when I lost my eyesight when I was nineteen years old and a junior in college.

DN: Now, when you were growing up you decided when you went to college to major in history. Did you have an active interest in current events during your childhood?

SG: Very much so. It was particularly active because in the forties [40s] most of my family had been decimated by the Nazis. And many of the survivors who I met told me about some of their experiences, limited of course because many of them wouldn't talk about it and there was no great discussion about the Holocaust. In fact the word hadn't really become popular at all. And I became naturally drawn into trying to understand the currents of history.

DN: When had your father emigrated to the United States?

SG: Nineteen thirty-nine [1939]. They'd lived underground in Paris and managed to escape and come to this country.

DN: Was your mother also a refugee?

SG: No, she was born in Buffalo, New York in 1915.

DN: And did your father talk much about his experiences in Poland when -?

SG: Well, regrettably he passed away when I was five and he was about forty, so I have some remembrances of him but I certainly didn't discuss his experiences.

DN: So any of your knowledge of the life that he was put through came through relatives?

SG: Yes, his sister and brothers. My Aunt Bertha was taken in by a Catholic family in Holland and hidden with her three children under a windmill, she and her husband, for the duration of the war. And then after the war was over they came to the United States and I heard many, many stories about our entire family and how they fared during this horrible time.

DN: When you had completed your Ph.D., where did you head?

SG: I had two jobs first. One was as a research associate at the Center for International Affairs at Harvard University, and I also received an offer which I accepted to teach as an assistant professor in the department of law and government at Columbia University.

DN: You'd had your undergraduate and your master's at -

SG: My Master's in business administration at Columbia.

DN: Columbia, and then your Ph.D. was at Harvard.

SG: Harvard, and my master's and Ph.D., yes.

DN: The -

SG: I then attended Harvard Law School for a year. I apologize, that's really the more direct answer as opposed to my two first academic positions.

DN: Are you apologizing for going to law school?

SG: No, I think this is my fourth decade on leave of absence from Harvard Law School so someday perhaps I'll go back.

DN: What made you decide not to continue in law school?

SG: Well, I had an opportunity, one of my dear friends, David Rockefeller and I, we had met when I was a graduate student. He was on the board of overseers of Harvard, and he suggested strongly that I might want to take leave and come and serve on the White House staff under President Johnson as a White House Fellow. And I thought that that was very interesting and I explored it. And after many months of diligent work in terms of filling out the applications and attending a variety of interviews, I was able to come down here in August of 1966. And that's when I took my official leave of absence from Harvard Law School having completed my first year.

DN: Now, what were you doing at the White House?

SG: I worked with the President's science advisor, the Office of Science and Technology.

DN: And did any of the issues that you were involved in there lead you to talking with Senator Muskie or -?

SG: No, I had not met Senator Muskie while I served in government. However, a couple of years later in 1968, Vice President Humphrey introduced me to Senator Muskie.

DN: How had you met Vice President Humphrey?

SG: I had met him when I was serving in government and he had been very kind to me in a number of ways.

DN: What were your impressions and feelings about working with Hubert Humphrey?

SG: Well, I worked with him to the extent I met with him from time to time on various projects. I had met him only informally a number of years earlier in the early sixties when I was at graduate school. He gave a lecture at the American Political Science Association, it was in New York. And it was an extraordinarily impressive lecture, because of the depth and breadth of knowledge the man had about politics and history. And I never thought I'd have the opportunity to work with him, but fortunately, because of my work in government, I had a chance to work with him and find out how he viewed the world in greater detail and less in theory as he discussed it in the early sixties when I first heard him.

DN: Now, you said that he introduced you to Senator Muskie when?

SG: In 19-, sometime, forgive my recollection, sometime in 1968.

DN: Was this during the campaign?

SG: I think it might have been right after the campaign, but I honestly can't say. I'd have to go back and check my diaries, my notes.

DN: Well, we will want to come back to that after we've talked a bit about Senator Muskie. So you met Senator Muskie sometime in -

SG: Sixty-eight.

DN: Mid to late '68, and did you encounter him more after that initial session, in that time?

SG: Oh yes, very often after that. In life I think you are fortunate if you're able to connect with a few people in an intimate way, and for some reason our initial meeting, at least from my perspective, was quite exciting and I felt a kinship with him in the first ten minutes of meeting him. And then we met many, many times after that. In fact, I would say from 1968 to 1996 we met for hundreds, perhaps thousands, of hours together.

DN: In the early years of that relationship were these formal meetings, were they social sessions?

SG: They ranged from conversations and meetings that were both informal and formal, but primarily informal. They covered subjects from political strategy and history to his love for golf and football.

DN: Did you give him scientific insights into playing golf?

SG: I certainly did, in fact at, down in, I think it was sometime in the mid seventies, we were summering in Kennebunk Beach starting in '71 through most of the decade. Our children were quite young and we loved it. And Mrs. Muskie was kind enough to serve as our real estate broker and found us a very lovely home.

And one day we were sitting and talking, my wife and I and her parents, and it was after breakfast, and I received a phone call from Senator Muskie who said, "Can you come over and play golf?" And I said, "Why sure." And he said, "Well, we need a fourth. Can you bring your father-in-law over?" And I said, "Let me get back to you." And I spoke to my father-in-law and he protested vigorously but finally recognized the request. He came along reluctantly and was quite shy about it.

Now what's relevant here is that I at the time, and unfortunately as of today, I was and am blind. And so he and a gentleman named Levinson were together when my father-in-law came up to the first hole and Senator Muskie could not have been kinder both in terms of the way, the manner in which he treated my father-in-law and made him quite comfortable, and also by the

way he moved me around those nine holes. It was a long day for me but a wonderful day.

DN: So you were with him and a very good friend of his.

SG: Yes.

DN: The informal and formal discussions in the 1968-'72 period, were they primarily related to political campaigns or did you talk science policy?

SG: Well we rarely spoke science policy as such. We talked about it but not in any detail. I think he and I were far more interested in history and politics to be candid with you, but we also talked political strategy to a great extent. And I offered to assist him in the campaign that he was waging, and he accepted, and we worked together for quite some time in that effort, as you know.

DN: Now I'm interested in the question of science policy particularly as it relates to the work he was doing on environmental legislation. And I wondered if there were any times where your knowledge and insights were brought to bear on problems that he was confronting?

SG: Well, naturally because of his commitment to the environment we did talk about it and what impressed me is his dedication and devotion to that cause. In the Talmud it says: *rah-poh yerapay,* that a person who tried to prevent danger from befalling others achieves a special level in this world of honor and righteousness. And over the years, as I came to know him better, saw that indeed he was a very righteous man. And since the discussions of the environment and its relationship to technology were really in its incipiency, we talked about some of the possible efforts, some of the efforts that were going on in the private sector, but frankly he was more focused on how he could get legislation through Congress.

DN: As it, you indicated that you both shared a strong interest in history.

SG: Yes.

DN: Were there particular aspects of history that you delved into?

SG: Yes, he was particularly interested in President Lincoln and during the summers when Mrs. Muskie and their children went to Maine and he stayed down here to continue his work in the senate, he would come over and have dinner with Sue and me quite regularly. And after dinner he and I would sit down in our living room and talk about Lincoln in particular. He had brought over a book on Lincoln and he began reading some of the sections in the book that he felt were particularly powerful. And we did that on many occasions with many different books and, both in Washington and in Maine, and even occasionally in New York.

DN: What was it about Lincoln that fascinated him so?

SG: That's a very good question. I suppose if I had to capture his thinking, which is difficult for any one of us to do, I would say he was most impressed by Lincoln's integrity, but also his

sagacity in dealing with real political problems, and how he dealt with the concepts of having principles and understanding that compromise was part of the American system. And I believe it instructed him in terms of the way he behaved because I know of few others who have passed through the halls of the senate who have had such a deep sense of decency and honesty and integrity.

DN: In those conversations that you had, did you also touch on the question of what had happened in Europe in the thirties and the whole question of the Holocaust?

SG: Yes, I did and I, because he had naturally asked about my background at one point and I told him about where my parents had lived, where they had come from, which was primarily Poland but also some in Germany. And he shared with me some of the problems of his ancestors who ultimately came and settled in Buffalo. And I think that the balance was better on his side.

DN: Did he talk much about his father?

SG: Only in passing and how he respected him and how he had inspired him, but not in any great detail, at least with me.

DN: And in these times when you were chatting, particularly the times when there were just the two of you, was it all serious discussion of history and politics?

SG: Oh no, no, no, no. I will tell you that in, I think it was 19-, at the 1988 convention, and I may be wrong, I believe that was held in Atlanta. And he had, if I'm not mistaken, introduced President Carter and it so happened that Sue and I flew down with him and spent a fair amount of time during the convention with him. And one night the three of us went out to dinner and it was a very nice restaurant, quite large, half filled, and we had a lovely dinner. We discussed his speech and President Carter's speech.

And after dinner he said something which really answered a question I had had some months earlier because Mrs. Muskie and he and Sue and I went to dinner here in Bethesda. And as the four of us sat around the table as often happens, I was speaking with Mrs. Muskie and Sue was talking with the Senator. And as I'm talking I heard out of my left ear a comment from the senator in which he said, "Well you know, Sue, I know how to hypnotize lobsters." And I said to myself, 'Oh how, I could not have heard that, I absolutely could not.' And so I continued my conversation with Jane and I thought nothing of it.

Well after dinner that night in Atlanta, he says to both of us, "Come on over here, I want to show you how I hypnotize lobsters." And I said, "Excuse me?" He pulled us over to the counter where he asked the man if he would remove one of the lobsters from the lobster tank, which the man did, totally befuddled. And the Senator put his hand on the top part of the lobster and, for a few seconds, he then removed his hand and the lobster didn't move. And so we left the restaurant. Now if that's history, I don't know when he discussed history.

DN: That was in fact one of his favorite tricks.

SG: Well, I mean, it's one thing to discuss it socially at dinner and talk about it because that's okay, but to actually go over and be embarrassed as hell, because my friend here is hypnotizing a lobster. Anyway, we had some crazy times. We, I mean when we had dinner, the Muskie's invited us to dinner a fair amount during the summers at Kennebunk, when we were up there together. And Mrs. Muskie, who I love dearly and without whom the senator would not have been able to accomplish what he did in my opinion, their forty-seven year marriage in retrospect, makes it extremely clear as to I guess what John Milton said, "They were soul partners."

In any event, we'd come over toward dusk and we'd sit outside on the porch, and my constitution doesn't take well to alcohol. But Mrs. Muskie was quite insistent that I try a vodka tonic with lime, so I had one, very slowly of course. Half way through my drink I was feeling quite happy and Senator Muskie began taking advantage of me, and it got worse through the evening. And as you know he has this, a very hearty laugh, and I heard that through a very thick haze for the rest of the evening. And we did converse. I'm not exactly sure about the subject but again, I don't know if that's the kind of serious talk you're referring to.

DN: You mentioned Ed and Jane Muskie and their relationship. Do you recall any illustrations of how close they were or her role in his life, both as a public figure and as a private figure?

SG: Well, I certainly know, and I believe everybody else knows, that before he made a decision about whether he wanted to run for the presidency we were down the road a piece. And the family, Jane and the children, got together in their home and spent a number of hours discussing what they thought the senator ought to do. And consequently, I do believe that without Jane and his children, but I believe primarily Jane, he wouldn't take any, or many, major steps. Again, that's an impression, and you never know what the real relation was, but we could tell that there was such dedication and devotion having spent, both Sue and I could tell, it was obvious, the unified nature of their incredible marriage and how each of them stuck together. I don't know if I want to share some of the conversations in which he described . . . . You can no longer use the phrase 'shared his pain', so I will say that he talked about the suffering that he was going through with certain members of the family, and how Jane had reacted and helped him through the trying hours that she had as well.

DN: This is a, you're talking about a period of fascinating public political developments in the United States, and also a very stressful time for the Muskies. How did you get involved in the campaign itself?

SG: Well, Senator Muskie as you know has is ways of doing things and he called me one day and he said, "I'd like you to have lunch with Clark Clifford." And I said, "Well, that sounds good, I'd be happy to have to have lunch with him." So I went over to Secretary Clifford's office and I was walked through a series of long halls until I finally reached the inner sanctum. And he, as you know, had the White House behind him which you could see through a window, and they wheeled in a little table and we had tuna fish sandwiches. And I won't say that it was similar to my Ph.D. orals, but there was some sense that he was trying to ascertain what he could about my strengths and weaknesses. And when I saw Senator Muskie after that, he smiled and said, "Well, how did you like your lunch with Clark?" I said, "Senator, it was a very enjoyable luncheon." And that was the beginning of my involvement with his campaign.

DN: And could you describe what it was you did in the campaign?

SG: Yes, I'll be happy to. I did largely spend time with him talking through the politics of the various situations. I became involved in a situation that was particularly trying for me, and I think as well for him, because I had received a number of calls from my friends around the country suggesting that Ambassador Yitzhak Rabin, who was the Israeli ambassador to the United States at that time, had been talking to groups of people suggesting that Senator Muskie harbored anti-Semitic sentiments.

So one evening I called him and I asked him if he and I could meet the next morning, which he agreed to. And when I walked into his office he was quite jovial and as always gracious and helped me to my seat. And I felt that once our brief discussion was over about the various events of the day, I told him about what I had heard was happening throughout the country. And there was a profound silence in the room and I could hear his very long arms drop from the desk next to his side and staring straight ahead, at least that's what I felt. And finally he said to me, "Well, Sandy, that is simply not true." And there was another long silence and after a bit he stood up, grabbed me by the arm and we walked out. And he said, "We have to solve this problem."

Well, soon I entertained the Rabins and Muskies for dinner with the help of some friends. And I had arranged a little study up on the second floor of my apartment and I invited the two of them to go upstairs together. And I put two yellow pads and pencils down there in the event they might want to take notes, and they were there for quite a while, I'd say somewhere between and hour and two hours, and then everybody left.

I am a creature of habit; Sue and I attend the same New Year's party with the same friends each year and have done so for about twenty-seven, twenty-eight years now. And the New Year's Eve before Ambassador Rabin was to go back to Israel, he was at this party and he and I had a conversation about strategies of war and the position of Israel. And in the midst of this he stopped and he said, "You know, your friend Ed Muskie, I have come to respect two or three people in this town so much that I'm only going to go over and say goodbye to these two or three people, and your friend is one of them."

DN: Had, after that, this, would this have been 1970?

SG: Maybe '71? I think it was '71, probably '71, yes.

DN: This was after -

SG: It was during the campaign I think.

DN: During the campaign but after he had made his trip to Israel and Egypt?

SG: I believe that's correct, but I have to go check, Don, to be honest with you, I don't want to misstate anything for the record.

DN: Do you recall any exchanges with Paul Warnke around this time in connection with the Middle East?

SG: No, sorry. At least I was not involved in those.

DN: The, so you were playing a role in, an almost diplomatic role in terms of the campaign in relationship to Israel and the Middle East. Did you and Senator Muskie spend much time talking about the problems of the Middle East and the options that were available to the United States?

SG: Yes, yes we did. I had the privilege of going to the Middle East prior to the time I went with the government. And I had received letters of introduction to Teddy Kolleck and a man named David Wiener who was then the head of their desalinization project, because as you know water is one of the great issues in the Middle East. And I began to understand from my conversations with Wiener where water fit into the politics of the Middle East. And then of course I understood the various parties, I learned about the parties that were in contention within Israel.

And when the Senator and I talked about that subject I was free, as I always felt, to give him my opinions on various subjects. And most of the time he asked me what I thought and sometimes he didn't, but I nevertheless volunteered my opinions. As I did in the case I just mentioned, that I felt it was pretty important to make amends with the ambassador for a whole host of reasons, but I let it, presented the facts to him and let him make the decision. But he, it's, it was really to me a sign that this is a man who I think doesn't, didn't have a petty bone in his body. How anyone could assume that he felt in any way about certain groups in this country was inconceivable to me. He treated everyone alike, whether it was my father-in-law who was a retiree from Florida or presidents or ambassadors. And I believe Rabin, in his actions, testified to the Senator's probity and compassion.

DN: Did you ever get any insight into why prior to that conversation at your home Ambassador Rabin felt that Senator Muskie was anti Semitic or had some anti Semitic feelings?

SG: Yes, I probed into that a bit and the best I could discover was that there were some people who weren't friends of the senator and they used his Polish ancestry as a way to incite others to make this claim.

DN: As you progressed into the 1972 campaign, were there other instances where the Middle East issue came up, or relationships with Israel, where you played a role, either in terms of -?

SG: Oh, well, let's put it this way. You, probably more than anyone else, are familiar with his fireside chat. And I guess shortly after that, as I'm sure you also recall, we had a meeting down at Arnold Picker's home in Florida. And the Senator and I flew down together; it was the week that he was on the cover of *Newsweek,* after the fireside chat propelled him into "front runner" status. And he talked about how quite happy he was and that he was very pleased about how he had worked things out with Ambassador Rabin, and read portions of the *Newsweek* article to me. And it was clear, I never saw him happier about his career as a public servant than that plane flight. Two and a half hours, and I primarily listened. Regrettably, as you also know, there was

a meeting at the end of that path when he met with his friends and supporters in the Chicago's O'Hare Airport to tell us that it was time to stop pursuing his objective.

DN: Tell me about Arnold Picker.

SG: Well, I thought Arnold Picker was terrific. When we went down there I was undoubtedly the youngest person there by many, many years. And I was simply trying to absorb everything I could, from George Mitchell who also was relatively young at that time, and Cy Vance and Berl Bernhard and, who else was there, Dave Tillinghast, and Jack Valenti, and I think that was about it, Don, unless you know -

DN: I think that's probably about it.

SG: I think that's probably about it. And Arnold couldn't have been a more gracious host. He was one hundred percent dedicated to trying to make Ed Muskie the next President of the United States, without any question. And Arnold and I got to know each other. And I remember he invited me to his home for dinner in New York and that evening Jack Beckett, who was then the CEO of TransAmerica, was at his home, and Beckett was a piano player. So we literally spent most of the evening, the three of us, listening to Beckett play piano. It was a, it started out to be a political evening but fortunately music conquered all. And so, I loved Arnold Picker, he was just as wonderful a human being as they come. As you know, Arthur Krim and he and Dick Benjamin formed United Artists. They were the first pioneers and founders of that company and - . . .

End of Side A, Tape One
Side B, Tape One

DN: This is the second side of the interview tape with Sandy Greenberg on the 2nd of November, the year 2000. Sandy, you were talking about Arnold Picker when we concluded the first side of this tape. Do you, did you know why Arnold Picker got interested in Ed Muskie?

SG: I suppose, the answer is I don't really know what was in his heart. Let me simply summarize it by saying that Ed Muskie was a staggering success. And he was that in terms of his family, in terms of his country, and in terms of his friends. One of the reasons that I talked a bit about the conversations that we had that were about history and politics, is that I feel that in the second half of this century there has been a substantial decline in political philosophy. When Camus wrote The Act and The Rebel and Kennedy was a man of action, that seemed to command the imagination of many, many people.

And I think that the notion of contemplation was diminished, particularly as it pertains to political philosophy, but not with Ed Muskie. Muskie was a man who was deeply contemplative and obviously as the record shows a genuine man of action, no doubt. And that combination, to me, was always intriguing. I know others said, 'well, he was indecisive'. Nonsense. A man who accomplished what he accomplished just simply wasn't possible to be just heavily indecisive. And I don't think anyone ought to mistake the role that deep thought played in the life of Ed Muskie, he was always educating himself.

This is surprising; he actually read many, many books. Now, I'm a businessman and I talk to a lot of business people and I also talk to a lot of people in public service and there aren't, there's not an overwhelming number that spend a fair amount of time reading books. So Ed Muskie was that special human being who was able to incorporate both streams in his life. And I suspect that became quite obvious to Arnold, who was enormously successful in the private sector. And he could have a conversation with Muskie that wasn't just a plain political conversation about how we're going to raise money, but to also talk thoughtfully about the issues of the day. But again, as I say, how does anyone know what's in another person's heart?

DN: You were introduced originally to Senator Muskie by Vice President Humphrey.

SG: Yes.

DN: Talk a bit about the similarities and the differences between the two men, in their personalities, their styles.

SG: Well, I don't know that anyone has to, I mean I think the record's pretty clear about the differences. I felt, you know, the differences were questions about how a person would respond to a question, whether it was as we discussed earlier, Don, responding in terse measures or others elaborating at some length about the issue and perhaps trying to educate someone else. And I think both Vice President Humphrey and Senator Muskie had different styles in terms of the way they went about carrying on the public dialogue. I think it would be a mistake to underestimate Vice President Humphrey's thoughtfulness and his enormous mental prowess. And I think both of them loved this country, they were both genuine patriots and I, I'm, I know, clichés are regrettable but I guess there are reasons why certain words become clichés, but they were both two of the giants of this century.

Muskie exhibited a constancy about himself that I saw on a personal level. He was able to accept enormous success, as I mentioned when we were on that plane flight, just being at the top of the world. And yet when he was defeated, he personally wanted to thank his friends and supporters for everything they had done to assist him, and remained the same Ed Muskie. And he was able to deal with people on all levels and treat them pretty much the same. When he and I would walk through airports he was of course quite recognizable and people would stop to talk to him. And it didn't matter whether it was someone who was cleaning the floor or somebody behind the concession stand, or another friend he knew from his earlier days, it was the same Ed Muskie, the same care and devotion that he brought to his work in the senate.

And if you do look at his work in the Senate, and we touched a little bit about the environment and the special role that I think he played in this world, there was, the notion of taking on the environment so that the health and quality of the lives of all of us, the citizens of this earth, are protected, is pretty noble and has a spark of the divine in it.

So I think that in summarizing my answer that Humphrey and Muskie were two extraordinary people and who felt very similarly about this country. And I daresay that had they won the election this world would be a very different place. And moreover, if Muskie had won the

nomination and become president in 1972, I suppose that what today many cultural historians call the descent, the decline of our society, our civilization, probably would have been halted. And it was the American people through the Democratic Party who failed themselves, because he was available and they didn't take advantage of that historic opportunity.

DN: Why do you think they did not take that historic opportunity?

SG: I think that the obvious answer is the incident that everyone refers to in New Hampshire. The fact that this man stood up to speak against those who were unjustly attacking his wife, and that he felt quite strongly and emotionally about this, is part of Ed Muskie's strength. For the right wing to, and I'm not suggesting this is a vast right wing conspiracy, but for sure the right wing took advantage of that incident to portray it as a weakness that could not be tolerated by the people in their president. And I think the press did him a great injustice. But that's, you know, that's just my view.

I think also, it also seemed very strange to me that, well, is it possible that the American people couldn't accept such a high caliber individual? I don't know. I mean, here was a man who was probably one of the great orators of our time, Periclean in nature, and I say that with no embarrassment, a thoughtful human being. A man who worked tirelessly for this country and it showed in the work he did as governor and senator or secretary of state, breathtaking actually, when you think of those three positions. So a great disappointment, I have great disappointment in my fellow citizens for not having recognized the enormous merits of this man.

DN: You were a volunteer in that campaign from, virtually from beginning to end, and after the campaign did you continue a close relationship with the Senator?

SG: I certainly did.

DN: And what sorts of contacts did you maintain after that?

SG: We continued to have our luncheons, our dinners, our visits in Kennebunk Beach. During the nineties, the Muskies would invite Sue and me to stay with them during the summer and so we did. And I do remember the last time that he was in good physical condition. We had stayed the weekend and then some, and he walked us to the car that was waiting to take us to the airport. And we said our goodbyes and Sue and I hopped into the car. And I sat there for a moment and I can't explain what happened, but I asked the driver not to proceed and I opened the door and I got out. And there Ed Muskie was standing in a t-shirt and shorts, maybe not shorts, maybe khakis, and I hugged him and he hugged me. It was a long embrace. Men in my generation, and certainly not in his, were accustomed to that. I do not know to this day what made me do it, but it was one of the best things I've ever done in terms of my own heart. So we had our own private goodbye.

The answer is that I spent more time with him than almost any of my other two or three closest friends, and it was quite an incredible relationship. And I don't think that we ever recover from losses like that and I have a tug at my heart pretty regularly, can't help it. You know, I always think of when Achilles went to the netherworld he was asked whether, if he had it to do over

again, he would take a short and glorious life, or a long and dull one. And Achilles said, "I will take a long and dull one, I would give anything for one more day of sunshine." And every day that Ed Muskie was out on the golf course or on his patio or porch, he had a long and glorious life, one of the few people I know who had, and not glorious just because of his public service. On the contrary, I think because of his understanding of the beauty that lies around us.

It's no coincidence that he was interested in the environment, he had lived and loved the environment. There were nights when I left their home late feeling quite good and as Ed walked me out he said, "How'd you like to go for a swim with me in the ocean tomorrow morning at seven?" Now, Don, you know Maine water and I'll tell you, all I could picture was myself jumping from glacier to glacier, and I passed. But it was a very gracious offer indeed.

DN: There were certain places where your leader couldn't take you.

SG: That's true, hell was one of them.

DN: Now, you have talked about Ed Muskie and the qualities that endeared him to you. He has a reputation of being someone with an enormous and difficult temper, did you ever encounter that?

SG: Don, in all the years I knew him he and I never exchanged a harsh word, so from my perspective, and we shared a lot of difficult times together.

DN: Were those difficult times because of disagreements or because of external or -?

SG: I think they were occasional disagreements. I remember one summer he had just been appointed chairman of the Budget Committee in the Senate if you recall. And he came over for dinner that week and he was so excited about the new challenge, because I had always tried to interest Ed in commerce, in finance, in business, and he didn't, didn't grab at it, so I dropped it. But once he became Chairman of the Budget Committee he began understanding a lot more about those worlds and he and I would often have disagreements about what was responsible and what wasn't.

You know, I should also, in that context, go back to your question about Vice President Humphrey and Senator Muskie. They understood that this was a great country and a very rich country. And they had a generosity of spirit that was so great that their efforts to promote certain legislation was misinterpreted to think that they were mushy, soft-hearted people. Quite the contrary. There were times when I felt the Senator didn't want to push further in terms of public expenditures for certain programs that I thought might not be responsible. But actually in the seventies, you know, we were suffering from a long, shall we say dull period economically, and there weren't the major issues other than, of course, the Vietnam War that affected our budgets, but we managed to limp along. And so the big question as always, I think, in public sectors, guns or butter, and I think when we finished with the guns the question was how much now could we afford to spend on butter. And his generous heart would lead him to places that he and I occasionally differed on. Not that I in any way, shape or form didn't share his views, the question was what's practical and what's financially responsible.

DN: So even with disagreements or other trials that one or both of you was going through, you did not observe the “”temper”, as it’s called?

SG: I’m sure you know I went campaigning with him when he went down to Houston, you know, and we went to Florida, and I was up in Maine and I don’t know how many hours, as I said hundreds, thousands of hours I spent with the man. And there were times that he told me some of the problems he had personally that caused me to become extremely sad. But even when, after he had suffered his heart attack and was compelled to take multiple, multiple medications which frustrated him to no end, did he ever really say a harsh word to me or in my presence. And I can assure you I did the same, I reciprocated.

DN: Did you have many opportunities to talk with him about some of his involvements with the law firm after he left the secretary of state job?

SG: Yes, I sure did. We spent a lot of time talking about what he might want to do afterwards and he was very proud to be affiliated with Chadbourne & Parke and talked to me at great length about all of its partners and their accomplishments. And, you know, when someone who has spent his entire life in public service, and genuinely spent his life in public service, it’s difficult to move into the private sector, and where the issues are often not as momentous and affect fewer people. So I knew that he had a sense of boredom. And we’d talk about that from time to time, but at the same time it was the first time he had had enough capital to take care of some of the issues that bedeviled him. So it was a mixed blessing, but he was there, as you know, always as the elder statesman and always looked to whether it was the Tower Commission or another group of people who wanted some wise counsel from an elder statesman.

DN: Did you have many encounters with him during his term as secretary of state?

SG: Yes, same encounters I had with him all the other years. I think that was one of the most exciting challenges. I mean, it was easy to tell that this was just absolutely marvelous from his perspective. His ability now to operate on an international level, deal with the complexity of economic subsystems and various alliances both east and west, and to confront the biggest problems directly, to represent his country in that regard. It was a wonderful choice given his stature, both physically, emotionally and intellectually. I was certainly proud to have him represent our country wherever he went and I think the nation was as well. And I attribute to President Carter a great deal of wisdom for having made that selection.

And what it did is capped an extraordinary career in public service. I know that he disliked, immensely, the fact that he was dealing in a vast snake pit and that all of the good and positive things he worked toward were far more difficult to achieve than even in the Senate. So, but yes, we talked about all of the issues of the day and how he was enjoying it and what were the shortcomings, and his frustrations. But on balance, I’d say he would have continued to do that as long as he could. He thought that was a great position.

DN: As you look back at your associations with Senator Muskie and your observations of him, what in sum would you say are the most important qualities he brought to his career, and then

what would you list as his major contributions to American public life?

SG: I, you know, it's always good to concretize things instead of providing these global responses and I'll just share a little incident that occurred in 1988. He and I had been working on the American Agenda, which was an organization put together to provide the next president with what, in the opinion of the members of the American Agenda thought, were the top six priorities for governance as the new President took over. And this was a group of highly accomplished Democrats and Republicans chaired by Presidents Ford and Carter. And we'd have meetings in Atlanta which were hosted by President Carter, and meetings hosted jointly here in Washington, and of course in Beaver Creek, where the meeting was hosted by President Ford.

Well, in Beaver Creek we were sitting around a conference room and all the participants were busily discussing issues from defense policy to, in the case of Ed Muskie, infrastructure. And after lunch the meeting continued and there was a little dull spot about two-thirty or three, but nevertheless everybody overcame that. And it was about four, four-thirty, and I had a grimace on my face which I assumed no one saw, and I began shifting about in my chair. Suddenly Ed got up, he was diagonally across the table from me, walked behind the two presidents around the table, and whispered in my ear, "Would you like to go now?" And I said, "I thought you'd never ask," and he took me to the men's room. And for a person who can't see, and to be put into a difficult position, it was an expression of his compassion, his sensitivity, his understanding, because there was no reason for him to do that other than he was a fellow human being who saw another having some difficulty.

In a microcosm, that is a microcosm of what I think Ed Muskie was like, a man of enormous compassion, a man who continued to study, continued to be a man of the book. As I said earlier, probably the highest compliment that the Jewish people can pay a human being is to call them truly righteous, which I believe he was. He had a dignity and a nobility about him that was apparent whenever he walked into a room. He was a commanding presence and with a very large heart. I guess I would say those elements of his personality, given his various positions in our country, contributed to making him one of the great people in this country. The human element, the element of constancy, with his family relations, relations with his colleagues in the Senate, his friends, his communities, local and national.

He also had an incredible vision. For someone to take on the environment, clean water and clean air for its citizens, at that time was quite radical. And yet he dedicated and devoted himself to doing that. He knew ultimately that the planet was, that the planet was sacred and that ultimately we were in danger of tampering with that sacredness. We are now only how many years later beginning to understand what this man saw half a century ago.

DN: Sandy, have we missed anything in your recollection of encounters or observations of Senator Muskie?

SG: Well, I'm sure we have, but I've used up your tape and your good nature and I apologize for taking so much time but it was a great pleasure talking about a dear friend.

DN: Time has gone very quickly and if we remember more we'll be back.

SG: Okay.

DN: Thank you very much.

SG: Thank you, Don.

DN: Sooner than we expected, Sandy just remembered something.

SG: I just want to say one thing that, just as I was complimenting the Senator about the highest compliment in Judaism that one can give to a human being. For a woman in our faith, calling someone a 'woman of valor' is the highest compliment possible, *Ayshess Chayill.* And I know to a certainty that Jane Muskie is one of the most extraordinary women I've ever met, proud to be a friend, and that she is undoubtedly a woman of valor. So that's it, thank you, Don.

DN: Thank you.

End of Interview