2009-13-06 PT. 1 SIDE B

RECORDED INTERVIEW

OF

JOHN KATZ

CONDUCTED BY

CHARLES FEDULLO

WITH

PAUL MCCARTHY

IN Washington, D.C.

June 8, 2009

Part 1 of 2, Tape 1, Side B

UAF ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

SENATOR TED STEVENS PROJECT

Transcribed by:

CAROL A. McCUE, RMR

INTERVIEW OF JOHN KATZ

(Beginning of Part 1, Tape 1, Side B of recorded interview.)

CHARLES FEDULLO: Okay. We are continuing.

Let's talk about gas pipeline and OCS, two -- two development projects that impact the State of Alaska pretty healthy. Senator's done a lot of work on OCS, particularly -- I would imagine particularly in the last decade. Recent court cases have really diminished the ability to do exploration on OCS North, and there seems to be a lot of debate right now in the Interior Department.

How did the Senator work with Interior and others to try to get the opportunity to develop Outer Continental Shelf?

JOHN KATZ: Well, a large part of his work was with the Interior Department as they evolved the five-year plans that really governed oil and gas leasing, not only in Alaska, but through -- throughout the country. And you know, to successive Secretaries of the Interior, he would express his views about the potential of the -- of the federal OCS in Alaska.

He also fended off the possibility of amendments

in Congress from time to time that would have declared a moratorium. There was a moratorium in Bristol Bay that expired, but some members have a more extensive idea of a moratorium, and he dealt with that because those that ended up being policy riders in the appropriation process.

In more recent history, opponents of offshore development have resorted to the courts, and obviously, his role there is not -- not the same. That's related to the judicial process itself. And there are pending cases now that would have the potential of significantly diminishing the oil and gas development in the Alaska OCS.

One would seek to invalidate the Chukchi Sea lease sale, which was one of the best lease sales the federal government has ever had. Another one would -- pending here in the Circuit Court of Appeals would seek to delay exploration and leasing activity in Alaska pending some additional studies. So in -- in a very real sense, the courts right now are helping to form OCS policy in Alaska and elsewhere.

The focus might shift back to the Congress, depending on what happens, and there are also going to be efforts at OCS reform in the energy legislation that's evolving through Congress as we speak.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Let's talk a little bit about gas pipeline, then we'll get to some -- there's more issues

I want to talk about, but -- but I want to get through some of the more basic -- the basic questions.

Gas pipeline, there's a columnist in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, Dermot Cole, that calls it a Rip Van Winkle issue, you could fall sleep for 40 years, wake up, and the gas pipeline would still be the issue we're discussing.

Senator Stevens has been around, at least in my research, three different potential opportunities to grow it. What -- what are those processes like? What are -- what was Senator Stevens's involvement, and particularly this -- this last go-around with Senator Murkowski having an agreement with ConocoPhillips, and then the AGIA process and Trans-Canada?

JOHN KATZ: Well, it is, in a sense, a Rip Van Winkle issue. It was one of the first issues I dealt with when I became Commissioner of DNR in 1981, and I'm not sure the circumstances have changed very much in time since then.

Senator Stevens has been involved in -- I think, in a number of ways. On the legislative front, he was a major player in 2005 in the enactment of federal legislation that created various permitting processes for the Trans-Canada producers, the loan guarantee which then was 18 billion, a couple of important tax incentives, he did a lot of the heavy lifting which laid that basis in federal policy.

He was less involved, I believe, in Governor

Murkowski's efforts to develop a contract with producers, although they met with each other and talked to each other from time to time and expressed their views.

I think, for the most part, in the last few years, the pipeline has -- has not been so much of an issue of federal policy. Right now, for example, there's a consensus in Congress in the Obama Administration to support the pipeline, and there may be some pipeline amendments that would be beneficial involving -- in the energy bill process. But Senator Stevens turned his attention to -- to the private sector aspect, the economic aspect, and he has been, I'm sure, in frequent touch with the producers and Trans-Canada when he was in the Senate just trying to find that magic formula that would lead to a commercial arrangement.

At the same time, two successive governors, first Governor Murkowski who emphasized -- emphasized the relationship with the producers, and now Senator Palin, who, through AGIA, has been more focused on the Trans-Canada as the pipeline builder, and Senator Stevens, I know, has talked to both of them from time to time.

Even in his private-sector capacity now, he still remains very much interested in the gas pipeline. He sees it as an extremely important next chapter in the socioeconomic development of Alaska.

CHARLES FEDULLO: I want to move back to some

larger issues -- larger scale issues, and then we'll come back to the more issues, the more specifics.

You know, when Senator Stevens gets into office, you know, he had helped with Statehood, there had been the whole process of him being appointed by Wally Hickel, and then it is immediately ANSCA and ANILCA; almost immediately as he comes in, he deals with those.

What -- how did things change over the next 40 years? I mean, I don't expect you to be able to tell me these were the issues the first five years, these were the issues, but -- but how did the Senator's view -- and you worked closely with him this whole time in the Senate -- change? What were his directions that changed? Or -- or did they?

JOHN KATZ: I think over time, he was able to use his seniority and his leadership more in behalf of Alaska. For better or worse, the Senate operates on the basis of seniority, so he moved up the leadership ladder in the appropriations process, and on the Commerce Committee, he's chairman of both, President Pro Tem of the Senate, Minority Leader of the Republicans in the Senate, or Minority Whip.

And when he first came there, I was amazed when I went to work with him about how much he already knew about the process. But it takes years, decades to develop not only the seniority, but the relationships in the Senate. The Senate operates very much on the basis of trust and

credibility, and -- and as he developed those relationships, he was able to do more.

His interests expanded, as well. In the beginning, for understandable reasons, they were quite parochial, for the most part. He had to deal with ANCSA, he had to deal with ANILCA, but as he spent time in the Senate, he became a genuine expert on other issues like defense policy and other things.

And, you know, he applied this experience and these tools to a succession of issues, some milestone issues, and some -- many, many issues that just occurred on a day-to-day basis. And he trained generations of Alaskans in public policy. Some of them stuck with him for long periods of his Senate career and contributed as the Capitol Hill staff and others went out into the world, either in the federal structure or in Alaska, and I think many of them reflected his knowledge of issues and his -- his dedication to those issues, and influenced public policy in their own ways.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Talk about significant accomplishments. We've gone through a number of them. There's many on my list that I haven't talked about: The BIA school system, bringing that to the state; transfer of Alaska Railroad, which we talked to Governor Sheffield about a lot. In your view, what are some of the most important accomplishments that Senator Stevens came to in his 40 years?

JOHN KATZ: Certainly ANSCA, and then the implementation of ANCSA because, for most of these issues, he not only was involved on the enactment, but he tracked those issues back into the Executive Branch.

That's certainly true with respect to ANILCA because ANILCA is still being implemented on a daily basis, and it -- over the years, many, many issues have arisen in both Congress and the executive agencies relating to ANILCA. The TAPS Authorization, which I think in many respects made Alaska what it is today, and so much of its budget is dependent on that throughput.

The Magnuson-Stevens Act, which created fisheries policy for the nation and for Alaska which has 55 percent of the national coastline.

NPRA. The efforts at least to bring ANWR to the attention of Congress and the public, even if it was ultimately unsuccessful. His work on the gas pipeline in 2005 and before and after, which is still the premise of federal policy relating to the gas pipeline.

Certainly he's worked in the appropriations process, and using the appropriations process to make defense policy, as well as to benefit Alaska. The Denali Commission with its focus on rural Alaska. The net operating losses to help the Native corporations in the beginning, followed by the Section 8(a) work. I guess, as

well, the Kodiak launch facility has a lot to do with his support.

And you know, just a whole host of issues that affect Alaskans in their daily lives. Looking out for federal employees in Alaska, you know, by maintaining the COLA, cost of living allowance. It really just goes on and on.

And I know that other senators deal with a full spectrum of issues, as well, but I think a very plausible argument can be made that nobody, at least in the modern era, has had more of an influence on the socioeconomic development of his or her state than Senator Stevens. Maybe the closest approximation might be Senator Byrd of West Virginia.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Let me -- the impact on Alaska is clear, but what about from a defense policy, from an energy policy, the impact on the rest of the country?

JOHN KATZ: Well, obviously, my focus in my jobs was Alaska policy, and so I don't have that broader perspective except with respect to defense policy, I think his goal was to ensure a strong national defense at all times, which then would lead to a better ability to engage in negotiation in foreign policy accommodations.

I think he was always looking out for the individual serviceman. He and I disagreed on Vietnam, but his position changed over time a little bit and he became

more insistent, I believe, on tangible results and on a rational and comprehensive policy toward Vietnam.

But in the Alaska context, you know, one of the more recent things that I attribute very much to him was the preservation of Eielson Air Force Base which could very easily have been on the base realignment and closure list, and he helped emphasize omission for Eielson and to follow through on that. And he was instrumental on all the BRAC processes that occurred during his tenure, and basically maintained the capability and the integrity of the defense installations in Alaska.

CHARLES FEDULLO: At the -- because you brought up BRAC, I'm going to just talk about that for a brief second. The BRAC in Eielson, the last time, I can't remember if it was 2004, 2005, maybe it was 2006, but Senator Stevens, along with Governor Murkowski, worked very hard and kept it off of -- kept it from downsizing significantly.

Is there a risk without somebody of Senator Stevens's seniority that military bases in Alaska face a more difficult challenge with BRAC in the near future?

JOHN KATZ: Well, the first question is, when will there be another BRAC process. Everybody thinks that there will need to be, but right now, the Congress is preoccupied with other things.

I'd like to think that collectively Alaska has

demonstrated the strategic importance of our military installations so that we wouldn't be subject to -- we wouldn't be as vulnerable in the next BRAC process. I mean, even Fort Greely is now the missile field for our interceptor missiles, along with Vandenberg Air Force Base. And he's -- he helped to clarify those missions for each base to provide the infrastructure that was necessary. He's -- he's been a very strong adjunctive supporter of the Alaska National Guard and its equipment needs and its mission needs.

So I'd like to think that all that will transcend, but as a practical matter, he had tremendous seniority, he had a lot of respect from the defense establishment, and he was either the chairman or the ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee in the Senate, and I'd be naive if I had said that only the merits count.

I think his place in those processes was important, but having said that, you know, picking up on a cue from Senator Stevens, we have to look forward, not backwards, and we have two sen -- two members of our delegation with significant seniority, or position of their own now, not in the same place Senator Stevens was on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and we have Senator Begich who is on the Senate Arms Services Committee and is already showing a very activist approach to his membership. So I'm

going to hope and think that the combination of where they are in the process, plus the merits, will mean good things, if there is another BRAC process.

CHARLES FEDULLO: And then on a similar vein, I think, sort of the same question for the -- for the 8(a) contracting you know, investigation by a senator from -- I believe it's Missouri.

JOHN KATZ: Yes.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Are we -- is there a risk here, or is this something that has been worked so well and benefits not only the state, but the nation that it stays?

JOHN KATZ: I think there's a risk. Senator McCaskill, Senator Lieberman, Congressman Waxman are all very, very interested in looking at the 8(a) process intensively and amending that process, perhaps. Right now the focus is on giving them facts, presenting a case on the merits; the State of Alaska is involved in that effort, as well.

All three members of our delegation have expressed a significant interest in this. Senator Murkowski's on the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, Congressman Young has jurisdiction over Indians and they have appropriations in the -- in certain respects in the House, Senator Begich has weighed in.

So yes, having Senator Stevens with his knowledge

and his seniority would be very helpful; but, you know, unfortunately, that era has passed and now we're dealing with a new situation. The Native corporations are very motivated, they are very well represented, they express themselves very well, and we have a delegation and a governor who are very supportive.

I think Senator Stevens realized that some modifications might be necessary, and perhaps the goal now is to find some modifications that don't really impair the basic thrust of the program.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Talk about areas of frustration or disappointment that you think the Senator saw in his 40 years. We talked a little bit about ANWR. Were there any other issues that he really, you feel, wanted to achieve or move forward with that he was not able to?

JOHN KATZ: ANWR certainly is the biggest that I can identify in that regard, but I think Senator Stevens sees public policy as a continuum, and it's sequential. And there's nothing that I can think of, of that magnitude, because if he failed in one Congress or the issue failed, he would be taking it up in the next Congress, maybe in a different permutation and combination.

And the jury is out on so many issues. Are we going to have a gas pipeline, which I think right now is more the product of financial issues, fiscal issues, the basic laws

of supply and demand, but he used his bully pulpit in the Senate, as our congressional delegation is now doing, and the governor, as well.

So he'd be the best arbiter of what he thinks about it at two o'clock and three o'clock in the morning as successes and failures, but ANWR may be one that is postponed for a significant period. We had the right confluence of the sun, the moon, and the stars of oil prices, and even that didn't budge the issue.

I think with respect to most issue -- other issues, Senator Stevens would see them as -- as part of a -- a continuum of public policy with the ability to come back and try again.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Do you think if he looks back in 40 years or if you looked back in 40 years with him, you would approach ANWR differently in any capacity?

JOHN KATZ: Yes. I -- I came to this conclusion awhile ago. That battle was never going to be won or lost in D.C. I think we carried the day at various times on the merits, there was some of our opponents genuinely opposed us on the merits, but for many others, it was politics. And I think the real effort had to be at the grassroots level in different states and districts to convince people, not through high-priced, you know, public financed ad campaign, I don't think that in retrospect was ever the answer, but

just the constant effort to educate Americans in their home districts and states about what ANWR meant.

And I'm not sure even that would have been successful, since our opponents have such a continuing presence in -- in those states over time. But in order to be successful in Congress, I think you would have had to be successful outside the capital beltway.

CHARLES FEDULLO: I want to make sure I understood what you said. I can't think of the name of the organization that was set up here in the mid '90s to do ad campaigns, but there was federal and state money that went to -- not federal money, excuse me, state money that went to lobbying for ANWR and also doing ad campaigns, but what you're saying is there needed to be a better outreach strategy to convince the hearts and minds of people that ANWR was of value?

JOHN KATZ: Yeah. I mean -- I mean, that group was called Arctic Power and it still --

CHARLES FEDULLO: Arctic Power. Thank you.

JOHN KATZ: -- it still exists in a different permutation and combination.

But I think, in retrospect, the focus was too much on D.C. and not enough -- efforts were -- were tried, and I don't want to say they weren't in the rest of the country educational efforts, paid advertising, heard media, but never with the continuity and the presence of -- daily

presence that might have been required, and so it was always seen as an Alaska issue, or often seen as an Alaska issue. It was very hard to make it into a national issue.

And Senator Stevens was such a dominant presence on ANWR that a lot of the focus was on him and, therefore, on Alaska. It was hard to translate that focus into something that demanded national attention and interest by the general public.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Do you have any stories or anecdotes of the Senator that kind of sum up what you think of him and his work? You know, I'll never forget the Don Young story. Don Young talks about the celebrations they had and the successes, but then he also talks about the temper and how there was a fight between Senator Murkowski and Senator Stevens as to who could storm out of the office first, and then they came back and had a productive meeting 5 minutes later.

JOHN KATZ: They did. And I think that was the thing with all of the political leadership of that era, and that is that at bottom, they had Alaska's best interests at heart; and with that dedication, they would get mad at each other and then come back together.

I remember Governor Murkowski saying one time that he and Senator Stevens had a relationship like an old married couple, you know, they'd fight and then they'd come together,

and I don't think any of the statewide political people ever took much of that personally.

And you know, I -- there are a million anecdotes about Senator Stevens, and I'm not all that good at remembering them. I just remember, you know, one time when he screamed at me for some sin of commission or omission, and he could tell I was pretty crestfallen; when it was over, he came right up and put his arm around me and said, "You know, I only scream at people I care about." And I think there was something to that.

I remember another time when I was working for him, he screamed at a constituent, and I thought -- no, he screamed at a federal official about something, and I thought it was a little unfair. So as we were walking out, I put my arm around the guy and said, you know, "Just forge ahead." And I turned around and I thought the Senator was going to get really angry with me, and he had this big smile on his -- on his face and he said, "That's okay. In D.C., you can be the good guy and I'll be the SOB; but in Alaska, I'm going to be the good guy and you're going to be the SOB."

And everybody who ever worked for him and been around him has, you know, many anecdotes to tell, but probably others are better at that than I am.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Those are good ones, John. And now I need to -- I want to talk a little bit about the trial.

And Stevens's Senate career, I mean, it ended under a cloud because of the scandal surrounding the indictment, the conviction, and then it was overturned.

Why do you think he got into this position that made him vulnerable?

JOHN KATZ: I think he said it himself, and so I'll just repeat what he said. He let certain people get too close to him, and he trusted those people. And I think that's a problem when you've been in the Congress as long as he has, there's some other members, some people get too close to you, and you want to believe what they say and think that what they say is always in the public interest, but they may have ulterior motives. And I think that was partially the case here.

My own view is that, you know, Senator Stevens relied on other people in certain circumstances, who I won't name by name, and perhaps they let him down. But he would take responsibility for the forms that he signed, and he has taken responsibility.

And I don't personally believe, as a lawyer, I don't believe that -- that his case was dismissed on a technicality, which is how some of the national media has portrayed it. When you have a prosecution that behaves the way that this prosecution behaved, and withheld evidence and perhaps did other things, that taints the prosecution, that

taints the justice system.

And I give a lot of credit to Attorney General Holder for the courage and integrity he had to investigate and to recognize what had happened. And I'm not excusing everything that happened, you know, that led to that. The forms were not properly filled out, they did not disclose everything, but I also think that the use of the criminal law in that circumstance and equally how that criminal law was implemented and practiced was far more than a technicality.

CHARLES FEDULLO: It's underscored by the recent request by the Justice Department to relook at the Kott and Kohring cases.

JOHN KATZ: Yeah. And I think to expand even beyond that, and think on a nationwide basis what is the obligation of a federal prosecutor, and are federal prosecutors living up to those expectations and requirements. And I don't pretend to have the answer to that, I'm not a criminal lawyer, and I've always avoided that aspect of the law, but it wasn't, by any means, a technicality, and it wasn't, by any means, because Senator Stevens had skilled lawyers on his side.

The prosecution apparently engaged in certain practices, and I think there's some significant issues about the proper role of the Senate and the proper role of the

Executive Branch in a circumstance like that.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Do you think the way his career ended diminishes his role as a historic figure?

JOHN KATZ: Unfortunately, I think, to an extent, it does. And my fervent hope, for his sake, but also for history's sake and -- and succeeding generations of Alaskans is that they will view his not 40-year career, but 50-plus-year career in the totality that it deserves, really starting with his military service, the Statehood fight where -- because he was young, I'm not sure in all places he's been recognized for the significant role that he played in it, and I understand that role a little bit from talking to some of the older principals who were involved at that time, and then his 40-year career in the Senate.

And I think he cares most about what Alaskans think, and Alaskans are fair minded. And I believe that as time passes, they will appreciate the -- the tremendous contribution and the sacrifice and dedication that he made over all those decades; but unfortunately, when the inevitable obituary comes, I think the writer will probably feel compelled to talk about this latest chapter, even though -- even though the case was dismissed for -- for good reason.

And I'm not, by any means, sure that Senator Stevens is finished as a private citizen. I see him, you

know, focusing on some of the issues that he's always cared about the most; and hopefully, he has yet an additional contribution to make. So there's no question that that's a blot on -- on his record, but I think it will be seen over time in the proper context of all the rest.

CHARLES FEDULLO: I'll ask you if there's any issues that you want to talk about, and then I'll kind of let you say what you think his legacy should be.

The only -- the issues on my list that I haven't talked about are Title IX, Special Olympics, BIA school system for the state. Are there any of those issues -- oh, aviation and telecommunications policy. Are there any of those issues that you want to talk about that -- that you feel like you can contribute?

JOHN KATZ: Well, on the first issue of that is Title IX, and Donna de Varona, and all the things that went with that. The state wasn't involved in that, but it does demonstrate, again, his versatility because that was a national issue of pol -- federal policy and policy in general relating to athletics, women's involvement in athletics, the Olympics, and he became an expert in that.

Transferring the BIA school system to the state school system was important to him, I think it -- it was very important to the state. The benefits far outweigh the detriments, I think, in the fact that that transfer occurred.

I think kids are being better educated in the state school system than they would have been in the BIA school system. They have better futures. And he virtually single-handedly did that one.

What were the other two you mentioned there?

CHARLES FEDULLO: There were telecommunications policy -- and I'm sorry to throw five issues to you at once.

JOHN KATZ: No, it's all right.

CHARLES FEDULLO: Telecommunications policy and aviation.

JOHN KATZ: Well, both of those, I mean, I think, you know, aviation probably stemmed from his time in the Air Force. He had a very large impact on national aviation policy and on Alaska policy. And he saw aviation in Alaska as one of the principal ways of connecting rural and urban Alaska, of giving rural Alaska a future.

Up until the very end of his Senate tenure, he was fighting for more money for runway lighting, for runway improvements in rural Alaska. He understood the importance of the -- of the Anchorage International Airport, he worked closely with the airport director, and there have been studies that have shown the multiplier effect of money that starts at the airport and then multiplies itself throughout Southcentral Alaska and on to Fairbanks, so that was demonstrable proof.

Telecommunications policy, similarly, he was very much associated with the Universal Service Fund, which has nationwide implications for rural and high cost areas, for Telemedicine, which, I think, began kind of as an experiment in Alaska, and now has nationwide implications.

He was involved in every aspect of the restructuring of Alaska telecommunications, starting with the military communications system called White Alice. And -- and the evolution from that military system through the period of monopoly, and now the period of pretty good competition in urban areas and some semblance of -- of competition in rural areas.

And also, you know, his understanding of the role that the federal government could play in promoting telecommunications in Alaska, but his desire that the private sector be the ultimate decision-maker, and that blend of federal policy and private sector initiative, I think, has served the state well. He did that from his vantage point on the Senate Commerce Committee over a long period of time.

CHARLES FEDULLO: I'll just -- legacy of Senator Stevens in office. There's so many things you can talk about. If you could sum it up, 40 years in the Senate, years of service beforehand in the State Legislature, helping with the Statehood, actually work with Seaton to get Statehood

and convince Eisenhower that it makes sense, how would you describe it?

JOHN KATZ: Well, I think in one sense it's almost too early to evaluate that legacy. We're still too close to the time he was in the Senate and the unfortunate immediate period thereafter, but I think when his full body of work is assessed with an objectivity that perhaps isn't totally possible now, all the issues that we've talked about and all the issues that we didn't talk about that happened on a daily basis will create a legacy that I think would be envied by any public figure; and it's both the -- the issues themselves, what they have -- have evolved into.

I think also the succeeding generations of people who went out into the world of law, public policy, government service from his office, you know, when he holds his periodic reunions, you look around and you see people who have become accomplished in so many areas after having been under his tutelage at some earlier time in their career.

But I think people will see, in summary, that the role he played from before Statehood, through the implementation of Statehood, and many of the issues that we work on now I still see as aspects of the fight for Statehood, certainly the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. Even the gas line is an effort to commercialize resources on state lands. His effort amidst all of the public land and environmental laws

that have been enacted over the years to make sure that Alaska still had the ability to develop its resources.

So, like all of us, you know, who are, human, he has certain flaws, but I think his legacy will be that his talent and his various attributes far outweigh those flaws; and in so doing, he did a job for Alaska that we -- we will reap the benefits of for -- for yet a long time to come.

PAUL MCCARTHY: I just wanted to ask a question in terms of the Senator's approach with the Native people, starting in ANCSA. It's -- it's really one of empowerment, and despite the rough edges and the transition of the Native corporations in the net losses, is his approach pretty unique compared to the other western states and senators?

JOHN KATZ: I think it is in the following respect. When I worked for him, I didn't know the politics of Alaska as well, and I didn't realize, frankly, what courage it took for him to not abandon his base of support, but to explain to them why we needed a claims act, because they were not at all convinced at the beginning, judging from the many meetings that we had in his office.

But where I think he had developed a more innovative solution along with Senator Jackson and others is he consciously rejected the previous chapters of the Federal Government's relationship to American Indians and Alaska Natives, you know, they can be loosely described as

things like conquest, and then reservation status, termination of reservations, individual allotments where we're going to turn everybody into a farmer or individual entrepreneur, he saw that they didn't work or didn't work in the Alaska context, and so he wanted to find a solution that would be empowering to Alaska Natives.

And basically, what he came up with was corporations chartered under state law that would own their resources and be beholden to their shareholders, and would own the land in fee, there would be no trust relationship, there would -- in Section 2 of ANSCA, it says, "No permanent workship or trusteeship or Indian Reservations except Metlakatla."

I think he and Senator Jackson, even Congressman Aspinall who was chairman of the House Interior Committee, then constructed this brand new chapter in the Federal Government's relationship to Alaska Natives. And it got off the ground slowly, but probably predictably slowly. It took the federal bureaucracy a long time to adapt to this new regime, it took the Native corporations a long time to staff up and analyze and appreciate their resources, but at every juncture in the process, whether it was NOLs or 8(a) or, you know, championing their causes in various forms, it was a question of -- of individual empowerment or corporate empowerment rather than the old way of the Federal Government

being kind of the paternalistic overseer.

But he did that, interestingly enough, I think, with -- with a respect for tribes because nothing in the Native Claims Act, in my judgment, does anything to impair tribal status. It did change the ground rules with respect to Indian country, and he filed a very persuasive brief as a friend of the court in the U.S. Supreme Court case on Venetie, which reflects a lot of his own personal views about the right relationship and -- and what they were hoping to -- to achieve, but it was, I think, a legacy by anybody's standards of -- of a new chapter in innovation.

(End of Part 1, Tape 1, Side B of recorded interview.)