

11-14-2003

Friendly, Alfred "Al" oral history interview

Don Nicoll

Follow this and additional works at: http://scarab.bates.edu/muskie_oh

Recommended Citation

Nicoll, Don, "Friendly, Alfred "Al" oral history interview" (2003). *Edmund S. Muskie Oral History Collection*. 136.
http://scarab.bates.edu/muskie_oh/136

This Oral History is brought to you for free and open access by the Muskie Archives and Special Collections Library at SCARAB. It has been accepted for inclusion in Edmund S. Muskie Oral History Collection by an authorized administrator of SCARAB. For more information, please contact batesscarab@bates.edu.

Interview with Alfred “Al” Friendly by Don Nicoll

Summary Sheet and Transcript

Interviewee

Friendly, Alfred “Al”

Interviewer

Nicoll, Don

Date

November 14, 2003

Place

Washington, D.C.

ID Number

MOH 422

Use Restrictions

© Bates College. This transcript is provided for individual **Research Purposes Only**; for all other uses, including publication, reproduction and quotation beyond fair use, permission must be obtained in writing from: The Edmund S. Muskie Archives and Special Collections Library, Bates College, 70 Campus Avenue, Lewiston, Maine 04240-6018.

Biographical Note

Alfred “Al” Friendly was born on May 17, 1938 in Washington, D.C. His parents were Alfred, Sr. and Jean Friendly and he was the eldest of five children. His father was a journalist with the *Washington Post* and his mother was a homemaker and involved in the Foreign Student Service Council. Alfred graduated from Harvard and later joined the Army. He became a journalist in 1962 for *Newsweek* and in 1966 moved over to the *New York Times*, until 1971. He worked for Senator Muskie as a speech writer and as a member of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee. From 1974 to 1976 he worked in Russia for *Newsweek*. In 1976 he returned to work on the Helsinki Commission, then worked for Joe Biden on the European Affairs Subcommittee. He became the Associate White House Press Secretary in 1980 for Carter.

Scope and Content Note

Interview includes discussions of: family; working for Muskie; working for Humphrey; Intergovernmental Relations (IGR) Subcommittee; speechwriting for Senator Muskie; and the Freedom of Information Act as it relates to the issue of Executive Privilege.

Indexed Names

Albright, Joseph Patterson
Biden, Joseph K.
Bork, Robert Heron
Cabot, Jane Fenderson
Carter, Jimmy, 1924-
Church, Frank
Clifford, Clark
Corcoran, Thomas G. "Tommy the Cork"
Cox, Archibald, 1912-2004
Ellsberg, Daniel
Ervin, Sam
Ford, Gerald R., 1913-
Friendly, Alfred "Al"
Friendly, Alfred, Sr.
Friendly, Jean
From, Alvin "Al"
Graham, Katharine "Kay"
Harriman, Averell
Holmes, Oliver Wendell, 1841-1935
Humphrey, Hubert H. (Hubert Horatio), 1911-1978
Javits, Jacob K. (Jacob Koppel), 1904-1986
Johnson, David
Johnson, Lyndon B. (Lyndon Baines), 1908-1973
Kennedy, Edward Moore, 1932-
Kennedy, Robert F., 1925-1968
Kissinger, Henry, 1923-
Kleindienst, Richard
Lorenz, Bis Meyer
McCarthy, Joseph, 1908-1957
McNamara, Robert S., 1916-
Melcher, John
Muskie, Edmund S., 1914-1996
Muskie, Jane Gray
Nicoll, Don
Nixon, Richard M. (Richard Milhous), 1913-1994
Percy, Charles
Porter, Mildred
Richardson, Elliot
Roosevelt, Franklin D. (Franklin Delano), 1882-1945
Roth, Bill
Rowe, James
Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr Isaevich
Teller, Edward
Thurmond, Strom, 1902-2003
Truman, Harry S., 1884-1972

Wallace, George C. (George Corley), 1919-1998

Transcript

Don Nicoll: It is Friday the 14th of November 2003. We are at 3506 Macomb Street, Washington, D.C., that's Macomb Street N.W., Washington, D.C. at the home of Alfred Friendly, and Don Nicoll is interviewing Mr. Friendly. Al, would you give us your full name and date of birth, and the names of your parents?

Alfred Friendly: My name is Alfred Friendly, Jr. Friendly is spelled F-R-I-E-N-D-L-Y. I was born in Washington May 17, 1938, and my parents were Alfred and Jean Friendly.

DN: And what was your father's occupation?

AF: He was a journalist, was with the *Washington Post* for most of his career as a journalist, and ended up as its managing editor. Which I guess he was when, no, he had left the *Post* by the time I actually worked for the Muskie, started working for Ed Muskie.

DN: And was your mother working at the same time, or was she at home?

AF: No, she was at home. She did good deeds, like the Foreign Student Service Council, in which I think she got Ed Muskie maybe, or Jane, involved. A sort of service and support group for foreign students here that my mother in fact started, and that I believe still crawls along somewhere.

DN: Did you have brothers or sisters?

AF: Two of each, I was the eldest, and of them one sister and one brother have always lived here in Washington with time out for a few places outside the country. And one brother is, went into journalism, never worked in Washington as a journalist and never lived here after college. And one sister moved away also after college.

DN: So you grew up in Washington?

AF: Yeah.

DN: Where did you go to school?

AF: Not far from where we are now, St. Alban's. I went to a public school around the corner from our house in Georgetown for a while. And then we moved to St. Alban's in the fourth grade, I guess, and went through high school except for a year abroad when my father worked for the Marshall Plan. And then after high school I went to Harvard, then in the Army, no, then most of a year abroad, then the Army, and then into journalism myself, first at *Newsweek* in the fall of 1962 I guess. And in January of '66 I moved to the *New York Times*, worked for a little bit in New York, got sent to Indonesia, then West Africa, then Rome, then Yugoslavia, and in

September of 1971 I quit. I by then had two small children and no great interest in writing stories that nobody read, or that a few people on the editorial pages of the *New York Times* read, but they didn't seem to get read by Henry Kissinger. And so I was mostly interested in seeing, in being involved in American affairs again. I'd never really worked in this country.

Then I came home and was assured that there was a splendid fellow named Ed Muskie who was going to be the next president of the United States and why didn't I go to work for him, which I thought was a -

DN: Who convinced you to do that, or is he -?

AF: Well, hey, remember the conventional wisdom of the time was not just that he was a splendid fellow, but that he was going to get the nomination and had a very good chance of knocking off Richard Nixon. But my uncle, Jim Rowe, who was a friend of the Muskies, was one of the voices of the conventional wisdom of the time. And after having an automobile accident that sidelined me for about six or eight weeks, I managed to talk Kay Graham's sister, Bis Meyer Lorenz, into sending the campaign three thousand whole dollars so that it would hire me, which it did. And in those days, that would have been early '72, maybe as early as December '71 but I think '72, at any rate, the hiring consisted of being on the Senate payroll after a time. I think there may have even been some minimal Senate salary from the very start, but certainly the place where I worked, one would not dare work these days, was the subcommittee on Intergovernmental Affairs of the Governmental Affairs committee.

And it was in fact the Muskie negative research operation run by Al From, and including Joe Albright, David Johnson, and Jane Fenderson [Cabot] was sometimes in the main office and sometimes in the subcommittee. And there were other people, Mildred Porter, was I think Al's secretary. At any rate, it was great fun. I don't think, and after a while I got given two sort of press assignments for the campaign; one was in Wisconsin for the primary. And I'm going to tell you, the first one must have been the one in Florida because I was still, I remember I still was walking around with a cane. And then I had a stint in Wisconsin just before the primary. And you will remember when Senator Muskie's birthday was, but I remember -

DN: That would be March.

AF: Yeah, it was March, and I was sort of in charge of a, not in charge, but I was working on a bus trip from beautiful downtown Green Bay to beautiful downtown Sheboygan with stops at various dairy farms in between. And there was a My brother, youngest brother who was a political junkie, was in charge of the birthday party in Green Bay that night for, or maybe not in charge again but very much involved with the birthday party in Green Bay. And that was the first time I met the senator, except I didn't. We were, I think it was the sixth floor at whatever hotel it was, and I got on to an elevator that was then held, and he and Mrs. Muskie got on to go downstairs to the birthday party. And I thought he was probably as unapproachable a human being as I had ever seen. He certainly did not I'd worked for Hubert Humphrey so my standard of presidential candidates was a little skewed, but Hubert would have known the birthdates and minor illnesses of almost everybody in the elevator by the time it reached the ground floor. Ed observed a respectful and menacing silence, shall we say, from one stop to the

next.

DN: And this was the first time you'd encountered him?

AF: Yeah, and during the campaign the only time, that I recall.

DN: Now, when did you work for Hubert?

AF: Oh, twice. Once as a, I was a robot room clerk in the summer of 1956. And I think that was my, I was then eighteen years old and it wasn't my first job, but it was certainly my first job on the Hill, and I got very good at those machines. Remember the machines that punched out form letters, and you stopped them to type in the name of the addressee? I got so I could run three or four of those machines at a crack.

And Humphrey had been a family friend, and particularly, of course, a very good friend of Jim Rowe's. James H. Rowe, Jr., R-O-W-E, who was a law clerk for Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., a special assistant to FDR [Franklin Delano Roosevelt], a Washington lobbyist with a man named . . . Well, I don't know when he left the White House but he certainly left it for the war. After the war he was a Washington lobbyist with a man named "Tommy the Cork" Thomas Corcoran, and very, very involved in Democratic politics, to the point that he was one of the people engaged, well, he's the man who wrote the memo that Clark Clifford claimed to have written on what should be Harry Truman's reelection strategy in '48. And Uncle Jim was very, very close to Lyndon [B. Johnson] and part of the, among the people who get credited with brokering the vice presidential nomination, over Bobby Kennedy's dead body in Los Angeles in 1960. Anyway, so Hubert I had known as somebody who was great fun and full of bonhomie up to the day he died. And I worked for him in '56. I worked for him again briefly in 1960 while I was waiting to go into the Army, and I was on his, on the staff of the disarmament subcommittee that he had.

And Muskie was a very, very different personality, who it was not easy to know, but who What happened after the campaign collapsed, that subcommittee kept on doing some negative research. And at some point or other I got, to my delight, involved in some real legislative work. The negative, there was The post campaign project as far as I recall was, had to do with property taxation. I still don't understand how this became a federal subject, but it was meant to be negative for its impact particularly on George Wallace, and positive in helping Jim [*sic*] [John] Melcher of Montana get reelected. So I got some very pleasant trips to examine the sinful influence of timber interests on property taxation in and around Birmingham, Alabama, and across the state of Montana, which if you have to do research is a pretty place to do it. And I'd set up some town hall hearings sort of for Melcher on that issue.

But I got most of all involved with amending the Freedom of Information Act, and that was a victory for which there were many fathers. The chief Democratic father, or person who wished to be the chief Democratic father, was Teddy Kennedy in the Judiciary committee, who had as he has now a very able staff whose priorities relate to Senator Kennedy, not necessarily to other senators. And I don't quite know why Al From managed to get some jurisdictional claim over the Freedom of Information Act amendment. The original bill, the original law goes back to the sixties. It has been something that journalists had supported; they thought it would make their

life easier getting access to closed government files. And it was also a product of the lasting animus against over classification of government documents, which wasn't just journalists. Anyway, it turns out the law, as far as I know, has been of very little use to journalists and quite a lot of use to historians. And it was an interesting set of issues.

DN: So now this landed in the subcommittee.

AF: Yeah, because it came over from the House, I mean it was being worked on in the House, and then came over from the House as a House bill. By the time it came over there was already, there were wheels already churning in the Senate, and I do not remember whether there were any joint hearings. I think to the contrary. There was a joint, there was a divided jurisdiction, I mean the bill was referred to two committees, Judiciary and Governmental Affairs. And [Samuel James, Jr.] Sam Ervin must have been interested in it, too. Anyway, it ended up in our committee, and it ended up there shortly after Watergate, well, shortly after the main I will be wrong because I don't really remember, but I believe that the hearings in the Intergovernmental Affairs subcommittee started in the late spring of '73?

DN: That would be about the time Watergate was really (*unintelligible word*).

AF: Was really, yeah, and they went on into '74, because when I left, *Newsweek*, for which I'd worked before, remembered that I spoke Russian and offered me a job in the spring of '74, and I left to take it in June of '74. At that point the bill, the clash with Kennedy had been resolved, the bill had gone to the Senate, and I believe, I think I left before it was voted. Although I have a, no, I'm having a different vote count. At any rate, I left, I think I left before it was voted on in the Senate. I certainly left before it was vetoed, which it was by Gerald Ford at Kissinger's insistence, among others.

(*Telephone interruption.*)

. . . . acts in office. But it must have been, the veto must have been August of '74 or September of '74, and it was overridden, which was another tribute to what Watergate had done to comity between the branches. At any rate, that's, I got to see the senator.

I also did start at some point, and I will have to go upstairs and tell you when, writing speeches for him. I don't remember what the first speech was. I do remember it was tossed back in my face. I also remember that after that we got on pretty well on speech writing, and I never had, and I ever rarely needed, frankly, a lot of time with the principal to work out what it is that the speech should say, because you can get, in a Senate staff at any rate, you can get that without bothering the senator too much. And I don't recall ever having a heart-to-heart with Ed Muskie about speeches, but I do know he liked some of them which made me feel good, because I liked some of them, too. And they got better, they got more fun to write as Watergate built.

That, I did not, though, write the speech that he gave after the Friday, the October massacre, [Elliot L.] Richardson's resignation and [Robert Heron] Bork's fir--, firing of [Archibald] Cox, and that was a speech that I have actually, I think, as though I had written it because it was, but I suspect Leon wrote it, or the senator wrote it. It was the speech where he says, where Muskie

said, "Look, I've held off a long time out of respect for the president, but now I can't hold out any more," and called, I believe, for his resignation. At any rate, called for impeachment or for a dramatic escalation of the investigation into Watergate.

The Freedom of Information Act issues needn't have been related to Watergate, but they were, and they became more and more so as the administration got into hotter and deeper water with the special prosecutor. And I do not remember the dates, but I do remember the moment when I realized what a really first rate legal mind and debater I was working for. Richard Kleindienst by then was the attorney general, so this would have been the spring of '74, and Kleindienst was a buffoon frankly, but, Muskie just pinned him. The issue was executive privilege, and it was tangential to the Freedom of Information Act but it was central to what was going on between the executive and the president on documents and on the Watergate tapes.

And the moment, I don't remember really, you'd have to get the transcript, is Muskie asking Kleindienst, who had given his testimony and made the claim for executive privilege in absolute terms, and Muskie saying, Well, then in your view (these are not the exact words) if the Senate wanted to talk to a washer woman in the Justice Department, the executive branch would be within its rights in forbidding that conversation. And Kleindienst, I mean it nailed him. It was just a lovely example of making the absolute, of the irrationality of making the absolute claim. And I occasionally wonder, had Muskie been elected president, I think he would have invoked a lot of executive privilege, or he would have certainly had advisers. There is a claim for executive privilege. And after, sorry, Kleindienst was the spring of '73, Elliot Richardson came in after Kleindienst. Just a second.

(Taping interrupted.)

After it was all over, there was a, that hearing with Kleindienst was one of the ones that brought in the cameras and was a nail that the administration had pounded into its own coffin in public relations terms. Months and months later, Muskie and Javits had an afternoon hearing and Elliot Richardson came, and the subject was exactly the same. And it was as learned and serious a discussion of what is executive privilege, when can it properly be invoked, what are the strains and tensions. And it was two men who respected one another as lawyers talking about a serious and basically not resolvable Constitutional issue in the way that you would like to think senators and distinguished members of the executive branch actually could talk to one another. Of course, there was not a reporter in the room. It was no longer, that particular wave had long since passed. But you could, in those two moments, and there were some others, you could see both the political acuity of Muskie and the very serious legislator, Constitutional, would-be Constitutional scholar side, and it was, it's fun to work for people like that, as you know. Can we stop here?

DN: Yes, I must just ask you a quick question before we take a pause. During this period, working on the question of freedom of information, were you essentially staffing the senator on that topic?

AF: Through Al From.

DN: Through him, yeah.

AF: But yeah, I had more of that ball than anybody else on the staff and I, I mean, that was I think the mistaken impression that since I was a journalist I knew something about the subject, which of course I didn't. But I learned a lot about classification, and there were some very good expert witnesses on the issue of over-classification which was, as I recall, where we started. And executive privilege is where we rolled into, and that got the most public attention, but after lunch I'll talk to you about the classification hoorah, which was fun, too.

DN: And we'll be back.

(Pause in taping.)

DN: Continuing our discussion with Al Friendly. Al, we were talking about the executive privilege question, and there were other experiences you had both with that, I assume, and with the subcommittee.

AF: Yes. Can I just, for the record, say I really prefer to be called Alfred; my father was Al.

DN: Excuse me.

AF: It's all right. The executive privilege was a Watergate related part, as I recall, of the subcommittee's work on the Freedom of Information Act. The central concern was the concern that I think had generated the act to begin with, which was overclassification, that there were lots of government secrets that weren't real secrets, and the amendments that had been proposed to the Act that were in fact adopted were all designed to make it harder, in theory, for officials to refuse to release documents that were legitimately requested, or were designed to cut the deadlines. So that if there was to be a refusal, it could be tested in court.

And I think the other issue was to try and put into the record what the tests should be if a court heard the government official say, yes, this information deserves to be classified. Well, Don Nicoll working for the Portland National Public Radio station said, no, it doesn't deserve to be classified, there's nothing secret about it, it's just being withheld, we don't know, how can we know whether it's secret or whether it isn't. But it's important that the public know what this information is, even if it might embarrass somebody in the government or the government, to release it. Embarrassment is not a reason for nondisclosure, and classification is an abused, much abused pretext. And it was deadlines, who review procedures, and as I say, an attempt at any rate to narrow the grounds on which classification could be invoked, or executive privilege in particular, yes, but classification was where it was at.

And the most famous instance of classification in those days had to do with something called the Pentagon Papers, which had come out in the summer of 1974, and it had been disclosed, had been provided to the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times* by one Daniel Ellsberg, E-L-L-S-B-E-R-G, who was indicted for abusing classified information, mishandling, and convicted as I recall, and appealed his conviction. And sometime in the spring of 1974 that conviction, his appeal was successful, at any rate, the charges against him were dropped. And he was notorious.

And I proposed to Al From that we try and get him as a witness; we had hearings that were ongoing. And Al cleared it up the line and it must be that somebody said to the Senator, "Is this okay?" because Ellsberg was not the most popular figure in the country. But the issue was hot, and the Senator, as far as I'm concerned, was on the side of the angels on this one and said, "Sure, have him." So he came and he testified.

And he made the same basic pitch that a scientist of great renown named Edward Teller had also made as a witness at a hearing that had not been anywhere as well attended, which was that: the more widely information is known, the better. And it's the Jeffersonian view of being able to tolerate error as long as truth is free to combat it. And Teller argued this case in the sciences, which was a specific area in the Freedom of Information Act that, where there was a broad, had been a broad definition of what could be classified, or a broad practice. And Teller was flat out, he said, "They'll classify anything." I mean, he took a really absolutist position.

Ellsberg came along and basically said, for policy reasons you don't want to restrict this kind of information, because otherwise policy makers will be operating, as they did in Vietnam, from premises that nobody has the information to challenge correctly. To you and me this is not a particularly fire breathing point of view to take, and particularly today when you see it happening again with Iraq intelligence. But it, because it was Ellsberg there were a lot of cameras. Muskie listened to him respectfully and didn't ask many questions as chairman. In fact, my recollection, but somebody has to look at the transcript, is that he didn't ask any questions but deferred to the other committee members who were there, one of whom was probably Bill Roth. I don't remember whether Javits was there throughout, or just when what happened next happened next.

One of the subcommittee members was Strom Thurmond, who appeared basically after Ellsberg had finished his testimony. And when Muskie deferred to him said, and I cannot give you the exact words, or I can give you some of the exact words, looked at Muskie and said, "This is an outrage. This man shouldn't be testifying before the Senate, he's a criminal, and you are not fit to be a member of the United States Senate." It was, I remember that took my breath away. I had never heard "the club" be disparaged in that manner. And I, it's one of those moments where I guess, you know, just before the car crash your mind goes blank?

I expected Ed Muskie to show a little temper, because it really was an appalling thing to say. And whoever bothers to look at the transcript of that hearing will find that the words, "You should be ashamed of yourself, you're not fit to be a United States Senator", are very close to the exact words that were used. And nothing happened, except that either [Jacob Koppel] Javits or [William "Bill"] Roth, Muskie said nothing, Javits or Roth immediately asked to speak, defended Muskie, and Thurmond walked out. But, again, the issue was an issue of some passion at the time, and it had a lot to do with the standing of the Nixon administration and various claims it had made, and that Lyndon had made before, and [Robert] McNamara, that things are too secret to be, for people to know, trust us. But that kind of rudeness I never see in the Senate; I don't know whether you ever did, but . . .

DN: No.

AF: I was so proud, I mean when I recovered my senses, I was so proud of Muskie for not saying a word, because what word can you say?

DN: Did he ever comment on it after that?

AF: No, no, because, I think it was probably Javits who said something, in my memory, eloquent and moving on the subject of Ed Muskie's credentials as a senator and a human being. At any rate, that was, even though the memory is not perfect, that probably is the episode that stands out best in my memory of this guy's ability, at least in public, to maintain total composure. I mean, we all know that in private he didn't, but, back to the elevator. Ed Muskie, to me, was a figure of enormous dignity, and it was unapproachable in the elevator, and it was unassailable when Thurmond went after it.

The one time, it must have been earlier in '74 or late '73, there was an outfit called the Appeal of Conscience Foundation, or Appeal for Conscience Foundation, that was run by a rabbi whom I had met in Moscow and disliked. It was one of those people who had taken up the cause of Jewish refuseniks in the Soviet Union as, I'm sorry, it couldn't have been in Moscow, I'd met him somewhere. But he was milking the refusenik issue to enhance, in my view, his own reputation. Besides which, he drenched himself in a cologne that was unbearable. And he invited Ed Muskie to come and talk at some annual conference dinner in New York in a chi-chi hotel.

And I wrote the speech that the senator gave, and I don't think it was the first time he'd given it, but it was, but he gave it with some considerable feeling. It had to do with Watergate and Richard Nixon, and the Constitution, and it was a clearly partisan view of the President's conduct that he gave before an audience of drunk Republicans, who threw food at him, bread. And, again, I had never seen that kind rudeness before, and we left together and I said, you know, "Sorry, that must have been awful." He said, "No, it was kind of fun." I mean, he did have composure, and he didn't say, at least in my hearing on the subjects that I worked on for him, he didn't say things he hadn't thought out and didn't believe.

I did try once to get him to attack Kissinger and Nixon, Nixon, Kissinger and Nixon, must have been in, yeah, in the spring of '73. Early March of '73 or late February the Soviets expelled [Aleksandr Isaevich] Solzhenitsyn, and I think a couple of Solzhenitsyn's books will be classics for a long, long time. Not most of them, but a couple. And, I don't know, maybe I just don't think you should treat writers that way. At any rate, I wrote a speech for him to give denouncing the administration for not receiving Solzhenitsyn at the White House, and the Soviets for treating Solzhenitsyn that way, and basically advocating a much tougher public support for human rights issues in the Soviet Union than the Nixon administration and the *Realpolitik* of Henry Kissinger, felt was appropriate. I mean, this was not exactly a new argument. I waxed, I thought, fairly convincing or eloquent on the subject, I still do, I read the speech seven years ago and thought it was pretty damn good. He didn't give it. I mean he, we had agreed that he would give it, it was to be given maybe on a Monday night to some student group in Pennsylvania or Ohio, and over the weekend he showed it to Averell [Harriman], I know, I don't know who else, but the decision was that Friendly was over the top on this one. At any rate, I got to write a good speech.

DN: Did he tell you why he didn't give it?

AF: Pretty much, yeah, that Averell and I don't, I've forgotten whether he mentioned anybody else, but I mean this was, he treated the matter seriously enough so that he shopped it around to people he trusted, which was perfectly okay. And he did tell me, well I know, I learned because we were going to release the text in Washington, and he told me that the consensus was that this, that position vis-a-vis the Soviets, was not the one he wanted to be identified with.

DN: Do you have any other vivid recollections from your time on the subcommittee?

AF: Only that, I don't know whether, I'm sure somebody else has pointed out, but that hearing room, which is where the staff also had desks, had been Joe McCarthy's permanent investigations subcommittee. That gave you pause. They're not specific recollections, Don. What I do remember was watching mark up, where it would be Muskie and Javits, sometimes with Ervin, and it was professional. There was, they disagreed, this was, Chuck Percy had a dreadful, I thought, consumer protection act. I've forgotten why I thought it was dreadful, but I thought it was a sloppy piece of legislative thinking, and I think that Muskie did, too. And it got marked up, I mean, it was one of the bills I saw them, you know, sat around as they marked it up. It was the level of discussion among all these men who had been there a long time, were certainly in three cases lawyers, I don't know about Roth.

DN: He was a lawyer.

AF: Yeah, and I had once thought of going to law school and decided wisely that I didn't want to, but I like seeing people who are good at what they do doing it well. And my other memory that's generic really is of the professionalism and bipartisanship, and the mutual respect that was evident around the table when they were working on something that they didn't have an identity of views on at all. I'd forgotten that Percy was on that subcommittee, but he was.

DN: Now, you left the subcommittee in 1974, and you were next in government and in an arena

AF: Oh, yeah, well I went to Moscow in '74 and stayed two years, came back and went to work, and I continually crusaded against Henry Kissinger, for something called the Helsinki Commission on the, that was basically an operation of Dante Fassel's, who was another very, very interesting and admirable, largely admirable Democratic politician, in the fall of '76 and stayed there until sometime in late Oh, and then I left in '78 to work on a book that I didn't finish on dissent in the Soviet Union, and got hired by Biden, Joseph Biden, then the chairman of the Well I was hired by a man named Bill Dader, D-A-D-E-R, who was the staff director of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that Frank Church of Idaho was the chairman of. And I worked in a subcommittee on European affairs that Joseph Biden of Delaware chaired, and I did that for about a year which was interesting, the SALT II hearings. And then went to work in January, no, February, March, February or March of 1980 in the Carter White House as a, what was called an Associate White House Press Secretary for the National Security Council.

DN: Did you during both your time with the Foreign Relations committee and at the White House have any encounters with Senator Muskie and as Secretary of State?

AF: Nothing that would, might have been more than a shake of the hand.

DN: And as you look back, and after both of you had left government, did you have any encounters?

AF: Almost none. No, indeed, until his funeral. I don't think I even saw very many, you know, of the people with whom I'd worked, because I just, I went in, I went different ways.

DN: Then as you look back over your exposure to Ed Muskie from the time you were told that he was an attractive candidate who would be a great president, and on through, what stands out in your own mind in terms of his strengths and possibly his weaknesses as a (*unintelligible word*)?

AF: On the weaknesses side, I'm not a very good commentator because I would only hear maybe second hand about the difficulty that he sometimes had on various issues coming to closure. As I say, I almost never saw his temper, except when I handed him the first speech, or when he handed, not handed, threw it back at me with some not very flattering remark about it. And after that we just got on to the extent that we worked together, we got along very well. What I admired in him was integrity, professional skill. I mean he had all the tools to be a great senator, a great writer or composer of legislation. I don't know that he had the executive talents to be a great president, but he had, but because of the integrity that he radiated, coming after Richard Nixon, even before Watergate, he would have, I think, contributed a great deal to the way Americans feel about themselves, to have had someone like that as their leader for four years as compared to some of the others we have had instead. He liked language; I like language. It was, that was not a bond, but it was, it was one of the things that makes you like somebody.

DN: Thank you very much.

AF: It was my pleasure.

End of Interview