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JF: This is the Morris K. Udall Oral History Project. Good morning, it's August 7, 1998, and we're at the Arizona Inn in Tucson, Arizona. I'm Julie Ferdon, and I'd like to welcome former Congressman John Anderson, to another in a series of oral history interviews that form the Morris K. Udall Oral History Project. Thank you, Congressman Anderson, for joining us.

JA: You're welcome.

JF: Let's start with some biographical information. When were you born?

JA: I was born February 15, 1922, in Rockford, Illinois.

JF: So that's the same year Mo was born, exactly to the day, four months earlier. That's great! Where did you go to college?

JA: I first attended the University of Illinois and got my bachelor's degree, and then my education was interrupted, as was true of so many back in that period, because I got my degree in 1942, interrupted by the war. So I came back after the war, and then I received a law degree from the University of Illinois, a J.D. And then after being in practice several years, I decided to pursue graduate study in law, and received a fellowship to attend the Harvard Law School graduate program, and emerged in 1949 from that institution with a Master of Laws degree, LLM.

JF: Was there a legal specialty connected with that?

JA: Labor law was one subject that I pursued, and had given some thought to using that as the possible foundation for labor law practice. But generally I took other courses as well: federal jurisdiction under the late Henry Hart. I took an international law course with Louie Sohn, I believe. So it was a program they had for people who wanted to get an advanced degree in law. To the degree that there was any specialization, it would have been the labor law field.

JF: I believe that's what Mo taught briefly, not long after he graduated from law school. While at Harvard, I understand you taught at Northeastern?

JA: Yes, to supplement my fellowship stipend, I was recruited to teach a course in real estate law, specifically real estate titles, at Northeastern University Law School, which is still in existence. That was just a one-semester course that I gave. And then actually I didn't get back to teaching law until some years after I had left the Congress. I taught some political science courses initially, starting with Stanford, and then I went to my own alma mater, the University of Illinois, taught a post-World War II history course. I taught at Brandeis for a semester. I was a visitor at Bryn Mawr, lecturing at that time on arms control, because that was very much a topic back in the mid-eighties, because of SALT I and SALT II. And then I gravitated into the legal teaching profession in 1987, was the first year, I believe. And that I have now pursued with regularity each year, one semester.

JF: And you are teaching (JA: Again, this fall.) at Nova?
JA: Nova Southeastern University Law School.

JF: And what are you teaching there now?

JA: I teach two courses: constitutional law, and electoral process, the latter being a course that deals with such questions as reapportionment law, how districts are created, and the legal problems, particularly that have arisen in recent years. Because of an effort to represent minorities, they have drawn race-based districts that have been struck down now about four or five times by the U.S. Supreme Court. And we talk about campaign finance law. Another important Supreme Court decision came out that launched this whole spending splurge as far as soft money is concerned. A case that came out of the senatorial campaign way back in 1986 in the State of Colorado: Tim Wirth was running for the Senate, and I forget who his Republican opponent was. Wirth lost. But anyway, out of that came a lawsuit involving the Republican senatorial campaign committee [that] poured a lot of money into Wirth's opponent's campaign. A suit was brought on the grounds that it violated FECA, the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended in 1974, I think it was, that Mo and I had worked on together when we were both in the Congress. And the Court struck down the objection and upheld the fact that party money, money coming from the Republican Party in Washington, through the channel of the Senatorial Campaign Committee, had been poured into this particular race, and said that that was outside the purview of the Federal Election Campaign Act. Didn't violate any provisions of that act, because it was party money that was being used to advance the party's interests in the state of Colorado. And so out of that was spawned this tidal wave of soft money that plagued the 1996 elections. And unless this Chase-Mann Bill that passed this week in the House of Representatives can somehow pass the Senate and become a law, the situation will continue.

JF: Will stay the same. I want to ask you a lot about the campaign finance law in a minute. Let's back up just a little bit. You worked in the foreign service for a few years, didn't you?

JA: Yes. I was still somewhat unsettled as to my career plans, and decided not to go into teaching, which normally you would do, upon being granted a Master of Laws degree, and so in 1951 I started the process, and actually I was commissioned in 1952, after taking the written and the oral exams under the Rogers Act, that provides for commissioning foreign service officers.

JF: Foreign Service Exam?

JA: Yes, Foreign Service Exams, and passed those, and then was actually commissioned in June, I think it was, of 1952. My first post was in West Berlin. After I took the officers' course, I went to Berlin, which was still a divided city, obviously, back in 1952, before the wall, but nevertheless under the Allied comanda toura, divided into the French and British and Russian and American sectors. And we still had a high commissioner there, [who] at one time was John J. McCloy. I think when I arrived it was Dr. James B. Conan, former president of Harvard University, who was the high commissioner. And I left the foreign service then in 1955, after one tour of duty, deciding that having married a girl that I'd met in Washington during my stay there, and she had come to Europe to be with me at my post. We had a child a year later who
was born in Germany, my oldest daughter, Eleanora, and I decided that the financial rewards were so insubstantial in the foreign service back in those days, that I should get back--"shoemaker, stick to thy last," or something like that--go back into the practice of law. So I went back to my hometown of Rockford, went into law practice, but was re-engaged in that for less than a year, until I got immersed in the political strain and ran for what was a rather unexpected opening. The state's attorney/prosecuting attorney/district attorney/state's attorney in Illinois, for the county, didn't run again, and I ran in a five-person race. I got the Republican nomination, and then in November of 1956, took office, and served in that position until the end of 1960. While still in office, I ran for my first time for Congress and was successful in November of 1960, and took office as a member of the U.S. House in January of 1961, which was about three months, I think, before Morris K. Udall of Arizona arrived on the scene.

JF: Exactly. I was just realizing that he came to Congress from a position of county attorney, Pima County Attorney.

JA: Yes, right, we had similar backgrounds.

JF: Exactly. And you started in 1960, and he began in 1961 as part of the special election to replace his brother.

JA: Right.

JF: Do you remember when you first met Mo in Congress?

JA: Well, I'm sure that it was soon after.... I, like him, was assigned to two of the more ignominious committees, because the old rules of seniority prevented me from being elected, or selected by the Republican Committee on Committees to the post that I was seeking on the Ways and Means Committee, the tax committee. But another member, a non-lawyer, very much wanted the committee, and he was senior by some years to me, a newly-arrived freshman, and freshmen were, back in those days, more apt to be seen rather than heard, so I was put on the House Administration Committee, a kind of housekeeping committee for the House, of no great import and interest. And then the other committee was the Government Operations Committee, which had a broad mandate to investigate any federal expenditure to see whether it was being conducted honestly and efficiently. But they had a Chicago machine politician, Bill Dawson, as chairman, and he was not wont to poke his nose into too much. And so that was really an extremely routine assignment. But in my second term, realizing my intense disappointment, I was put on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which was fairly new, and had arisen out of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954--that's six years before my election--and generally supervised the civilian nuclear energy program of what later became the Department of Energy, but at that time was simply called the Atomic Energy Commission, headed by Dr. Glenn Seaborg, a very famous, world-wide famous, Nobel laureate, professor of physics from the University of California at Berkeley. And that was interesting, because they monitored not only the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and its various national laboratories, some of which are like Sandia in New Mexico, and the laboratory at Berkeley, and the one at Argon in my home state of Illinois. But also the AEC, of course, rode herd on the whole nuclear bomb and nuclear missile
program. So it was some prestige at that time in being on the joint committee, which was, I think, twelve members: six from the House and six from the Senate. They alternated the chairmanship between the House and the Senate. For many years, Chet Holifeld, the Democrat from California, was the chair; and John Pastori, senator from Rhode Island, was the chair. And they had such luminaries as, oh, Clinton Anderson of New Mexico, who at one time had been secretary of agriculture, I think under the Truman administration. And they had Joe Montoya of... Oh, he was New Mexico.

JF: He was New Mexico.

JA: He was New Mexico, but he was on the committee, because they had an installation in New Mexico. Then an opening appeared also on the Rules Committee, and because my predecessor in Congress, who had been there for twenty-eight years when he suddenly retired and I ran to take his place, he had been on that committee for many years, actually, and the two Republican Congresses of 1948 and.... No! they were elected in 1946. They were defeated when Truman ran for reelection in 1948. But I forget the number of the Congress, but the Congress that was elected in 1946 was Republican, right after the war, and he became chairman of the House Rules Committee, and then he was also chairman for two years when the Republicans controlled the House in the first Eisenhower term for two years. That would have been.... Well, the first Republican Congress in forty years was the 104th that was elected in 1994, so five Congresses back of that would have been the 99th Congress, I guess. Yes, it must have been the 99th Congress.

Well, I digress, I'm giving you too much detail. But anyway, that gave me some claim, because my district predecessor in Congress had been chair of that committee. So to mollify me for having been denied my real choice, which was the tax writing committee, the Ways and Means Committee, they put me on the Rules Committee, and there I stayed.

I've never served in anything but a Democratic House, so I was never chairman, but I eventually gravitated to the point where I had more seniority on the Rules Committee than anyone else. But then, paradoxically, the fruits were quickly plucked from my grasp of being the ranking minority member, because in 1969, I had run for the House Conference chair position that was vacated by Melvin Laird, who was appointed by Richard Nixon as his secretary of Defense. So when Laird departed to go down to the Pentagon to become secretary of the Department of Defense, I ran for his position, which was--well, the House Republican minority leader when I arrived was Charlie Halleck, and then he was finally succeeded by Jerry Ford when there was a palace revolt against Halleck after the Goldwater defeat in 1964. Ford came in, in 1965, and then of course Ford ultimately was succeeded, when he was appointed to fulfill the vice-presidency under Nixon that was caused by Nelson Rockefeller's death. I guess it was then that John Rhodes became minority leader, I believe. (JF: Yes.) Yes, I think he succeeded Ford.

JF: The House Republican Conference is what you became chairman of. What is that?

JA: Well, it's sort of like the general assembly of the Republican Party in that every member
who sits on the Republican side of the aisle is a member and has a vote in the Conference. And there was always a little jousting for position between, frankly, the Conference and the Policy Committee. The House Policy Committee was a much smaller group. Members were appointed by the leadership and by the Committee on Committees. I think there were some leadership appointments by whoever the minority leader wanted on the committee, and then the Committee on Committees would put somebody.... And that was a much smaller committee, oh, of only about eight or ten or twelve members--I forget the exact size. But at the time I came to Congress, I guess we had about 160 or 170 Republicans. We were very much in the minority. And after 1964, that number shrank considerably, because we lost a number of seats. But anyway, the Policy Committee was a much smaller group, and really much more the vehicle of the minority leader, to knock out statements of party policy. And I tried to energize the Conference a little bit, and give it a broader role. And to some degree, I guess I was successful, but there was always a little jousting, you know, that the Conference not call all 160 or 170 members in and have a conference and adopt a resolution. That was too unwieldy a group, it was felt, to come to a consensus on an important policy question, and it would be better to refine it through the smaller and more malleable group that made up the policy committee, which was John Rhodes' responsibility before he became minority leader. He was Policy Committee chairman.

JF: Now, in 1969, when you became chair, were your progressive leanings obvious at that time?

JA: Yes. They were, to the extent that I had cast the deciding vote in 1968 on the Open Housing Act. Martin Luther King had been assassinated, there was this bill pending at the clerk's desk, that had come over from the Senate, that would have enacted--we had passed civil rights legislation in 1964, the big bill which I had supported: public accommodations, no further discrimination on restaurants and public places and so on; and Title VII, which prohibited discrimination based on race or sex--Title VII of the 1964 Act. And then in 1965, the truly landmark Voting Rights Act, which sent voting registrars into districts that in the past several elections it was discovered less than 50% of the eligible black voters had not voted. It was felt that they were not voting, and it was true. Because of discrimination, they were being kept from registering and so on. Their rights to vote were definitely being impeded, so the Voting Rights Act was passed. But the area of housing was not specifically dealt with in either of those measures, so in 1968, the push was on to pass the Fair Housing Act that no person should deny the rental, sale, leasing, transfer of ownership, of property to anyone simply because of their race or color or creed. It was to try to give the blacks a fair shake as far as getting decent housing in all-white neighborhoods. And I was the only Republican on the Rules Committee who voted for that. I jumped ship because the others wanted to send the Senate bill to conference, where it was perfectly obvious that it would have been watered down and worked over, and if it ever emerged, it would have been in a very emasculated form. And I decided we simply could not, at this critical juncture, after the death of King, of all times, to be backpedaling on civil rights legislation, of which there had been precious little for the last hundred years. This was no time to have that kind of regressive action by the House of Representatives. And that, really, I think exposed the progressive streak in me, because my vote was widely quoted and editorialized about, because without it.... And I remember the next day when I went to the White House when the bill was actually whipped down there and signed quickly by Lyndon Johnson, they
whispered to Lyndon, who really didn't know much about this four-term congressman from Illinois, "This is the guy who got the bill out of the Rules Committee, and they had to then vote on it and pass it and bring it down to you," he gave me a special handclasp and "thank you" for my [efforts (Tr.)].

But despite that—oh, I had been rebellious on an environmental bill, too. I remember the terrible scolding I got from the fellow who was the ranking member on the Rules Committee, because we never had the chair—an old Republican from Ohio by the name of Clarence Brown. There was a very ecologically and geologically sensitive and unique bit of territory in Southern Wisconsin called the Kettle Moraine area that had been glaciated in a very unusual way. And Henry Reuss, a Democrat, who became a very good friend of mine, Democrat from the State of Wisconsin, but he didn't represent that area—he put in legislation to put that in federal protection. I can't remember now whether it was a national refuge. Anyway, it would have been protected against any development in the area containing this ecologically and geologically sensitive area of the Kettle Moraine, which made good sense to me, because there is no other area really like it in the whole country. The environmentalists obviously were on one side, and the developers were on the other, and the Republican congressman in whose [district] the area was located, was very opposed to Reuss’ bill. He said, "This is my district, I should be the one who decides whether or not something goes into a national park or into a national reserve." And I voted against him. I was the only Republican who voted, and it was the deciding vote again, and it brought the bill out, and old Clarence called me down to his office and just gave me a tongue lashing the likes of which you never heard, about "Haven't you got enough sense to know that the way the game is played on Capitol Hill is that when a member—particularly when the object of the legislation is located in his district, you don't listen to some Democrat, even though he lives in the same state, who lives in another congressional district, or represents another congressional district! You do what your Republican member wants done!" And that was to keep that bill bottled up in the Rules Committee where it would never get out for a floor vote. Well, I listened in silence to his admonition, said very little, as I recall. I became, I think, something of an object of suspicion thereafter—less than totally reliable on holding the party line. Republicans, you know, after all of these years, since 1954—and this was 1960, we're talking about 1968—so my God, after all these years of being in the minority and being run over by the Democratic steamroller, they thought the least you could do, if you were a Republican, was to observe this congressional courtesy of never voting to report out a bill that a Republican didn't want reported out. Well, I thought my responsibilities were somewhat broader than simply protecting the Republican Party.

JF: Your ideas don't seem to have hurt you, however. I mean, you were reelected chair of the House Republican Caucus.

JA: Well, I was about to say that the next election, they were laying for me, and they almost upset me. They came within ten votes in the votes, because you had to be reelected to this job every two years. They came, they ran a very conservative Republican called Sam Devine, an ex-FBI agent who was the head of a group called, oh, I don't know.... The Good Guys! They were called The Good Guys. They were the really right power of the Republican Party, and they kind of snuck up on me, and I didn't realize until almost too late when I frantically got a committee
organized to start circulating my side of the story. And they came within ten votes of beating me, which was a very close vote for reelection. But I survived, and then somehow I survived until I decided in [1979, ten years later,] that I was going to run for the Republican nomination. Then they let it be known to me that, "You know, if you want to run for president you have to resign your chairmanship, or you can't be both a Republican candidate for the presidency while you're a House member, and have the aura of being chairman of the Republican Party in the House, chairman of the Conference." So I saw the handwriting on the wall, because even some of the fairly moderate ones were shaking their heads and thought this was too much for me to parade under the banner of being the House chairman. That might give me some advantage over Ronald Reagan, who was even then the declared darling of the Republican Party. So I submitted my resignation. But for ten years I did hold the job. Then I went into the primaries, of course, and that's another story.

JF: Now, do you have a memory of first meeting Mo? And if not, what were your earliest recollections of Mo?

JA: Well, my earliest recollections were that, you know, I had early-on decided that most of the Republicans in the House were so much more conservative than I on a whole range of issues that I was not comfortable with where I found myself. I know when Goldwater ran in 1964, I just was bothered. Not that he wasn't a perfectly wonderful man and true to his principles, but I didn't think that the standard bearer of the Republican Party should come from that very conservative wing of the party. I remember I went to Laird, who was chairman of.... What was his job? Well, chairman of the Conference. I told you that before. He wanted to have a meeting with Nixon. This was after Goldwater's--I'm sort of getting ahead of my story. I'm trying to give you the evolution that drew me to people like Mo Udall. But going back to Goldwater, I was very.... You know, I didn't make any speeches against Goldwater, but I didn't go out of my way to associate myself with his candidacy and my campaign for reelection to what would have been my third term. I kind of pursued a separate course and did not identify with the people who were really dancing up and down in enthusiasm for Goldwater. That, I suppose, knowing politics as I do, did not entirely escape the attention of my more conservative brethren in the House.

Then the next Republican candidate who came along, of course, in 1968, was Nixon. And here again, when Laird, who was Conference chairman, wanted to hold a Conference breakfast, personally invited me to be there and be sure to listen to the guy that he thought should be the next Republican nominee, I came right out and said, "I can't agree with you. I think that there ought to be other people in the Republican Party. He's had his chance, he failed the test. We ought to be looking for someone other than Richard Nixon as our candidate." And I didn't even go to the convention, which normally a sitting member of Congress would do, whether he was a delegate or not. You were given certain access and courtesies as a sitting member. I stayed away from the Miami convention where Nixon was nominated. I was that unenthusiastic about his nomination, which seemed to be inevitable, and proved to be so.

So I don't know how that all hangs together, but over that period of time, you know, I looked on the other side of the aisle, and it wasn't that I thought of converting and becoming a Democrat, because I lived in a district that was so [rock red?] Republican, that no Democrat had
been elected since the Civil War, in that district. But it's just that I felt more comfortable with
the more progressive ideas and open attitudes that people like Mo Udall seemed to exhibit. As I
observed them on the floor of the House and listened to this speeches and heard the positions
that they were articulating, it seemed to me that someone like Udall ... was not an extreme left
person at all. He was espousing positions on issues--be it open housing, or be it environmental
issues, or anything else--that was so reasonable, that I was mightily persuaded. So that, plus his
outgoing nature. You know, I told a little story today, he got to know very quickly every
member, because he made it a point, which I never did, to look at the pictures and identify the
name and so on.

JF: That was his first year in Congress?

JA: Yes, right. So I got to know him quickly enough, but it really was not until the campaign
finance thing came along, which was very early in the seventies, that we began this active
collaboration on a specific bill that went in as the Udall-Anderson Campaign Finance Reform
Bill. And in an effort to build support, [we] held frequent strategy sessions and meetings, both
off the floor and in his office or mine, and tried to recruit cosponsors and build up support for
that legislation. So that threw us into.... And then by that time, I can't remember whether Mo
was married to Ella, his second wife. I can't remember when they were married.

JF: Had you met Pat and Ella, both his first wife and....

JA: No, I'd met her, but I had not at that time. As a matter of fact, I'll tell you where I met her. I
met her in Washington when I introduced Mark, his son, at a fund-raiser. He was in Washington
trying to drum up a little support, and Roy Jones, a lawyer who used to be on Mo's staff, called
me up and said, "Will you come down? You're an old friend of Mo Udall's." Everybody knew
that I thought of him so highly and with great affection. "I need somebody. I'm going to invite
in some business people and lawyers." It was a fairly small group.

JF: This was a fund-raiser for Mark's congressional campaign?

JA: Yes. And she was in the background very much. She didn't thrust herself forward, but she
came up and introduced herself to me. That was the first time I really ever met his first wife.
But what I started to say is that then he got married to Ella, and I don't remember when that was.
But she and my wife somehow got acquainted, and they were like two peas in a pod. Ella was
very outgoing, and very, very open and frank. My wife is exactly the same kind of person, and
didn't particularly care whether the person she's talking to likes what she says or not. If she feels
it strongly, she doesn't beat around the bush, she tells it like it is, from her point of view. And so
they hit it off, and socially they got together, and I think that obviously served to strengthen....

JF: That was soon after their marriage?

JA: Yes. And I wish I could remember just when that was. Chronologies are hard after all these
years.
JF: I should know that myself, but I want to say it was probably around 1967, 1968.

JA: Yes. Well, that certainly was another thing, the attraction that our two wives had for one another served to strengthen the bond of friendship between us.

JF: What did you think when Mo in 1968--and I think that was the same year he and Ella were married--when he opposed the somewhat institutionalized House speaker, John McCormack?

JA: Well, frankly, as one who had suffered, as I have just described, from the rigid application of this very hierarchical system that, you know, you have a leadership ladder and when somebody climbs a rung and is on the ladder, you don't try to knock them off. You wait until death or retirement takes them away.

JF: The "deadhand," I believe you called it (chuckles), "the deadhand of seniority."

JA: Right. So I was very admiring--although it wasn't for me to stick my nose into intramural Democratic politics and try to lobby one way or the other, but I think I made no secret to him, or anyone who wanted my views on the matter, but I thought it was a wonderful thing that someone as young and active and vibrant and gifted with these unusual qualities of leadership that he had, should aspire to that. I couldn't go any higher than Conference chairman. I was lucky to have that little rung on the ladder under my feet, given the very conservative composition of my side of the political aisle. John indicated today he thought, "Oh, my God, you like Mo, too!" There wasn't any question about it that he was really putting his neck in the guillotine, that he would lose and suffer all kinds of dire consequences. But it was just another thing that I found very attractive about his political career.

JF: I believe Tip O'Neill, in his autobiography, Man in the House, indicated that he thought Mo running against Speaker McCormack was the greatest mistake Mo ever made.

JA: Well, because he then couldn't advance on the ladder, because then he lost when he tried to be majority leader (JF: Exactly.) and we ended up with....

JF: Oh, Hale Boggs.

JA: Yes, Hale Boggs. Hale Boggs came on about.... And I don't know, I haven't read Tip's book, but maybe he meant it in that sense.

JF: I think that's what he meant.

JA: Tip was very much a man of the old school, as far as the hierarchy is concerned. He had this hierarchical notion that you take this little step, and then you look around, and when the time is right, which means the person ahead of you doesn't want the job anymore, or quits or retires or dies, then you make your bid. You don't try to leapfrog, which was really what he was doing. I couldn't see any point to that argument. (JF chuckles) There was a little of the rebel in me.
JF: Well, let's talk a little about campaign finance reform. In 1967, which is four years before the introduction of the 1971 Campaign Finance Reform Act, Mo introduced legislation that would limit the cost of campaigns, federally finance some campaign costs, allow free radio and TV, and shorten general elections. Were you involved in that early bill?

JA: In the 1967 effort? I have to be honest with you, I don't recall any specific contribution. I may have signed on as a cosponsor, because I think even at that early date--and that was before all of the odious outfall from the 1972 campaign of CREEP [Committee to Re-Elect the President], you know, and the talk about $100,000 in laundered money being smuggled over the border from Mexico, and W. Clement Stone giving a million dollars in contributions to Nixon's CREEP. That really was what spurred me. But I think I may have been a cosponsor.

JF: Do you know what happened to that bill?

JA: I don't.

JF: It must not have gone anywhere, I'm guessing.

JA: No, I'm sure it didn't. And Mo was a man ahead of his time. I didn't have time today to expound on that thesis to the extent that I would like to--not only on welfare reform, but on campaign reform, on the need to conserve our natural resources. Here was a man who had his eye on the far horizon, and he could see further than most--very prescient in his approach to what the needs of the nation were. I didn't tell all of the things that I remembered reading in the little research I did to try to jog my memory for this thing we did today over before the students, about the extent to which he linked our inability to make public expenditures in really needy areas, like eliminating or dealing with problems of poverty, and dealing with environmental problems, assuring us with clean air and clean water, because we were spending billions of dollars on programs that ought to be reformed and changed, so that we could channel the money. He wasn't a big spender, in my opinion. I mean, he was looking for ways to save money. He was not really one of the all-out redistributionists, which the Democrats are sometimes accused of being. He saw a need for government to curtail its programs, if they were costly and ineffective and inefficient. But not just saving money for the sake of saving money. He then wanted to transfer those funds that would be freed up to pursue the other goals that were just being ignored and neglected altogether. And again, I was attracted to the logic of his position.

JF: In 1971, you and Mo were involved in passage of the first comprehensive campaign finance reform legislation, which was entitled the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971. (JA: Yes.) What was the impetus for this legislation? You referred to CREEP and all before.

JA: Yes, because that was before the 1972 election, you know, that was so scandalous that it made a lot of converts. We were really ahead of that particular wave, and that's what makes me think that I may have been on that 1967 bill, but I don't want to say for sure, because I'd have to research it, try to find out whether that's so.

JF: But you were a cosponsor....
JA: I give Mo credit. I mean, I was not the great progenitor of that idea. It came out of his brain. And he was sufficiently cogent in his arguments and persuasive and clear about why it would be better than the way we were going about it, that he just brought me along to the point where I became.... You know, like you get more Catholic than the pope, as the convert Clare Boothe Luce said, when you're a convert. As a convert, because of his ministrations and seeking me out and talking to me about it, I got as excited as he did about what a great advance this would be, and what a great reform in the political process. Again, he was a reformer. I did say that today--I hope I did! He was at heart. He wanted change in the process itself. He saw that too often there was stasis where there should be forward movement. And so in his very analytical way, he looked for the reasons, and he found this deficit in our way of dealing with the funding and the conducting of campaigns as one of the reasons our politics have gotten as screwed up--pardon the expression--as it was. And that made a convert out of me.