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**Transcript**

**Don Nicoll:** It is Tuesday, the 27th of February, the year 2001. We are in Washington, D.C. in the offices of Frank Mankiewicz and Don Nicoll is interviewing Mr. Mankiewicz. Frank, would you tell us your full name and spell it for us, and give us the date and place of birth.

**Frank Mankiewicz:** Name is Frank Mankiewicz, M-A-N-K-I-E-W-I-C-Z. It’s pronounced
Man’-kie-wicz here but everywhere else in the world it’s pronounced Man-kie’-wicz. I was born in New York City, May 16th, 1924.

DN: You and Ed Muskie share a certain heritage.

FM: I suppose so, yeah, yeah. Although in those days it was always hard to know whether the place where you were born or where your grandparents were born was Polish or Russian or even German for a while. But I think it’s Polish. I know it was definitely Polish.

DN: As a matter of fact, Ed Muskie’s father, Stephen Marciszewski -

FM: I was going to say that was it. The K-I-E ending suggests to me that at one time there might have been more letters there.

DN: That’s the immigration service, did an injustice to his name.

FM: What was his father’s name?

DN: Marciszewski, and he grew up in eastern Poland which at the time was occupied by the Russians. And he left to avoid conscription in the Russian army.

FM: A wise decision.

DN: Frank, you were working for Senator Robert Kennedy in the 1960s.

FM: I worked for Senator Robert Kennedy as press secretary from ‘65 until he was killed in ‘68.

DN: And had you had experience on Capitol Hill before that?

FM: No, none, none.

DN: What brought you into his orbit?

FM: Well, I’m not sure. I’d been the Peace Corps director in Peru in the early sixties, ‘61, ‘62, ‘63, and then I became the Latin America regional director for the Peace Corps in Washington. And in ‘65, ‘65 wasn’t it? Senator Kennedy was just elected to the Senate, election of ‘64, and I guess had been sworn in probably early in ‘65, and in the fall of that year he wanted to take a trip to Latin America. And somebody at the State Department gave him an agenda which was not really to his fancy, and I guess someone told him that I knew a lot about Peru because I’d been there for two years, that was my first assignment in the Peace Corps. And so he called me up and said that someone, I forget who it was, had said he should call me about his schedule in Peru.

And so I, he said he would read it to me. And it was very typical for the State Department at that time, he would spend the morning, I think, at the American School, and then a lunch with the
Peruvian-American Chamber of Commerce, and then in the afternoon I think a visit to the American hospital and maybe a few other things like that, and then a reception in the evening at the [US] Embassy. I said to him, “Why are you going to Lima?” I said, “You can see all those people right here.” And he laughed and said, “Yeah,” that’s what he thought, too, and what did I recommend. So I proposed an alternate schedule for him, put him out to San [ ] university and took him out to the sort of slums and so on were, because slums are deteriorated dwellings, these were sort of almost like tent cities, they were squatter settlements moving out from the center of the city. Maybe half the population of Lima lived there, little places they had built themselves out of straw and called *barriadas*. And I said, you can go there in the morning, and somewhere, where did I take him, perhaps to the copper mine in the afternoon, and let him see how the people work there. And then a meeting probably with some students in the evening.

So he apparently liked that idea and then, I met him next about a week later when he was being briefed for the trip by the Department of State, and they had me there as the regional director of the Peace Corps, and the Latin America head of the CIA was there, and the military mission, and AID and all the other components of American foreign policy in Latin America, and the Assistant Secretary. And Senator Kennedy began by asking, “What shall I say when they ask me about what’s going on in the Dominican Republic?” Because at that time there had been an attempted democratic uprising and the government had put it down very strongly, or was in the process of putting it down. And there were American troops there.

And the assistant secretary said, “Well, you could tell them something your brother said about Communism in the Caribbean.” Now, if you know Senator Kennedy, you know, he did not like to hear President Kennedy referred to as “your brother”, or “Jack”. So he looked very coldly at the Assistant Secretary of State and said, “And what statement of President Kennedy’s are you referring to?” Well he didn’t remember, and he said, “Well, something about Communism in the Caribbean.” And the senator said, “Well,” he said, “I hope you’re not using anything President Kennedy said to defend your policy in the Dominican Republic.” And that was the way the briefing began, and it rapidly got worse.

Well, I must say I didn’t contribute anything helpful from the State Department’s point of view. And it was clear that there was some difference. And when the briefing was over, oh, and I remember one great moment, he said, “What about Brazil?” you know, where the [military] government had just outlawed political parties and shut down the Congress, and thrown out the president, of course. And some State Department guy said, “Well you could say,” and then he read from a statement he had, saying, “while we regret that temporarily a great power has seen . . .” you know, and Bob cut him off with a statement that was fairly typical of him, I guess, he said, “I don’t talk like that.” The briefing ended fairly shortly after that.

And he asked me if I would come to his house the next day, as he put it, for a real briefing. So I went and spent some time with him and some associates of his, and then he asked me to go on the trip with him and I said, “Oh, I can’t do that. I work for the Peace Corps, I work for this government.” But I noticed, about three weeks later, I was in Panama for a regional meeting, and I noticed that Kennedy’s plane was coming through Panama one of the nights I was there.

In those days there were no nonstop flights from Florida to anywhere in Latin America, you had
to stop in Panama and refuel, I guess. No jets. And there was always about a one hour stopover in Panama from two to three in the morning. And so I thought, ‘well, I’ll just go out there and see if anybody’s up’. So I went to the airport and there was his plane and a couple of reporters standing out on the tarmac, and one of them said, “When is he going to have his press conference?” I said, “Gee, I don’t know, I’m not aware there’s going to be a press conference, but I’ll go see.”

So I walked onto the airplane, you know, you could do that in those days, and there he was with Ethel. And Pan-American had fitted the front of the baggage compartment so it expanded into like two berths so he could sleep. He was in one and Ethel was in the other, with some of his staff people around, and I told him about these two reporters and he said to me, “Well,” he said, “if I don’t go down and talk to them,” and he knew nothing about it, there was nothing planned. He said, “If I don’t go down and talk to them, who gets hurt the most, the reporters or their publishers?” I said, “I think probably the reporters,” and he said, “that’s what I thought, too.” And so he started to get up and get dressed. And then one of them, one of his staff people said, “Well, why don’t you stay here?” “We’ll bring the reporters on board and that way you won’t have to get out of bed.” And RFK [Robert F. Kennedy] looked at me and he said, “What do you think of that?” And I thought, this is a key question, and I answered him very quickly, I said, “I think that’s what General DeGaulle would do.” And he laughed and got up and started to get dressed, he said, “Yeah, I agree.” And I think maybe that’s where I made it as his press secretary, I’m not sure. But we went out and had the press conference, I interpreted for him, and came back.

And then when he came back to Washington after the trip he had somebody call me and we talked about the Peace Corps in Latin America and some ideas for a speech he was going to give. And about a month later he called me up and said his press secretary was leaving and would I like the job. And I’d never been a press secretary, I wasn’t even sure what a press secretary did, but I thought, it can’t be that hard. And obviously I wanted to work for him, so I asked my wife what she thought and we accepted in about ten minutes. So that’s how that happened, but I’d never had any experience on the Hill.

DN: Had you done any writing?

FM: I’d done some journalism, yeah, I knew how to be a reporter but, I’d been to Columbia School of Journalism and I’d worked for about a year in Washington and a year or two in Los Angeles as a journalist before I went to law school. And, so I knew that side of it by God, but I wasn’t sure what else went on.

DN: Did you find the press secretary role any different from what you suspected it might be?

FM: Yeah, it was, well for him, I’m not sure what being a press secretary for other senators might have been, but at that time we were getting, you know, a hundred, two hundred calls a day saying they’d like to come interview him, and letters and invitations, speaking invitations, and it all became very, you know, very difficult to handle all of that, but after a while I began to sense what you turn down without even consulting him and what he needed to be consulted about. And also his own work habits. He never talked to lobbyists, or saw anyone on weekends, save a
lot of time.

He was very interested in people with ideas, I mean, he would often ask me or someone else on the staff who’s writing good stuff about this or that subject, what have you read lately about housing or civil rights or whatever. And sometimes we’d tell him the names of people who had written interesting articles or books and you’d see them in the office a couple of days later, I mean he’d call them up, some professor from California or Michigan or whatever and invite him to lunch, and they almost always accepted. So it wasn’t, it was about what I thought it would be. The press was ravenous and I was as helpful as I could be.

**DN:** Did you get involved much with other offices on the Hill?

**FM:** At first not that many, you know, he was still a freshman senator and he had a couple of issues that he worked on. He had some friends, obviously he talked to his brother, to Senator Ted Kennedy frequently. Senator McGovern had some dealings with, and then later went into his presidential campaign, but I’m trying to think who else. Well, he’d regularly go out and campaign with various other senators who were up for reelection, you know, we’d go around, did a trip once for Paul Douglas and a fellow from New Hampshire, McIntyre.

**DN:** Tom McIntyre.

**FM:** Tom McIntyre, and various members of Congress, go out. Jennings Randolph he did a special trip for, gave a speech at some event in West Virginia. So I got to know some of them that way. We went to give a speech for Senator Mondale on “turkey day”, somewhere, Burlington, Minnesota I think. Thousands of turkeys. So in that sense I dealt with some of them. I’m not sure whether we ever did anything jointly with Senator Muskie. I know he talked to him from time to time.

**DN:** When did you first really become aware of Senator Muskie or -?

**FM:** I think really, I’m trying to think, it may have been some issue before then but I think really in, at the convention in 196-, well, in sixty-, no, in ‘68 when he was nominated for vice president. Senator McGovern called me early that morning, the morning after the nomination of Hubert Humphrey, and asked me if I would go with him to Humphrey’s hotel room at, I think, four o’clock in the afternoon. And I said, “Sure, and why?” Because, and McGovern had entered that presidential race late and I sort of coordinated his campaign. And he did very well, he got a hundred and fifty delegates and everybody liked what he had to say. Well, he was an anti-war leader then. And he asked me, and I said to him, “Why would you want me to come to the meeting?” And he said, “Well,” he said, “I’m afraid he’s going to ask me to be his vice presidential candidate and I don’t want to do it, but I want some support there.” So I said, “All right, I’ll be happy to do that.”

But then at ten or eleven o’clock in the morning I think Humphrey had selected Ed Muskie. And so McGovern called me and said, “Well, I’m happy to hear it was Muskie,” and he thought he was an excellent choice. But Humphrey still wanted him to come meet him, and I think Senator Muskie was there at that meeting. Not for long, he had somewhere else he had to go. But
Humphrey asked us what he ought to say that evening, anything special, he had sort of the guts of his speech. And I said he ought to say something about the violence that was going on and about the police and about the, particularly about the security in the convention hall which was dreadful. People were not being allowed to go from delegation to delegation, the media were being manhandled by the Chicago police.

And so he said, Humphrey asked me to meet with Max Kampelman and somebody from Senator Muskie’s campaign, I’m not sure who it was. They were all in the room, why don’t you guys go off into a room here and write something, give me three or four paragraphs to begin the speech. So we did, and I thought it was pretty good. It was one of the great undelivered introductions of American political history. And we had every reason to think he was going to deliver it, but somebody on his staff vetoed the whole thing and he never said anything about what was going on in Chicago. I think it was a mistake. And I’m not sure where Senator Muskie stood on that, but I had a sense from our earlier conversation that he was concerned about that issue, too.

DN: He was.

FM: Yeah, I’m sure he was. And of course, now when did he give the speech by the fireplace?

DN: The, oh, that was the 1970 speech, it was not by a fireplace but outside a home in Cape Elizabeth, Maine.

FM: Why do I associate a fireplace with it?

DN: No, that was a, you’re talking about the response to Nixon in ‘70?

FM: Yeah, yeah.

DN: No, that was filmed on the grounds actually of someone you undoubtedly knew during that period, Hal Pachios. Hal Pachios’ father’s home.

FM: Sure, Hal, he was the state chairman maybe.

DN: Not at that time.

FM: No? Hal had been in the Peace Corps, that’s where I knew him.

DN: That’s right, yeah. And his folks owned a home on Cape Elizabeth south of Portland, and that’s where the piece was recorded.

FM: And he wasn’t seated inside for that speech?

DN: No, you might have that memory because the house was a big stone house.

FM: Yes, yeah.
DN: And it was a stone background, it would almost appear to be a fireplace.

FM: Isn’t that funny, I’d have sworn he was sitting by the fire. But it was wonderful speech. It was done outdoors.

DN: Done outdoors.

FM: At night?

DN: No, in the day time. Recorded and then broadcast.

FM: Well that was in 1970, yeah, okay. He was then the unsuccessful vice presidential nominee, right, okay.

DN: Were you involved in that campaign?

FM: Sixty-eight?

DN: No, the ‘70 campaign.

FM: The ‘70 campaign. Well, I was a journalist, I was writing a column in the Los Angeles Times syndicate, ran in the Washington Post. No, I didn’t play any real role in that campaign.

DN: Did you cover it on the road, or?

FM: Yeah, yeah, I certainly covered that speech of Muskie’s, incorrectly as it turns out.

DN: The, in 1968 after the convention, were you in, did you then go into journalism directly?

FM: Yeah.

DN: So you were not involved in that campaign either.

FM: In ‘68?

DN: Yeah.

FM: Well, I worked with Senator McGovern at the convention.

DN: Up through the convention.

FM: Yeah, yeah. Then after that Tom Braden and I collaborated on a column, and we also worked at Channel 9 here in Washington for a while, for I think two years we were the anchors, six o’clock, eleven o’clock.

DN: You’ve had a varied career.
FM: Things were more relaxed then.

DN: What, did you ever have any personal conversations with Senator Muskie?

FM: I have, yeah. I can’t really remember precisely the circumstances. I know once I was with Berl Bernhard and we talked. I think just sort of general stuff about the campaign and the Nixon, that first Nixon term. And I would see him on the campaign trail in ‘72. We’d cross paths occasionally when I was with Senator McGovern. And then I remember very well a moment in, oh, I guess it might have been April or May, maybe earlier, of ‘72 when Senator Muskie was, either had informally or was about formally to drop out of the presidential race. (Break in taping.)

DN: Before our break you were starting to tell about a conversation with Senator Muskie just before he announced his withdrawal in ‘72.

FM: Yeah, well it wasn’t a conversation with him, I think we had talked briefly. But Berl Bernhard, who was sort of running Senator Muskie’s campaign, called me and said that Senator Muskie was going to withdraw from active campaigning. I forget when this was, just before a state convention meeting probably, I think in Oklahoma. And we were, and he said that he wanted to announce his support, when he withdrew, for Senator McGovern, so how could we work this out? So we worked out, Berl and I, and Senator McGovern agreed and I assume Berl was speaking for Senator Muskie, that Senator Muskie would join the campaign plane in New York where it was, we were going up to New York and we were going to get on the campaign plane there and fly to Oklahoma. It’s either Oklahoma or Missouri, I’m not sure, for the state convention, at which time the two of them would appear together. And it would make a nice photo and a good TV spot, and we would let the press know that this was coming, and Muskie and Senator McGovern would fly together for the day. Probably April.

So we had it all worked out and I even arranged for a reservation, two seats, for a flight from Washington to New York to get to where we were going in plenty of time for Berl and Senator Muskie, and we even used false names on the reservation so that people wouldn’t know he was going to New York. I guess I wasn’t going, for some reason I was going to stay in Washington, maybe fly directly to the convention, I’m not sure, but the two of them were going to go. And it was a terrific day, we thought it was a wonderful boost to the campaign. And I was particularly pleased, because I frankly had hated running against Senator Muskie for whom I had great admiration, particularly from his efforts in ‘68 and his actions since then. I thought he was a terrific fellow, and I even said to McGovern a couple of times, you know, if you weren’t running I’d be working in Muskie’s campaign. And then he [Muskie] did not do well, and then when he was ready to get out I thought this was just perfect.

And something happened late that night or early in the morning, I think early in the morning as a matter of fact. Berl told me that Senator Muskie had talked to somebody at the last minute and they had talked him out of it. He said, go ahead, withdraw, but don’t endorse McGovern or anyone. And I don’t know why, my impression was that it was Clark Clifford he had talked to, but Berl may even have said that to me, I’m not sure. So, and then this came in a phone call
from Berl around maybe three, four o’clock in the morning, ‘not going to do it’. They were going to leave at eight in the morning, they had no airplane. So that was that.

I think I saw Senator Muskie a few times in the campaign after that. And then when I started writing a column I had an interview with him about some matter or other, ABM or something on which he felt strongly and it was a good column and I think it represented him quite fairly. But that was about it, because when the campaign ended I devoted most of my time very quickly to writing books, I wrote a couple of books, four in fact between 1972 and 1976. Then in 1977 I became president of National Public Radio and started another career.

DN: Number five or six?

FM: Yeah, yeah, way up there.

DN: In the ‘72 campaign did you have an opportunity to view the Muskie campaign and develop any strong feelings about what was happening?

FM: Not really. We stole a few staffers from that campaign, but only after New Hampshire and Florida and a couple other places where he seemed to be drifting down. Sandy Berger came and joined us from the Muskie campaign, and I think maybe even Bob Shrum, I think Shrum had been in the Muskie campaign.

DN: Yeah, he had been writing for it.

FM: Yeah, Berger, Shrum, a couple of others, Ann Wexler. We got the stars as the Muskie campaign began to fail. But why it was failing or what decisions were being made or what was happening in that campaign I didn’t know.

DN: Dropping back to the Senate days -

FM: Certainly we thought of him as the strongest candidate that we were going to oppose. Turned out it was Humphrey, but we had a lot of respect for the Muskie campaign and of course for him.

DN: Dropping back to the Senate days, do you recall any impressions or involvement by, or comments by Senator Kennedy with reference to Muskie legislation? I’m thinking particularly of the environmental legislation and then model cities.

FM: Well, he was very interested in the model cities legislation and I think talked to Senator Muskie frequently about it. Senator Kennedy was not an early environmentalist. I’m sure he might have become one, but that whole issue was really not on, not on our screen, or on his. He was much more concerned about urban problems, cities, as you might imagine. And I think if it had ever been put to him starkly, any issue as a choice between trees and jobs, I think he’d have probably gone for jobs. We didn’t have any environmental people on the staff who were directing his attention in that direction. I’m sure had he lived he would have been.
But on the model cities program you're quite right, you reminded me, he did talk to Senator Muskie and he endorsed that program of Muskie’s frequently. He always respected Muskie as a man of stature and dignity. He had a curious vocabulary about other people. He, politicians were either, he would say about someone, he says, he’s a good fellow, or he’s a very good fellow, and the difference being were they for John Kennedy before or after the convention. A very good fellow would be someone who had endorsed Kennedy maybe even before the primaries, although, you know, in 1960 there was not much thought about primaries, it was mostly conventions and dealing and dare I use the word “bosses”.

But in the Senate he talked about men of stature, dignity, he was very interested in sort of the senatorial aspect of these political figures. He had great admiration for Senator Muskie. Muskie, Paul [Howard] Douglass, Claiborne [de Borda] Pell, Frank Church, well when you think about it there were really giants in the Senate in those days. You look at the, you look at the Senate today and by and large, except for some of the holdovers, they’re pygmies. They raise money and they clamor to get their thirty seconds on television when an issue is presented that they can demagogue. But you start thinking about who was in the Senate in those days, McGovern and Church and Hatfield, John Sherman Cooper, Ed Muskie, [Jacob Koppel] Jack Javits, Pell. Sure I’m leaving out four or five names but they were extraordinary people.

DN: What has made the difference do you think?

FM: Well, I wrote a book about it and I still stick to it. I think television has made the difference. It is so pervasive and we need, politicians need it so badly that all they can do is raise money. I mean, people talk about campaign financing as the issue, but it’s television that’s driving that. A lot of people, maybe Javits began it, I’m not sure, but there were iss–, proposals back even in the sixties, and certainly in the seventies, that television stations, as a condition of their license, should be required to give free time to candidates. That would end the campaign financing issue because that's what the money goes for. But you know, you’ve lived that, you know what it costs to run a Senate campaign today. I bet you in Maine, it’s a relatively small state, you need what, maybe ten million dollars to run a Senate campaign?

DN: Three or four, but that’s substantial.

FM: Three, four, five maybe? Well, that means you’re raising two thirds to three quarters of a million dollars a year once you’re elected to have your campaign ready for reelection. Well, that means you’re on the phone every day to four or five people. It’s very, very constraining.

DN: The, do you think that television is at the root of the drop in civility in the Senate as well?

FM: Partly I think, because you’ve got to say everything very quickly and if you say something dignified for thirty seconds nobody’s going to care. But if you use words like lie and, you know, steal or oppress, outrage, those are becoming very overused words. I think it has a lot to do with that. And also the fact that, that somehow the job has lost a certain cache. I think maybe it’s no longer, in one’s scheme of things when you start thinking about a career, even if you’re drawn toward public service. I’m not sure the job of United States senator is quite as dignified and exemplary as it used to be. It’s, ‘oh, that politician’. I mean, you get out there and
you get excoriated and attacked and reviled, and you know that people are sorting through your 
garbage and, you know, trying to find the ex-wife who will say something terrible, or a high 
school girlfriend if you don’t have an ex-wife. And I can see good people without even knowing 
that they’re doing it, shrinking from a life in politics. And I think television has had it’s sort of 

But you look at those guys who were in the Senate and they weren’t there for, you know, for 
raising campaign funds. They were there because they believed in some things. Ed Muskie was 
maybe the first environmentalist in the Senate, not because he thought the Sierra Club was going 
to give him enough money to be reelected, I’m sure it never occurred to him. He was in it 
because that’s one thing he believed in. George McGovern risked his career many times because 
he hated that war, like Church. Some of the southerners who spoke up against traditional 
southern culture, they weren’t doing that for money, or even to keep themselves in office. Paul 
Douglass, I mean these were giants. At least I thought so.

DN: The communications, the relationships across party lines were quite different in those 
days.

FM: Yeah, absolutely. Yeah, well Kennedy, you know, had very good relations with a lot of 
the Republicans even though he would fight with them regularly in the Senate. Certainly Javits, 
Clifford Case, Charles Percy, interesting people. John Sherman Cooper, one hardly knew what 
party John Sherman Cooper was in.

DN: When you think of Senator Muskie, what, you’ve mentioned Senator Kennedy’s comment 
about his dignity and integrity. What are the qualities that struck you most particularly at the 
time?

FM: Well, he was very careful in what he said, I thought. I know that Senator Kennedy and 
others, McGovern too, would say you have to be very sure to read what they have to say, and 
Muskie was one of the handful of senators to whom Kennedy particularly looked to. Don’t listen 
to what correspondents are saying he says or thinks, read what he has to say, read his speeches, 
read his articles if there were any. He thought Muskie was careful in his speech and in 
expressing himself on an issue. And he admired that. I mean, he’d been around probably too 
many hot headed Irishmen in his youth to, not to respect that. He liked Muskie. When did Ed 
Muskie come to the Senate, ‘60?

DN: Nineteen fifty-eight, he was part of the class of ‘58, Phil Hart, Gale McGee -

FM: There’s a name I forgot. And Kennedy, John Kennedy came to the Senate, no, he did in 
‘52 and reelected in ‘58. But Phil Hart, yeah.

DN: Let’s see, Gale McGee I mentioned, Gene McCarthy was in that class.

FM: Yeah, yeah, Frank Church, maybe earlier?

DN: Frank, I think Frank may have been earlier, or he may have come in in ‘60. He was in the
House before he came to the Senate, and I just, at this moment I can’t remember whether he was in that class or not. But he was part of -

**FM:** Abe Ribicoff.

**DN:** Abe Ribicoff came later.

**FM:** He’d been a governor, that’s right, he was a governor in 1960.

**DN:** He was a governor in 1960. In fact, when you mentioned Senator Kennedy’s “good fellow” and “very good fellow”, I was reminded of the December, or, excuse me, November 1959 trip that Senator Jack Kennedy and John Bailey and Abe Ribicoff made to Maine seeking endorsement for the Democratic leadership which came in early 1960, January of ’60.

**FM:** Now, was Ed Muskie the governor then?

**DN:** No, he was senator. Governor Clauson, who died actually before the endorsement was given, was governor, and Frank Coffin was at the House, or Frank Coffin and Jim Oliver were the House members.

**FM:** Frank Coffin was made a federal judge.

**DN:** Yes, and is now still active on the first circuit.

**FM:** Is he?

**DN:** Yes.

**FM:** Oh, good.

**DN:** A former chief judge and now senior acting. Hasn’t slowed down a bit. In fact he and Ed, before Ed died, were deeply involved in the effort to broaden access to the courts by the poor.

**FM:** When, when did Senator Muskie die?

**DN:** Nineteen ninety-six. Well, Frank, is there anything else you’d like to say about either the era of the sixties and the seventies or Senator Muskie?

**FM:** No, I think I’ve, I think I’ve covered it. I wish I had spent, paid more attention to the time when he was secretary of state but I didn’t really, I was busy doing other things. But I must say I, just personally, I’ve always admired Senator Muskie. I mean, you form an opinion early about certain figures, and unless they disappoint you terribly or do something that’s unexpected or uncharacteristic, you pretty much stick to it. And I always had that high regard for Senator Muskie, even before he came to the Senate I remember a few things he did as governor that I, that struck me. I can’t remember what they were but I was very pleased to see him get elected.
DN: Thank you very much.

FM: Not at all.

*End of Interview*