6-21-2001

Platt, Alan Arthur oral history interview

Don Nicoll

Interview with Alan Arthur Platt by Don Nicoll

Summary Sheet and Transcript

Interviewee
Platt, Alan Arthur

Interviewer
Nicoll, Don

Date
June 21, 2001

Place
Washington, D.C.

ID Number
MOH 301

Biographical Note

Alan Platt was born August 14, 1944 in Jamaica, New York and grew up on Long Island. His parents were Ruth and Philip Platt. He attended private schools in Long Island and then went to Princeton where he majored in international politics. From there, he went to the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies for his master's and then to Columbia for his Ph.D. in international politics. He accompanied his advisor, Roger Hilsman, to Washington, D.C. to work on his unsuccessful congressional campaign in 1972. Through friends, he was hired by Senator Muskie's office to work as a legislative assistant from 1972 to 1975. He later taught at Stanford and wrote a book on his experiences called The US Senate and Strategic Arms Policy. He returned to D.C. a few years later as a political appointee in the Carter administration. He worked in that administration until January 1980, soon after the Russians invaded Afghanistan, when he made the difficult decision to return to Stanford. He then went from Stanford to the Rand Corporation, which moved to Washington. He was still living and working in Washington, D.C. at the time of this interview.

Scope and Content Note

Interview includes discussions of: Platt's educational background; 1972 elections; Platt's employment as Senator Muskie's legislative assistant; Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Subcommittee on Arms Control; Henry Kissinger; War Powers Act; Senator Muskie's ability to

sort through new information and think on his feet; Armed Services Committee under Nixon; Vietnam and the early investigations into Kissinger and his wire tapping; Muskie's relationship with Kissinger; Muskie's friends in the Senate and on his staff; OPIC; Muskie as Secretary of State; Platt's later career; and traveling with Muskie.

Indexed Names

Albright, Madeleine Korbel
Bennett, Doug
Brooke, Ed
Brzezinski, Zbigniew, 1928-
Bush, George W. (George Walker), 1946-
Carter, Jimmy, 1924-
Church, Frank
Ervin, Sam
Finn, Leslie
Fulbright, J. William (James William), 1905-1995
Hilsman, Roger
Humphrey, Hubert H. (Hubert Horatio), 1911-1978
Jackson, Henry M. (Henry Martin), 1912-1983
Javits, Jacob K. (Jacob Koppel), 1904-1986
Jones, Norville
Kennedy, John F. (John Fitzgerald), 1917-1963
Kissinger, Henry, 1923-
Lake, Anthony "Tony"
McGovern, George S. (George Stanley), 1922-
McIntyre, Thomas
Micoleau, Charlie
Muskie, Edmund S., 1914-1996
Nicoll, Don
Nixon, Richard M. (Richard Milhous), 1913-1994
Parmelee, Carole
Percy, Charles
Platt, Alan Arthur
Platt, Philip
Platt, Ruth
Rose, Bob
Roy, William Robert "Bill"
Schlesinger, James R.
Smith, Larry
Stevenson, Adlai E. (Adlai Ewing), 1900-1965
Symington, Stuart
Toll, Maynard
Tower, John G.
Vance, Cyrus R. (Cyrus Roberts), 1917-2002

Warnke, Paul

Transcript

Don Nicoll: It is the 21st of June, 2001, we are at the Gibson, Dunn law firm at 1050 Connecticut Avenue NW in Washington, D.C. interviewing Alan Platt, and Don Nicoll is the interviewer. Alan, if you would state your full name, spell it, and give us your date and place of birth and the names of your parents.

Alan Platt: Alan Arthur Platt, P-L-A-T-T. I was born on August 14th, 1944 in Jamaica, New York. My parents' names were Philip and Ruth.

DN: And you grew up in Jamaica, or?

AP: I grew up on Long Island, not exactly where I was born but within a few miles.

DN: And attended schools there?

AP: I went to a private high school in that area. When I went off to college, my parents moved and I haven't really lived in that area since I was seventeen.

DN: Where did you go to college?

AP: I went to Princeton.

DN: And did you go to graduate school directly from college?

AP: I did, at Princeton I majored in international politics, and after Princeton I went to the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies where I got a master's, and then I went on for a Ph.D. at Columbia in international politics.

DN: Were you pushed in that direction at all by your parents, or did they have any interest in international affairs?

AP: No, my parents thought, given my interest, I should go to law school. But a combination of my professors in college, and work at the State Department for a summer, led me in that direction.

DN: And what was your particular topic, or your dissertation topic, for your Ph.D.?

AP: I wrote a doctoral dissertation on U.S. foreign policy toward Italy. I had spent a year studying in Italy and it combined my interest in Italian politics with an interest in the American foreign policy process. And I completed that at Columbia in the early seventies.

DN: And did you come directly from there to Ed Muskie, or?

AP: No, I, what happened was that I was finishing my doctoral dissertation and my advisor, Roger Hilsman, who was a professor at Columbia who had served in the State Department during the Kennedy administration, asked me what I was going to do when I finished my dissertation. And I said, "Well, I was thinking of moving to Washington to seek a job in the Congress." And he said, "I'm going to run for Congress next year." To make a long story short, I moved to Hilsman's house in eastern Connecticut and lived with him for a year and had my first experience in electoral politics. I started off as a speechwriter and campaign aide, and ended up as the campaign manager. Unfortunately he lost in 1972, as did all challenging Democrats in a bad year for Democrats.

Ironically, Hilsman decided to run for Congress, his only time to run for elective office, because in early 1972 he thought that Ed Muskie was likely to be the Democratic candidate for president and whether Muskie was successful or not for president, Hilsman was confident that Muskie would run very well in eastern Connecticut and that he might end up being swept in with Muskie if Muskie were on the top of the ticket. In that part of Connecticut there are a lot of Polish Americans, a lot of people of eastern European ethnic background, and I think it would have been a good area for Muskie. It was not a great area for George McGovern, and ultimately Hilsman lost.

DN: And what happened to you after the campaign?

AP: Well, I had been bitten by the political bug and moved to Washington and began calling friends with the idea of getting a job on Capitol Hill. And as it happened, two of my friends from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies were working for Ed Muskie: Maynard Toll and Charlie Micoleau. And Maynard Toll, who I knew reasonably well, explained that he was going to be changing his position in Muskie's office from legislative assistant to administrative assistant and that his former job was open. And I went up for an interview and met with Maynard, and met with the senator, and ultimately was offered a job and accepted the job before the end of 1972.

DN: So you were, and you became a legislative assistant with a focus on international affairs.

AP: And defense policy.

DN: And how long were you with Senator Muskie in the office?

AP: I began in late 1972 and left in the spring of 1975. Muskie had gone on the Senate Foreign Relations committee, I believe in 1970. I was told it was perhaps with an eye toward running for president that he wanted to have this sort of experience, but had not spent a lot of time on the committee because in fact he was out campaigning. So when I arrived, he was going to be a member of the Senate Foreign Relations committee, which he was for the period I was there. But in late '74 the Senate Budget committee legislation was enacted and in 1975 he became the first chairman of the Senate Budget committee and had to give up his membership on Foreign Relations, and my job in Muskie's office became of less interest than it had been in the previous years because he was not on the Foreign Relations committee.

DN: And where did you go from there?

AP: When I left Muskie's office I went out to Stanford, wrote a book on my experiences called The U.S. Senate and Strategic Arms Policy.Taught at Stanford, wrote this book, and ultimately came back to Washington a few years later as a political appointee in the Carter administration working at the Arms Control Agency on many of the issues I'd worked on on Capitol Hill and written about in this book.

DN: So your focus became more and more international arms control policy?

AP: Well, it's a funny story. When I was hired by Muskie, we talked about what I would work on. I was a European specialist, having spent some time living in Italy, having written a doctoral dissertation on that subject and written some other things on it, and Muskie was the chairman of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Europe. When the new Congress got put together in early 1975, the subcommittees were rejiggered and Muskie was given Subcommittee on Arms Control.

DN: That wouldn't have been '75, it was '73.

AP: Did I say, '73, excuse me.

DN: Okay, yeah.

AP: When the new committees were formed in the Congress beginning in 1973 he was given the Subcommittee on Arms Control and I had already been offered the position. And we had a discussion about it and I said, "Frankly, senator, I don't know anything about arms control." And he said, "I don't either, we'll learn together." So for the next session of the Congress we spent a lot of time together on issues related to arms control and disarmament, held a series of hearings, and did a variety of other things, and we did both learn together. And frankly, it had an important impact on the rest of my career because after having worked on these issues, as compared to having specialized, say, on Europe, I ended up writing a book in this area. And when the Carter administration was elected, the kind of positions that were open to me were determined by what I had worked on and what I was strongest on, and at that point I had become something of a specialist. And it was not surprising that I ended up working at the Arms Control Agency and have spent work in this area for my entire career as a result of my working for Muskie on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Subcommittee on Arms Control.

DN: What was it like learning this intricate subject with Ed Muskie?

AP: Well, it was a challenge. It was a challenge for both of us. He obviously was a very capable intellect who didn't have a lot of experience in this area, but soaked up material extremely well, always asked the next question beyond what you thought you knew, was formidable preparing for hearings. This was the period in which Henry Kissinger first was National Security Advisor and then Secretary of State. We had many meetings with Henry Kissinger where I had to prepare Muskie for the meeting, and he always wanted to be at least as

prepared if not more so than any person I've ever met. So it was a real challenge!

DN: What, what were the major questions that you were dealing with in that '73-'74 period?

AP: I've talked about arms control, and some of the issues did relate to arms control. Both strategical armament limitation talks were going on, and also talks on mutual balance force reductions as well as other arms control subjects and we held hearings on virtually all of them. And Muskie became quite knowledgeable on many of these issues. In addition to that, I was broadly his assistant dealing with all foreign policy issues as well as defense issues other than arms control.

In terms of other foreign policy issues, he had an interest coming out of the 1972 campaign in things related to the Middle East and Israel. He spent a lot of time on that; things related to Russia, we spent time on that. He was heavily involved in the Jackson-Vannick amendment to the Trade Bill that had to do with immigration from Russia and he had been one of the original sponsors with Scoop Jackson in the early seventies and was very active throughout my period with him on these issues.

Another issue that came up was the War Powers Act, and that was an interesting situation. That happened to be a subject that he had not spent much time on. But when the War Powers legislation came up, and of course the Vietnam War was still going on, the Nixon administration was opposed to this. And there were various differences within the Foreign Relations Committee and on the floor as to whether this was wise or not, the leadership turned to Muskie to be the floor leader. And this was a subject that was fairly complicated, it was clearly very important, and not a subject that he had spent a lot of time on. And ultimately after thinking about it and talking about it, he agreed to be the floor leader and mastered the subject, and along with Senator Javits and some others, Javits being the Republican leader, the legislation ultimately was passed. But it was really a testament to Muskie and his intellectual capabilities that they turned to him with relatively short notice, and he was able to carry this forward.

DN: How did he prepare himself? You've talked about him absorbing material, but how did he prepare himself in terms of the, his colleagues in the Senate, for example, and how they might respond?

AP: Well, in this one he was like getting on a moving train. Many of his colleagues had a lot more history than he did on this subject. So he talked to the people in the leadership and got some sense of where this train was going and how, as the conductor, he could lead it in a way that was going to be successful. As he did with everything, he immersed himself in the substantive material at great length. And he provided a certain kind of intellectual direction and force. And I say, unlike some other issues, on this one a lot of the kind of the political deals had been worked out by the time he got involved.

One issue that we mentioned in the defense area that I think is an interesting one, and I spent some time on this when I worked for Muskie and then ended up writing about it in this book that I wrote on my experiences in the Senate, was in the defense area. And there was a great debate in the 1973-74 period, when Jim Schlesinger was the secretary of defense, about changing our

targeting doctrine. It was a fairly arcane subject in terms of military strategy, but we held a series of hearings through the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Arms Control on this and had people in of all different persuasions. And Muskie had become quite an expert, having soaked up a lot of information in a series of hearings and he understood it was quite an important subject. And he came to believe that the Nixon administration was headed in the wrong direction in terms of what they wanted to do in this area. And in 1974 a bill came out of the Armed Services Committee that committed a lot of money to carry forward this Nixon initiative, which was very divisive and clearly controversial. And the question became, would Muskie offer an amendment on the floor to change the direction and the funding for this counter force targeting.

DN: What was the Nixon policy or approach in brief?

AP: In brief, there was an effort that Schlesinger led, that Nixon supported, that Kissinger supported, to change our targeting doctrine to make it more precise. We had had a targeting doctrine that basically consisted of mutual assured destruction doctrine: as a way of deterring the Russians we would have several thousand warheads, and in the event there was attack on us they were led to believe we would respond, and that solidified our deterrence. There was a sense in the Nixon administration that we had to refine this doctrine, that we had to begin having, and being able to convey to the Russians a much more precise targeting doctrine so that they understood that, in fact, if they were to attack a city, we would attack a city, or if they were to attack a silo, we would attack a silo. And that there was a belief that the deterrent value of just saying we'd respond massively was decreasing.

Obviously this point of view has a certain amount of plausibility. But Muskie argued that to drive our targeting doctrine into a very specific direction was not necessary and would likely lead to counter reaction by the Soviets in a way that would be destabilizing for both sides. And, you know, I can go into more detail, but it was a fairly arcane military argument. And the question was, would he offer an amendment on the floor to set this right and to kind of create a bipartisan consensus around what had been a targeting doctrine for many years.

And I spent a number of hours with him trying to persuade him to do this, and one of the very few disappointments I had working for Ed Muskie is that he refused. And he said, "I will support it, I will speak out, but I will not offer the amendment." And I said that I thought if it was not him offering the amendment, the chance of this amendment succeeding were very slim, that he had a certain amount of bipartisan credibility, he had held all these hearings on the subject, and that he should be the leader of it. And at the end of the day, he did not want to take on Scoop Jackson and John Tower on this technical subject, on the Senate floor. He did not feel comfortable doing that, did not offer the amendment, Senator McIntyre of New Hampshire offered the amendment, and the amendment failed.

DN: Who was Senator McIntyre's assistant, who was the specialist at that time?

AP: Larry Smith was his assistant.

DN: This, and it was the issue of feared lack of credibility that -

AP: It actually is an interesting question of what motivated Muskie to not do this. And I always thought it was a combination both of his personal style, and he didn't like to get involved in things where he didn't feel a hundred percent comfortable in what he was doing, especially in a situation where he was going to be taking on two of the more formidable senators on a subject they had spent their entire careers on, which he had not. And the structural issue was, it's very hard (and it certainly was even harder twenty-five years ago), to get senators on the Foreign Relations Committee to challenge members of the Armed Services Committee on armed services issues. There's a quality to military issues that insulates those issues from the kind of broad debate you get in the Senate on most other issues. So it was a combination of things.

DN: Were there any potential allies on the Armed Services Committee at that time?

AP: Absolutely, Senator McIntyre was on the Armed Services, there were a number of allies on Armed Services. It was a close vote on this within the committee. But -

DN: No one else, no one beyond Tom McIntyre was willing to take it on.

AP: Oh, there were others. There was group of staffers with some of the senators got together and tried to figure out if Muskie was not available, who would be the best person who knew the issue, and we agreed it was McIntyre. But, no, there were a lot of other senators on both sides of the aisle who were interested.

DN: Was Senator Brooke involved in that at that time?

AP: Senator Brooke was heavily involved; he voted for the McIntyre amendment.

DN: Were there other, well at this time you were dealing with the winding down of the Vietnam War, and Kissinger's policies there, and Nixon's. How deeply involved did Senator Muskie get in that issue at that stage of the game?

AP: It was a complicated issue for him because it turned out of course as we learned more as the years went on about dirty tricks where his name came up. He was a little reluctant to get directly involved because he clearly had been involved at first hand. At the end of the day he inevitably was involved because, as you may recall, there were allegations that Henry Kissinger had been involved in wiretapping. And they decided to create special subcommittee in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to examine Henry Kissinger's role in wiretapping. Fulbright was the chairman, and Fulbright asked Muskie to chair this. And Muskie understood that it was an important assignment and he was being looked to once again for leadership on an issue of national importance, and he accepted the assignment. Actually we held a series of hearings in the Muskie subcommittee on this subject individually. And we also held a series of hearings with Sam Ervin, who was chairing another subcommittee at the time in addition to the Watergate committee on Constitutional rights.

One interesting aspect of this, which is, best I know has not been recorded anywhere else, had to do with this Muskie subcommittee investigation of Kissinger's role in wiretapping. Muskie and I

had talked about him doing this, and I didn't think he had much choice and he ultimately agreed with that. This was not something he enthusiastically jumped into but realized that he had, that it was important and he needed to do this. And he said, "You're going to be my staff person." And I said that I did not have any background regarding wire tapping, and that he really needed some people who had legal training, that this was going to be a serious exercise and he needed to make sure that it was going to be a credible exercise. And he went to see Senator Fulbright, and this is at least my own recollection of the way this played out, and Fulbright refused him monies to hire new staff.

And I always believe that at the end of the day, Fulbright was not interested in having an exhaustive investigation of Henry Kissinger's role in wiretapping. Fulbright and Kissinger during that period had created a good personal relationship. I think there was a widespread perception on Capitol Hill in this period that was moving toward Nixon stepping down, that Kissinger was a very important pillar in the government and in America's role in the world. And people were very reluctant to do anything that was going to undercut the strength of Kissinger and U.S. security as a result of that. In any case, for whatever reason, Fulbright refused our efforts to get additional money for staff. He did agree to make available one person from full committee staff to work on this, somebody by the name of Norville Jones.

DN: Is he an attorney?

AP: I think he in fact had gone to law school. He would have been the first to say he was not experienced in wire tapping, but he was a very bright guy and he took this seriously, and he was full time working with Muskie and I was helping him as best I could on this whole investigation. So to the extent he was involved in this, there was a series of hearings that he had that all revolved around Kissinger and his role in wire tapping that he directly chaired.

DN: How did the Muskie relationship with Kissinger evolve while you were with him?

AP: They had very good relations. The fact is that Kissinger would come to see him, and I sat in on a number of meetings where there were three people in the room, Kissinger, Muskie and myself. Kissinger came with no staff most of the time. And Kissinger would frequently say to Muskie, "I have great respect for you, Senator Muskie, you're one of the few members of the committee who can really understand the complexities of world politics." He would then explain his point of view, Muskie would ask him questions, and frequently they saw eye to eye, and I think Muskie was a great admirer of Kissinger's.

DN: Who were some of the other figures at that time in the, either the foreign policy establishment or in the Senate on whom he depended for advice and counsel?

AP: Well, when I arrived in Muskie's office in late 1972, he had just gone through the campaign. And during the campaign Tony Lake had been full time foreign policy advisor, and Maynard Toll had been on the staff working on foreign policy. And the two key people outside the office and the campaign who he relied on heavily were Cy Vance and Paul Warnke. So certainly for much of 1973 when anything came up, and some issues came up that had antecedents during the campaign and I was not familiar with what positions he'd taken, or

Maynard couldn't remember some of the details, or they were complicated issues, he would say, "Get Cy on the phone, or get Paul on the phone." Those were the two people who he most heavily depended on in, say 1973, for foreign policy issues.

DN: And in the Senate, with whom did he tend to counsel on foreign policy issues?

AP: I would say the person he worked the most closely with was Hubert Humphrey. They sat next to each other on the Foreign Relations Committee, and obviously had formed a relationship over many years. That was the person with whom he exchanged views regularly on foreign policy. He also had a good relationship with Javits who he'd talk to regularly, and a variety of others, but I think Humphrey and Javits are the two who I remember most.

DN: You mentioned one issue on which you and he in essence disagreed, that is taking on the targeted doctrine. Were there others?

AP: Well, to clarify on the targeting doctrine issue we really, he ultimately voted for the McIntyre amendment and spoke out on the floor, he just didn't want to be the floor leader on that. So -

DN: You disagreed with him on the tactics.

AP: On the tactics. I can honestly say, in all the period I worked with him, and we had many, many issues and many, many votes, there's only one issue I can remember, and a relatively minor one, that I ever disagreed with him on. I frequently had to brief him before there was a floor vote and his style was such that after he questioned you from all different sides, you frequently did not know how he was going to vote. But at the end of the day when he cast his vote I found myself agreeing with him ninety-nine and a half percent of the time.

The one issue that I remember we had kind of an ongoing battle about concerned the future of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. This is an organization funded with federal money that is designed to help American companies be competitive in the international environment. The Japanese, the Europeans all have their form of OPIC, and in 1973-74 Muskie sat on the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Multi-national Corporations. And the future of OPIC came up in that subcommittee and we had a series of hearings, and Frank Church was the chairman of that subcommittee. As I recall, the members were Church, Symington, Muskie on the Democratic side, and Javits and Percy on the Republican side. And there was a move by Church to zero the funding on this, saying that it was basically not very effective and was an organization that only helped big corporations that didn't need the help anyway.

At the end of the day, I thought Muskie should vote for the continuation of OPIC and he voted to kill it. And the vote in the subcommittee with three Democrats voted for it, voted for the Church position, two Republicans voted on the other side. It got to the full committee and the floor, survived, and survives to this day, and I would argue continues to be a useful adjunct in this era as well. And indeed the Bush administration is trying to cut its budget by a third. It's now funded roughly in the seven hundred million dollar a year range, and helps promote American exports. But we had some long debates about OPIC in which we disagreed, but that was really

the only issue I can remember.

DN: Did he ever change his mind?

AP: He was able, yes. I mean, not on OPIC he didn't, but on other issues, you had to be very well prepared and forceful and articulate and persistent, but you could get him to change his mind. I think as a result of hearings, he just soaked in material, and heard different points of view, and could easily come up with a view other than what he had before that. Perhaps not quickly, but over time he certainly did change his mind.

DN: Before we leave this part of the interview, I wanted to ask you for the title of your book, we should have that in here for -

AP: The U.S. Senate and Strategic Arms Policy.

DN: It was published in -

AP: Westview Press.

DN: Okay.

AP: And also I should add, at the same time I did an edited volume called Congress and Arms Control, also published by Westview Press.

DN: You went from the Senate to Stanford, and then you came back in the Carter administration and were in the Arms Control Agency. You were there for the entire Carter administration?

AP: No, I resigned soon after the Russians invaded Afghanistan in January 1980, when arms control was not very interesting. I had been involved in a series of negotiations with the Russians, all which stopped, and it was clear that this was not going to be an area that either made sense or was productive. And I began to think about what I wanted to do next, and realized what I wanted to do next was to go back to California and go back to Stanford, and worked out an arrangement to do that.

Soon after I had told my colleagues at the Arms Control Agency, which is a semi-autonomous part of the State Department, that I was planning to leave later in the spring to return to Stanford, we had the situation with the Iran hostage effort that was unsuccessful. Cy Vance resigned as Secretary of State and Ed Muskie was named. And the question I was presented with was do I go back to Stanford or think about staying around with Ed Muskie as a Secretary of State. The timing was not great in the sense that I had already committed to moving back to California. But I held open the possibility of working for Muskie, who I very much liked and respected and thought he would be an excellent Secretary of State.

To help me with my thinking on this, I got together with a few friends who were likely to be involved with Muskie, including Leon Billings and Bob Rose, Madeleine Albright, Maynard

Toll, Doug Bennett, and I talked to all of them about the situation and what they were going to do. It became clear early on that Leon and Bob and Leslie Finn, who was the office manager, were going to move down to the State Department, [and] Carole Parmelee, with Muskie. And Madeleine and Doug Bennett had, as I recall, made it clear that if Muskie wanted them to work at the State Department they would be delighted to. But that the general sense was that that would make sense not in the last part of the first Carter administration but if Carter were reelected and Muskie were to continue as Secretary of State, that would be the time to bring in his own team, as compared to replacing a lot of people who were there.

So I decided to move to California and see what happened in the 1980 election. There was also, I should add, some question in my mind that had Carter won, whether Muskie would have been asked to continue as Secretary of State in a second Carter term. Muskie and Brzezinski did not have good relations, Carter was very close to Brzezinski, and I don't know how that would have played out. So I decided that for a variety of reasons it made sense to go back to Stanford and that's what I did.

DN: It's your impression that even after the fiasco with the attempt to rescue the hostages that Brzezinski's cache with the president remained?

AP: Yes, and that was not seen as his fault.

DN: Did you have any observations on Secretary Muskie's performance in that role?

AP: Well, I obviously observed with great interest, having worked closely with him on a number of these issues. I was living in California during the spring, summer, fall of 1980, and I was on the phone with Leon and Bob at various times. Things came up and they called me and I called them. I actually had some advice that I believe was largely disregarded during that period. I have the impression that Muskie felt very strongly that it was his job to essentially not break a lot of new ground, nor break much china during that period, and that the time for new initiatives would be in 1981 if Carter got reelected. And he chose by and large to basically continue what had been going on, and on various issues to try to avoid at all costs inter-agency differences.

And I suspect that a lot of these came up and he made an effort to try to be as conciliatory as possible, particularly with Brzezinski at the NSC, but I'm sure there were some differences between State and Defense. I wasn't sure that that was the right strategy at the time, and then frankly after Carter lost and I learned through friends that Brzezinski was going to be writing a book about the Carter administration, I urged Muskie through Leon and Bob to write a book to make sure that his point of view on some of these things was accurately reflected, and Muskie refused. And that didn't surprise me, given what had happened in the last part of 1980.

DN: After he left the State Department, did you ever have a chance to talk to him about that experience?

AP: About the State experience?

DN: Yeah.

AP: Some, I did see him some through the years. I was in California. I moved back to Washington in 1984. Ultimately I moved from Stanford to the Rand Corporation, and then moved with the Rand Corporation from the think tank based in Santa Monica, from Santa Monica back to their Washington office, and I saw Muskie at various times. Indeed, I was involved with him some in 1987 when he was appointed to the Tower Commission, my advice was solicited on some issues related to that. So I had contact with him, and also we saw each other socially at various events. I never had a detailed conversation with him about any of the specifics of what he might or might not have done as Secretary of State. At that point I felt -

DN: Did he reflect at all on the experience?

AP: I mean it's actually quite interesting in light of the conversation we had earlier about his not having served for a long time on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and to some extent feeling he was a novice and uneasy with some of these issues. I think he thought Secretary of State was an enormous challenge, and I think he responded to it very positively and my sense is that he never regretted for a day doing that.

DN: As you look back on your time in the Senate working for him, what strikes you most about him and his approach to the foreign policy field and the arms issues, and what strikes you most about the way the office functioned while you were there?

AP: Well, the Muskie story is a good microcosm of how the Senate's changed in twenty-five years. In my current capacity I get up to Capitol Hill from time to time. As we move into the 21st century the Senate is very partisan, it's very polarized. You don't have a lot of the camaraderie and the friendships as existed twenty-five years ago. Twenty-five years ago, when there were sessions late at night, Muskie had a hideaway at the Capitol. He had a variety of friends on both sides of the aisle who he felt comfortable with personally, and he was a guy that sought compromise. And whether we're talking about the War Powers Act, or we're talking about a whole host of legislation, he was a great one at bringing people together and people came together because typically they respected him and they respected his intellect, and especially on issues that they didn't know as much as he did, they would defer to his judgment. And that certainly came up in the environmental area and other areas. So in the environment in which he operated, and to some extent which he epitomized, and he could carry lots of people with him on a certain vote, which doesn't exist today by and large. It's a different world on the Hill.

As far as the office goes, a number of the people I've stayed friendly with over the years, which may be unusual for some offices. I think today people come and go in congressional offices, and they don't develop the kind of ties that we developed in those years. And it became something of a family to people. I should say that I was one of the few people on the staff who was not married at the time. I got married in the early eighties, so I spent actually a lot of time in the office and I was the designated person to travel with Ed Muskie. And we spent large numbers of hours traveling because in 1972 a number of senators had campaigned for president for him, and owed a number of political IOUs. So, for example, I can remember going out to Kansas a number of occasions for Bill Roy who was running against Bob Dole in a very dirty campaign, Adlai Stevenson in Illinois and a variety of other places. And I used to travel with him, and he

was sometimes a difficult person to travel with -

DN: Why was he difficult to travel with?

AP: Well, he's one of those people when if the plane is delayed or your bag is lost, he's not very patient. And I would come back and delight the office with stories of traveling with Ed Muskie on a particular trip. And I would keep it within the staff however.

DN: The total experience with Ed Muskie left you with what assessment of his particular qualities and complexities?

AP: I'm a big fan of Ed Muskie's. He had an enormous amount of integrity, obviously a quality that's not always present in American politics today. He was a towering intellect, he was a guy that you never for a minute hesitated to say you work for him, he would always make you proud. The thing that I was struck, though, and I entered this after he had run unsuccessfully for president, is how apolitical he was. I'll never forget one of the first trips I took with him, we were on a plane going up to New York in perhaps January of 1973, and we were reading the *New York Times* and he looked over to me and he said, "Is there a mayoralty race in New York?" And I had to explain to him that John Lindsay was running in a tough reelection campaign. And I was thinking to myself, this is the guy who ran for president, and he's not aware of the fact there's a mayoralty race in New York? And I subsequently learned as I got to know him more, he had been in Florida and opposed the space shuttle. He was not a guy who followed petty partisan politics, it was just not part of his make up and it perhaps at times hurt him because he was not focused more on the political aspects of things. But that was him, and that was his style.

DN: Thank you very much, Alan.

AP: You're welcome.

End of Interview