

**Lucius D. Battle, Oral History Interview – JFK#3, 10/31/1968**  
Administrative Information

**Creator:** Lucius D. Battle  
**Interviewer:** Larry J. Hackman  
**Date of Interview:** October 31, 1968  
**Place of Interview:** Washington, D.C.  
**Length:** 60 pages

**Biographical Note**

Battle worked in the Department of State as special assistant to the Secretary and Executive Secretary (1961-1962), Consul General (1962), and Assistant Secretary of State for Education and Cultural Affairs (1962-1964); he was Ambassador to the United Arab Republic (1964-1967); and chairman of the UNESCO General Conference in Paris (1962). In this interview, Battle discusses UNESCO; staffing issues and changes in the State Department, particular after the Bay of Pigs invasion; and initiatives of the Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs, among other issues.

**Access**  
Open.

**Usage Restrictions**

According to the deed of gift signed September 14, 1970, copyright of these materials has been assigned to the United States Government. Restrictions on the use of these materials have expired pursuant to the deed of gift and upon the death of the donor. Users of these materials are advised to determine the copyright status of any document from which they wish to publish.

**Copyright**

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excesses of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law. The copyright law extends its protection to unpublished works from the moment of creation in a tangible form. Direct your questions concerning copyright to the reference staff.

**Transcript of Oral History Interview**

These electronic documents were created from transcripts available in the research room of the John F. Kennedy Library. The transcripts were scanned using optical character recognition and the resulting text files were proofread against the original transcripts.

Some formatting changes were made. Page numbers are noted where they would have occurred at the bottoms of the pages of the original transcripts. If researchers have any concerns about accuracy, they are encouraged to visit the Library and consult the transcripts and the interview recordings.

**Suggested Citation**

Lucius D. Battle, recorded interview by Larry J. Hackman, October 31, 1968, (page number), John F. Kennedy Library Oral History Program.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION  
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

Gift of Personal Statement

By Lucius D. Battle

to the

John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library

In accordance with Sec. 507 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (44 U.S.C. 397) and regulations issued thereunder (41 CFR 101-10), I, Lucius D. Battle, hereinafter referred to as the donor, hereby give, donate, and convey to the United States of America for eventual deposit in the proposed John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, and for administration therein by the authorities thereof, a tape and transcript of a personal statement approved by me and prepared for the purpose of deposit in the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library. The gift of this material is made subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. Title to the material transferred hereunder will pass to the United States as of the date of the delivery of this material into the physical custody of the Archivist of the United States.

2. It is the donor's wish to make the material donated to the United States of America by the terms of the instrument available for research in the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library. At the same time, it is his wish to guard against the possibility of its contents being used to embarrass, damage, injure, or harass anyone. Therefore, in pursuance of this objective, and in accordance with the provisions of Sec. 507 (f) (3) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (44 U.S.C. 397) this material shall not,

for a period of seven (7) years,

be available for examination by anyone except persons who have received my express written authorization to examine it.

This restriction shall not apply to employees and officers of the General Services Administration (including the National Archives and Records Service and the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library) engaged in performing normal archival work processes.

3. A revision of this stipulation governing access to the material for research may be entered into between the donor and the Archivist of the United States, or his designee, if it appears desirable.

4. The material donated to the United States pursuant to the foregoing shall be kept intact permanently in the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library.

5. The donor retains to himself for a period of ten (10) years all literary property rights in the material donated to the United States of America by the terms of the instrument. After the expiration of this ten year period, the aforesaid literary property rights will pass to the United States of America.

Signed Lawrence S. Battelle  
Date Sept 3, 1970  
Accepted James B. Rhoads  
Archivist of the United States  
Date September 14, 1970

**WITHDRAWAL SHEET (PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES)**

Document Type	Correspondents or Title	Date	Restriction
OH	<p align="center"><b>Page(s) Containing Closed Portion(s)</b></p> <p><b>Interviews opened in toto upon review, June 3, 2008</b></p> <p align="right"><b>Updated: 6/16/2008</b></p>	7/9/1968 8/27/2008 10/31/2008	<b>C</b>

**File Location:**

**John F. Kennedy Oral History Project**

**Lucius D. Battle, Interview #1, July 9, 1968; Interview #2, August 27, 1968; and Interview #3, October 31, 1968**

**Restriction Codes**

- (A) Closed by applicable Executive Order governing access to national security information.
- (B) Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- (C) Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in the donor's deed of gift.

Lucius D. Battle – JFK#3

Table of Contents

<u>Page</u>	<u>Topic</u>
81	Project to save the Abu Simbel temples in Egypt
86, 91	U.S. involvement in UNESCO
88	René Maheu, Secretary-General of UNESCO
93	UNESCO conferences
94	U.S. appointments to UNESCO
100, 122	Advisory Committee on the Arts
106	Reorganizing the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs
108	Inter-Agency Youth Committee
109	Organization of American States meeting in Bogotá, Colombia
112	John W. Gardner
115, 129	Staffing issues in the State Department
123	Deciding which countries and regions should receive State Department cultural programs
126	Chester B. Bowles opposition to the Bay of Pigs plan
132	Acting as an intermediary for others with Dean Rusk
136	Efforts to reform the Foreign Service
137	Communication problems between the White House and State Department

Third of Three Oral History Interviews

with

Lucius D. Battle

Washington, D.C.  
October 31, 1968

By Larry J. Hackman

For the John F. Kennedy Library

HACKMAN: What do you have on this beyond.... The only thing I can remember is a brief mention of Mrs. Kennedy's [Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy] interest in the project.

BATTLE: In the Abu Simbal project? Well, I recall fairly early in my tenure as Assistant Secretary of Educational and Cultural Affairs that an expression of interest came from the President [John F. Kennedy] and, particularly, from Mrs. Kennedy—an interest in this project and a hope that I would do what I could to find a way to help the international effort and to find a way that we could contribute some of the vast holdings of pounds that really had no purpose, they could not be used outside of Egypt. At that time there was a great deal of discussion of the project. It had excited a good deal of interest in the world and in America. Everybody had a plan. Most of the plans for the preservation of it were really quite crazy.

HACKMAN: I remember that you did mention a plan whereby they would be cut up and moved up as opposed to...

[-81-]

BATTLE: Well, that was the one that was finally selected. There were many

other plans. We went to the general conference of UNESCO, the meeting of 1962 in Paris, November-December, and this was a major issue at that particular conference. I had, at the beginning stages, very little enthusiasm for the project because I didn't think we had much of a chance of getting it through the Congress, and also most of the plans in the early days for lifting it on hydraulic lifts or for floating it on pontoons or some of the other ideas were both incredibly costly and would have involved a very difficult effort to get any contributions from the Congress for the project.

So my effort at the UNESCO conference was to try to be sure that every possible plan was considered and that we find a plan that was less costly and, particularly, a plan that did not involve hard currency in any major way. It seemed to me that if we were to be a major donor, as we would have to be, paying as we do roughly one third of the cost of all UNESCO budgets, that it would have to be in a form that permitted the use of pounds rather than drawing on hard currency, which I was confident we could never get from the Congress. Therefore, I wanted a plan that could be done for as little hard currency as possible and was not so outrageously costly, even in its total—regardless of what currency it was quoted in—was not so totally out of line as to be ludicrous in the world marketplace and in the face of the poverty in Egypt.

The plan that was finally worked out and to which we contributed was low in dollar or hard currency content and much lower than the original cost that had been contemplated. The earlier costs ran up as high as a hundred million dollars, even higher for some. But the one that was finally agreed upon was thirty-six million, of which we paid twelve million dollars in pounds, and the hard currency content—I've forgotten the total amount of it, but in my recollection it was around eight—was raised through contributions from other countries and through private efforts in this country which were rather considerable. They didn't raise a lot of money, but they raised some, and it ran into a couple million dollars. But the project has been successful.

[-82-]

I think it was interesting in that it was a major international cultural effort which President and Mrs. Kennedy wanted very much to foster and to stimulate. It was a period in which interest in culture was high. Everybody was interested in cultural activities, and it was a moment—I don't believe it could have happened if it hadn't been for the sort of climate in this country. I got it through the Congress; I did all the testifying and actually got it through the Congress on something of a fluke. But it got through all right, and we were able to contribute.

At that stage, I had no idea that I would be Ambassador to Cairo; it never had occurred to me. Interestingly enough, I never felt that President Nasser [Gamal Abdel Nasser] showed any great interest in Abu Simbel or for that matter in historical projects, in cultural projects at all, or in history at all. He is interested in them only as they might affect development of the country via tourism and the appeal of Egypt via tourism. But he didn't, I think, see any inherent value in cultural or historical projects. I don't know whether he saw himself as the antithesis of a pharaonic type or whether he saw a little competition in some fields or what, but he was perfectly reasonable about it when I told him of our contribution, which I did, I guess, the day I presented credentials, the first meeting I had with him.

I became rather indignant with some of the people in the U.A.R. government about the fact that we had contributed the amount we had and had made the rather tremendous effort that we made and had not received the kind of attention locally that I felt we deserved. I objected to this rather strenuously and told the then Deputy Prime Minister of Cultural Affairs that I felt that this would hurt any efforts that were made privately—they still hoped to get dollars—if there was not a due attention given to the U.S. government contribution. After that the attention improved considerably and our contribution was noted reasonably well. They're not, as a people, noted for graciousness, and they are not terribly noted for appreciative attitudes in any respect, so it wasn't too surprising, in a traditional sense, that they did not respond any more warmly than they did.

[-83-]

But the project, as an international cultural effort, was worthwhile; as a historical preservation, it is worthwhile. If we had been able to spend the dollars or to spend the pounds that we contributed on other projects that might have contributed to development of the country, I think a good argument could have been made that we should have done that instead of the preservation of Abu Simbel. But that really wasn't the alternative; it wasn't a question of choice between the two. For that reason, I think the effort was worthwhile, and I'm very glad that we did it.

HACKMAN:           What was the fluke on the congressional handling? What about this?

BATTLE:           Well, there's been a long misunderstanding on the question of foreign currency, the holdings of foreign currency generated by, primarily, PL 480 sales, but not entirely. And I think there has been a very bad, in the main, handling by both the executive branch and Congress of this issue. There has never been, I think, no understanding that all foreign currencies are not alike and that an excess holding of a freely convertible currency such as the Japanese yen or French francs or Deutsch marks is one thing and a very different thing from a holding of Indian rupees or Egyptian pounds or Indonesian whatever it is—dinar—whatever it is. There is a real difference in the value of these currencies, and also, you're always limited by what you can do with them.

In the case of these currencies where we had no possible use outside the country, where it was even difficult to find ways of using them internally without contributing to inflation, without having effects that the country would not want, where the arrangements entered into with those countries had limited us considerably to what we were able to do; it seemed to me that where we had opportunities that did not have inflationary effects and did work for the long term interests of the United States, that we should have been given a freer hand and not been made to justify an expenditure of a foreign currency in that category as though we were spending a dollar.

[-84-]

At that time, any—and it's still true—any foreign currencies that we wish to use we had to get a dollar appropriation from the United States Congress and buy the foreign

currency from the United States Treasury. This was a reasonable position with respect to freely convertible currencies, a reasonable attitude in countries where we had holdings for only, say, two or three years or something of that sort. But when you had currencies that were going to last you for the next fifty years and still be in excess, a different kind of standard for the use of those currencies should have been applied.

It was, for example, impossible for me to get the fences painted around the Embassy in Cairo, even though we were sitting there with a hundred and twenty-five million dollars worth of Egyptian pounds. Even on an entirely local expenditure both for the labor and the paint, I couldn't get the money because it involved getting appropriations of dollars. Therefore, the fences just didn't get painted. The same thing happened in India where Chet Bowles [Chester B. Bowles] couldn't run his fountains because he didn't have the money to pay the water bill even though they owned a good share of the rupees in India; and still we couldn't pay a water bill over a certain amount. It was rather silly.

Well, the fluke I referred to was that we had a request for a twelve million dollar appropriation, and while it was clearly stated in this legislation, in this request, that it would go for the purchase of Egyptian pounds, it was still identified as a dollar appropriation. Unless you read the fine print you never knew what it was all about. When I got to the Congress, in the first case, the House Appropriations Committee, John Rooney [John James Rooney], who was the Chairman of the Subcommittee, turned it down.

And then I appealed it to the Senate Appropriations Committee, and Allen Ellender [Allen Joseph Ellender], oddly enough, not a great lover of culture, saw a technical gimmick that bothered him. He said that we were sitting in Egypt at that time with a large fund growing out of the Cowley [Harold D. Cowley] appropriation for the use of private American business in the country and that after any of those currencies had been held for three years they could be used without resort to the United States Congress because they were available for Cowley loans and no limitation existed after three years' holding. And so I picked up on that suggestion saying I thought this was a

[-85-]

very distinguished and very statesman-like suggestion, and I assumed that he applied this provision to Abu Simbel and was willing to see the Department of State spend money from the Cowley funds and that we could, therefore, use these funds without an appropriation, and I would hope that such a directive would be made in the report of the Committee of their willingness to have this procedure take place.

I went back to John Rooney and told John Rooney that this is what had happened. He said he wasn't enthusiastic, but he wasn't going to object. So this ended up going through on a kind of fluke. And I had the feeling, he told me a couple of times, Rooney did, that he was well aware of the interest of the President and Mrs. Kennedy in this. In fact, my recollection is that President Kennedy spoke with Rooney at one point, either he did or someone in the White House did, and I think this is what led Rooney to accept this without objection, and this is how it went through.

HACKMAN:                   Okay. Well, let me just start on UNESCO policy in general then.  
When you came in, in preparation for that Paris meeting in '62 there

were some changes, I believe, in our policy. We went for a budget cut, for one thing. How did this come about? Did you change things when you came in or was this in process when you came in?

BATTLE: Well, it was both. It was already in the process. There were several issues that came up in this connection, and while these were cleared with the White House, I don't recall that President Kennedy ever had any direct involvement in them or had any particular interest. There was not a great deal of money involved. UNESCO had always been a fairly badly run organization but with great promise in its goals and purposes. It's always operated on a plane in our country that has been considered rather unreal, and it has done some extremely stupid things in terms of publications it's put out and a lot of the programs and things it's gone into. It is still an organization that I think the world needs, and it has a place.

[-86-]

I think my attitude at that time was that if we were to let it realize the promise that it had and live up to the promise of its inception that we had, in terms of U.S. participation, to try to remove the very nebulous and, in some respects, useless projects that kept popping up. There was a kind of proliferation of projects that turned up each year. There was not an adequate control over what these projects amounted to and you could find them going straight through the budget process and then reaching a stage where it was almost impossible to stop them and yet no one, certainly from our side, had ever evaluated them.

I remember one thing we did that was rather amusing. We had a copy of the budget. It was an enormous thick thing—I never read it—a huge thing, hundreds and hundreds of pages, and listing all kinds of little projects all around the world. We took that copy and split it up, literally, and Harlan Cleveland [J. Harlan Cleveland] and I sent it out to all the ambassadors in the field, all of the American ambassadors, saying, would you go out and look at this project and would you tell us what you think of it. This was, I think, the first time that this approach had been undertaken where we were paying for a third of the total cost without any real control over what the projects amounted to and without any real assessment as to their utility and propriety. We got back some useful reports from the ambassadors; some not so useful.

So I went to the meeting with a strong feeling that we must not let the budget get out of hand. And in an amusing way I was joined by the Russians as the second largest contributor in an effort to control the budget. They had, well, I would say almost a contempt for UNESCO, which I did not have. I was frequently irritated with it, but they objected strongly to the tendency toward proliferation of activity, and they felt that the U.S. was quite right in trying to contain it.

[-87-]

Moreover, we were getting into a situation that later became a very key one, and that was whether the recipient nations, having one vote as did the donor nations, could raise the level of the budget with the major contributors opposing that level. If this had been permitted

we would have, I think, started a kind of practice that would have caused very serious repercussions, here, on the willingness of the U.S. Congress to go on appropriating money in a situation over which they had no control. It bordered on the ridiculous from our point of view.

If the African nations, for example, could join hands and, knowing that they would receive the benefits of these appropriations, vote them without having to pay any of it, then having us have to defend those projects with which we were not in great sympathy, this could have been a very difficult thing. So what I tried to do was to get them to eliminate those things that were peripheral to cut down on the numbers of projects, to interject a sounder analysis of what they were going to do. We ended up with a small increase I think in the budget, but the debate had a good effect on the organization. There were many people who felt I was quite outrageous in my attitude and couldn't see why I was making as much of a point as I was over what amounted really to the difference of only perhaps eight hundred thousand or less than a million dollars in our contribution.

HACKMAN: I think we had recommended thirty-eight million, and they had the budget as forty, and it came out around thirty-nine.

BATTLE: That's right. And that's about it. Well, we felt we had a victory for sanity. We felt that at least it made the various delegations aware of the problem, aware of the issue, and that we had at least raised the flag for the future. So from that point of view it was very useful that we went through it.

[-88-]

René Maheu was up for appointment as the Secretary General of UNESCO. We had a great argument within the Department; I was opposed initially to the position that IO [International Organization Affairs], headed by Harlan Cleveland, wanted to take at that time. They wanted to oppose him. I had no objection whatever in opposing him. I didn't like him very much, still don't, but I did not feel that we ought to try to start a campaign against him without a candidate and without the time available to really have a chance at succeeding. Therefore, I felt that this was a mistake to get into a big row over his appointment when we knew we were going to lose. There were a couple of candidates suggested to us. Neither one got anywhere at all. The whole effort sort of collapsed, and we ended up with a great deal of hard feeling on the part of René Maheu.

And we were wrong; we were quite wrong in what we did. It would have been better to have gone along with him, to have had a quiet talk with him as I did while I was there. But he is not, in my judgment, really what the organization needed. I think he's been much better than we feared he would be at the time. I do think if there was any benefit, and there may have been a little, it was that we alerted him to the fact that we were not going to go along with him on everything he wanted, and we had real hesitation about some of his attitudes, and that we expected a good deal more of him than had been the pattern of the past. To that extent, I think it, perhaps, was useful.

The last contacts that I've had with René Maheu have and were, really, always reasonably satisfactory. But I think we handled the issue badly as a government. I took René

Maheu to see President Kennedy one time. It was the last time I saw President Kennedy. It was, if I'm not mistaking, only two or three weeks before....

[-89-]

HACKMAN: It was October 19th of '63.

BATTLE: Yes. You really have done some research on that. It was the last time that I saw President Kennedy, and it was a brief meeting. I recall that he asked us to come out and see the garden and showed us—we stood on that little terrace thing by the garden and looked out on it, talked for a few minutes, after the meeting was over. I had no idea at that stage that it would be the last time I would see him, of course, but it was.

HACKMAN: Can you remember the substance of the meeting?

BATTLE: No, not very well. Bill Benton [William B. Benton] went with us. It did not get into any depth, particularly. The President simply reaffirmed, as I recall it, the—there's a memo on this from somewhere, if anyone ever wants it—the President simply reaffirmed the U.S. support for UNESCO, our concern about the way in which they approached some of their problems, but our basic support and goodwill for the organization. That is about all I remember about it; it was not a very substantive or a very lengthy meeting. It was essentially a courtesy call on the President. It was a courtesy call that I was rather happy we could arrange. The President had a very heavy calendar and it was rather difficult, but we did not stay very long. Both Bill Benton and I went on out to Chicago with René Maheu. He was extremely pleased that he had had a chance to see the President. I talked with him afterward; he was honored that he had been permitted to call on him and that's about all I remember about it.

HACKMAN: I had heard that he was upset previously because he hadn't gotten to see the President a previous time he had come to the United States. I don't remember if that was when he was acting director the fall before or...

[-90-]

BATTLE: He was acting director and there was some other technical reason that it had not been considered necessary the preceding time that he had been here. I don't recall what it was, but it was primarily that he was acting; he was not officially in office at that stage. But because of the unpleasantness over his election and because of our belief that we had to reaffirm our support, although a cautious one in some respects, for what they were trying to do, we felt, Bill and I felt, that he ought to be received. We were very glad that he was. As a matter of fact, René Maheu referred to this meeting when I saw him in Cairo about a month ago and recalled it.

HACKMAN: You had mentioned previously that some people found it hard to understand why you were making these attempts in relation to UNESCO programs. Were you talking about people within the United States government or people at the General Conference?

BATTLE: Oh, it was the people at the General Conference; everyone here thought it was superb. And we had, of course, several congressmen on our delegation. I was worried about what would happen if these several attitudes that I mentioned prevailed. I felt that we needed to show at that time a firmness of U.S. policy and that, while supporting the goals and purposes of the organization, that we should not permit ourselves to simply appear to go along with it if we were going to end the chances of getting U.S. support for it.

The Congress was perfectly fine. There were a couple of inquiries by the congress into things that UNESCO did. There were a couple of issues. I remember appearing before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Frank Church was the chairman. The issue had to do with some publications they had put out that were considered below the scholastic standard that should have prevailed in UNESCO publications. They were of doubtful political balance to put it mildly. From our point of view, UNESCO was quite wrong. This issue didn't make as much difference as it would have appeared from reading the press at that particular moment, but it did matter a bit. I remember saying to one of my colleagues before I went down to the

[-91-]

Hill that day that I felt we in the executive branch had a bad case, and I was going to treat it as such. And so in my opening statement I said exactly what I thought of the UNESCO actions in this particular regard. I recall Frank Church saying to me once, saying to me right after the hearing that day—he was the Chairman of that subcommittee—he said, “Luke, it's very difficult for a senator to exercise the senatorial prerogative of indignation when the witness is more indignant than the senator.” And the whole thing sort of disappeared perhaps, I said this last time. Did we? I don't remember getting into this.

HACKMAN: I think you had mentioned...

BATTLE: I told somebody...

HACKMAN: ...Church making that...

BATTLE: Did I? I'm sorry.

HACKMAN: But I... Not in connection with UNESCO. I can't remember.

BATTLE: Well, I apologize. I'm afraid I repeat these things.

HACKMAN: Well, we can always take that out if you want to. There were no

problems with Harlan Cleveland and his operation except the thing on Rene Maheu?

BATTLE: That was the main one. There was one other, but I've forgotten exactly what it was. It didn't really pop up until later. It had something to do with the position we took involving Latin American countries. If I think long enough I can remember it, but it didn't appear to be important at the time.

[-92-]

HACKMAN: Bogotá Conference, ministers...

BATTLE: No, that was later. I was chairman of the U.S. delegation to that also. But this issue had to do with acceptance of the deficiencies in—we abstained on a report rather than opposing the voting rights of those who were behind in their contributions to UNESCO. That was the issue. And it was IO [International Organization Affairs] that had insisted on the abstention and that this was the way to handle it. I remember we went along with it and nothing happened until much later and then that got played back to me as to why I abstained. I said, "Well, that was the position paper agreed to before I left Washington." Harlan said, "Well, you should have had enough sense to change it." He said, "You usually change things when you don't think they make any sense." And I said that, "Well, in this case I felt that this was..." whether it had been agreed to or... Harlan and I got along very well. I have great respect for him; he's a very able fellow. We had violent arguments on many issues, but we didn't have any very basic disagreements, and essentially, we got along very well.

HACKMAN: On the cooperation you received then from the Soviets on the budget at that meeting, was this anything that was talked about before the meeting, anything planned or did it just come up?

BATTLE: No, it only happened. We anticipated that the Russian delegate would be fairly close to us in his attitude on proliferation and increase of budget and I found—I can't even think of his name at the moment—I found to my astonishment that I rather liked him. We had some very amusing conversations, and I remember saying to him that I had been in many conferences with the Russians but this is one of the few times that I'd ever found myself on the same side with them. And we met two or three times during the course of the conference, and it became something of a conference joke. The whole thing, there was a good deal more joviality about all of this than the record would suggest. The record is probably more formal, but what went on behind the scenes and after conferences and so on was... I remember one rather amusing thing that happened with the

[-93-]

Indian delegation. The, I can't remember the name, she's dead now, she was the delegation head. She was the Minister of Health of India, Raj Kamari, I can remember, that's a title, but I can't remember her name. She was a Gandhi [Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi] follower, had gone to jail with him, was a very elegant princess, a remarkable woman. She heard my speech on our attitudes towards the organization, and she came up to me afterwards and said she thought it was one of the best speeches she had ever heard. Then, in the middle of all these very dull speeches, I would get a note from her in the middle of the conference asking me to come outside and have a cup of coffee. So each day we had a little chat almost every day. It was the period of the Chinese invasion of India; she was deeply concerned and wanted to talk with me on that as well as other things. But to get back to UNESCO, I had great talks with her. The Indians had been a major problem. She finally, when her turn came to speak, she made a speech in which she said that she supported throughout her speech every position I had taken, said she considered it highly logical. Up until the last sentence, I thought I had a ringing supporter. Then she said, "But for other reasons we will vote to the contrary." It was a very amusing, a very Indian kind of thing. But she told me afterward that she had her instructions, as I had mine, and she couldn't do anything else. But she said, "I basically agree with you."

HACKMAN: How did Senator Benton work out as the UNESCO Ambassador? Do you recall how that appointment came about?

BATTLE: Very vividly. The appointment came from the White House. That started it. He was very interested in this. I'm very fond of Bill Benton. He is rather too wordy at times to be as effective as he might, but all in all I think Bill's utility has been very great. Bill has been very useful, I think, with UNESCO, has been back here in the United States where he's been very active in a number of ways. He found some of the bureaucracy and some of the tediousness of UNESCO—which is true of almost any international meeting of that magnitude—

[-94-]

he found it rather tiresome. And actually, I did not serve very long with Bill, a very short time, a few months, not much longer. He and I worked together very well. He writes great tomes of papers. I don't know whether you've been at the receiving end of his memoranda or not, but they are enormous in quantity. But he's essentially well motivated in terms of UNESCO and he's done, I think, a very good job.

HACKMAN: Any resistance to the appointment from State? Any opposition?

BATTLE: Yes, there were several concerns that he was not going to be—that he was going to be undirected and that he would act on his own. This was, I think, during the period I worked with him much less true than many people feared. There was some opposition and some concern, but I think it disappeared. He has many good qualities, also some bad ones, but many very good ones. I think all in all people felt he did fairly well, in fact, in some respects, very well. The

combination of Bob Wade [Robert Hirsch Beard Wade], who was the U.S. permanent representative, he went over there, actually he and I went out, I to Cairo and he to UNESCO on the same ship. So he had not gone over there. The fellow who was there was Crane Haussamen. Now that appointment had been resisted rather strongly by me and by others. This was an out and out political appointment and for very clear reasons which had to do with campaign contributions.

HACKMAN: This was Ribicoff's [Abraham Alexander Ribicoff] man, wasn't he?

BATTLE: Yes. He had given rather substantial amounts to the Party and had absolutely no qualifications for the job, and it was really disastrous. Bill was very indignant about this and, between us, we managed to get something done about it, but it was a bit awkward. Crane simply lacked the experience and background, and he certainly lacked the sophistication and the posture that I thought we needed at that time. It was nothing personal between us at all. I didn't mind him personally, really, but it was a very bad appointment. And I told Ralph Dungan [Ralph A. Dungan] when it was made it was wrong. But the appointment got made. There have been

[-95-]

more important appointments made for political reasons in the stream of history. Really, it's nothing at all but a minor little incident, but in terms of our representation at UNESCO, it was quite wrong. Bob Wade is an entirely different person and he and Bill Benton have worked together very well, but Crane Haussamen and Bill didn't work together at all. I think the present arrangement has been highly satisfactory. Bill has gone to the Executive Board meetings and Bob Wade has been there on a permanent basis.

HACKMAN: You said Wade went out at the time you went to Cairo: was there any success in getting Haussamen out before the Kennedy Administration went out or did this get accomplished, then, under the Johnson [Lyndon Baines Johnson]....

BATTLE: No, we got him out afterward. I'd have to check the dates on that. He came back and was given an assignment to take a trip. My recollection is he paid for it. But he wanted to do a study of education in underdeveloped areas or something of that sort, and he was given this sort of interim kind of thing and he did that for a bit and then came back and wrote a lengthy report which I never read. But I think that while the effort was under way during the Kennedy Administration, my recollection is that it did not actually occur until later. That ought to be verified, but that's my recollection.

HACKMAN: What about the National Commission for UNESCO? How did the appointments get made to that? Any problems on those?

[-96-]

BATTLE: Yes, there were problems. Ralph Dungan and I had an excellent working relationship. I knew Ralph very well, and Ralph was political but practical and extremely well motivated in most respects with relationship to UNESCO. I told him at the beginning that I recognized full well that, on both the U.S. delegation to UNESCO and the National Commission, that he had to have a certain number of appointments. He had to make a certain number of appointments that were out and out political, but I hoped they wouldn't be outrageous in terms of qualifications. There ought to be some sort of relationship between their background and their interests in appointments to either the delegation or to the National Commission. I also said that we had to have a certain number of people from the National Commission go every two years to the General Conference so that the National Commission felt a participation in it, the work of the General Conference, but that if we could split it up, that if we could take x number—I've forgotten how we divided the pie—if he could take a certain number of political appointments and I would take a certain number and we'd work it out together; that we had to have working people, that we had to have an effective delegation....

The delegation that I headed was incredibly good, really extremely good. I had a number of very excellent people on it, and they worked hard. There were a couple of bad ones. But people like, well, Mildred McAfee Horton, a woman for whom I have considerable respect and admiration, was a member of my delegation. Mildred was a very distinguished woman, ex-president of Wellesley and ex-director of the WAVES and all sorts of things. Mildred, while she agreed with the position we were taking, she felt that the thing which she could do most usefully was to help write my speeches and make the position, while firm, as palatable as possible. Mildred would stay up all night, and did on many occasions, writing my speeches for the next day, which I thought was an incredible performance for a woman of her distinction and age. She never minded at all, and I think if you asked her she would say she had a superb time. But the delegation worked very well together.

[-97-]

Congressman Bob Barry [Robert. Raymond Barry], with whom I would have disagreed on on most every basic issue in the world, but for whom I had a considerable liking, personally—he was a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, a Republican, ultra-conservative; he's been out of the Congress now for some time—but he was quite willing to pitch in and work. Harold Cooley [Harold D. Cooley] was another member. He did very little, took very little part, but he wasn't a problem. There was one senator who was only there for a few days. It was Senator Byrd [Robert C. Byrd] of West Virginia, not of Virginia. But he was there for only a very short time. But the rest of them were made up of people who, while some of them were political in a sense, they were also well selected in terms of background. We had enough people who could take on the chores of representing the United States in the various committees of UNESCO and were very effective.

We had a staff meeting at eight o'clock every morning, which everyone just screamed about, and we reviewed every issue for that day. The meetings then began at about 9:30 or 10:00. We had an hour's meeting, and then it took about twenty or thirty minutes to get over there. We reviewed every issue and every speech. Then we had a late afternoon meeting or,

on occasion, an evening meeting. We divided up the work. We had already divided the committees, obviously, but we divided up the workings of the thing. George Allen [George Edward Allen] was vice chairman and he and I had agreed—I could not stay the full six weeks—that I would take the first three weeks and he would take the second. He came and overlapped with me for a couple of days. He's long experienced and has been very active in these fields and he was the vice chairman.

I went on and took a trip around the world after that, in connection with Cultural Affairs programs, Educational and Cultural Affairs programs, chaired a meeting of Cultural Affairs officers in Beirut and a number of other things. But I didn't stay for the full period. But the delegation worked very well together.

[-98-]

We would divide up the duties of going to receptions, of handling our own work and decide collectively how we were going to spend the very modest amount of representation money that we had available. It really, as a delegation—Bob Wade said he'd never seen one function as well—it was a very good group, dedicated group, and, with one or two exceptions, we had a very good rapport and it worked extremely well.

HACKMAN: This is the '62 meeting?

BATTLE: Wade was there. Wade went with me as my assistant.

HACKMAN: Oh, I see.

BATTLE: He was not assigned there. At that point John Morrow [John Howard Morrow] was there, and he was a hangover from the Republican Administration, totally unfitted for the job. He spoke good French but he was just, you know, you're either up to these and tuned in to them.... He was essentially a college professor and has gone back to the academic world.

HACKMAN: He's the Negro Ambassador to Guinea.

BATTLE: That's right. He was Ambassador to Guinea. He was not in any way successful at UNESCO: a perfectly nice fellow, I liked him enormously, and he stayed on for a while with the State Department. We did find another place for him. But as the representative to UNESCO, it wasn't right.

HACKMAN: Did Secretary Rusk or Under Secretary Ball [George W. Ball] take any particular interest in UNESCO? Or did you have to call on them for support on any issue?

BATTLE: No, I didn't pay any attention to them on this. I didn't bother them and they, I felt—the only thing they got into at all, one staff meeting

Harlan Cleveland and I got into an argument about René Maheu and the argument about whether we opposed him or didn't. I said I thought it was too late, that we couldn't fight him without a candidate. If they'd give me a candidate I was quite willing to, but if we couldn't find a candidate that

[-99-]

could bring any international support I thought we were better going along with him; and that was the only issue.... I remember Dean got very bored with the whole thing before we were through arguing. This is the only thing that I recall that we ever talked with him about. I felt quite secure in my relations with the seventh floor of the State Department having just left there and knowing George Ball and Dean Rusk intimately. I didn't have the slightest feeling of concern about them. We kept a little closer touch with some of the White House staff on this particular thing than I did with the seventh floor of the State Department, and I don't recall they ever got involved in it in one way or the other.

HACKMAN: On the White House side, mainly Dungan on personnel, or anybody else....

BATTLE: Well, Dungan mostly on personnel and Arthur Schlesinger [Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.] got involved from time to time. Once in awhile there'd be some little issue involving Mac Bundy [McGeorge Bundy], but not often. It usually had to do with an appointment, a personal aspect of some sort. I don't recall—the Advisory committee on the Arts, I recall Mac got into it in one way because of Archie MacLeish [Archibald MacLeish] and we got into a little hiatus about that, which was all utterly ridiculous. Not between Mac and me, but it later got in the press. But actually it got in the press in the last few months, strangely enough. It had to do with security clearances for those that we appointed to the Advisory Committee on the Arts.

HACKMAN: That was the resurrected Advisory Committee after the study by Larsen [Roy E. Larsen] and Wolfe [Glenn G. Wolfe] that...

BATTLE: Yes. Well, actually the issue had started a long time before. Before I was even in CU, an Advisory Committee on the Arts was being appointed, but no function had been assigned to it. No one was sure what it did. The appointments got all hung up in a variety of ways, and it was during this period that I got the Larsen study made and we then assigned functions to it—

[-100-]

did a very different kind of an Advisory Committee because none of the appointments had been made, which was a blessing. But there was great argument over some of the individuals on the list and I remember—Archie MacLeish is a friend of mine—one of them got rather silly.

Archie said he—and I agreed completely with Archie, but I had to also recognize my responsibilities and bureaucratic sense—the issue was whether we waive security clearances for the list that was to be appointed. We were under congressional mandate to subject them to security clearances, and we didn't have the authority to do anything. You could waive it and make an appointment “subject to,” but you could not waive it in a permanent sense. So all you were going to do if you waived it was just delay it.

Archie wasn't awfully enthusiastic about coming on the Committee in the first place. I called him up and he said he didn't want to fill in all those forms at his age, and at this stage in his career he didn't think he should have to fill in all those forms. I said, “Archie, I'll fill in all those forms for you, all you need to do is write your name. I'll do all of it except a few things you'll have to do. We've got it all on file here, everything you've ever done is right here.” But there was a flap about that. It was all rather silly. But it got straightened out.

Later the question of waiver came up in connection with—I guess it was the Otepka [Otto F. Otepka] thing or something. In the last year or so it came up in the press. I can't remember the details about it, but I remember Schlesinger got irritated about it. He was arguing with me that we should waive them. I said, “We can't waive them. It's impossible to waive them. We can waive temporarily, but we can't waive permanently. So we're better off having it and not running the risk. I can't put Dean Rusk in this position of waiving.” He said he thought it was ridiculous to make these people have security checks. I said I didn't argue with that. He said, “For a Committee that isn't going to deal with any security matters...” I said, “But nevertheless, that's the mandate from the Congress, as interpreted by the lawyer.” So that was the issue. It seems like a long time ago, and I don't remember all the specifics.

HACKMAN:               What really had prompted the Larsen study of the American National Theater and Academy?

[-101-]

BATTLE:               I'll tell you the story on that. This is a very interesting one. It had been rather fascinating in a number of respects. When I took over the program the.... What had gone out under the program, if you looked through the files, and I won't get into specific names here, but the record that we had had was one of sending out people who should not have gone; who went either by bad selection or as a result of political pressure. We had sent out homosexuals, dope pushers; incredible fiascos had occurred, fights among the groups.

There had been a great scandal over—Joey Adams had gone out. He's what is known in the trade as a stand-up comic. He'd gone out on a tour that was, I thought, ill-conceived but had not been as much a disaster as the press had built up.

This all occurred just before I came in and the attention of the Congress that year on the budget of Educational and Cultural Affairs, of which the cultural presentations portion was a very minor part in terms of dollars, had occupied the bulk of the attention. I became convinced that if something were not done that we were going to lose the program. We were badly exposed. I could see enough horrors in those files to just make it impossible to defend it. They had a very awkward selection procedure which really didn't; it involved referring

everybody to ANTA [American National Theater & Academy]. They had a group that went out from the University of Arkansas, the Arkansas Choir...

HACKMAN: Right.

BATTLE: ...went on the Fulbright thing [J. William Fulbright]. It went out to this very minor—I don't even remember which one it was in Italy—competition. It had been turned down for U.S. assistance for a perfectly valid reason, but it won first place. Bill Fulbright called, and he was very upset about it, and it looked as though—this just contributed one more factor to it. So I got in touch with John Gardner [John W. Gardner], with whom I had superb working relations, he and I—it couldn't have been better. He was chairman of the Advisory Commission on Educational and Cultural Exchange. I told John I wanted to suspend the whole damn program, everything that was going on, pending a study by that group of which Roy Larsen was the vice chairman, and a new look at selection procedure. That we had to do several things: we had to make sure that what we sent out were the best in American culture, that we

[-102-]

had to be sure that they were selected by professional people, with a professional judgment, that we had to be sure they were representative of the United States, and we had to allocate the money as between types and have a structured program based on some kind of conception rather than haphazard, and so on. Out of it, Roy Larsen created this new selection procedure.

We had the Advisory Committee on the Arts which really had never before been given a defined function, really, other than to advise. This led to a complete scrapping of the earlier list and a new series of appointments to be made, with a representative from each of the key areas of activity. And that became the overall Advisory Committee on selection of what we sent out within each of the categories, represented by the one person from that category on the Committee. There were additional committees, subcommittees, of people on dance, on symphonies, on whatever.

From then on I never once veered from the recommendations of those committees on selection. They planned the program, and we took it out of ANTA's hands. Because it was in such trouble I got a very tough administrator—I was criticized for this—Glenn Wolfe, who had no more experience with the arts than my nine year old boy, which is why I wanted him. There were incredible administrative disasters known to me in ANTA's handling of it. ANTA had—and I don't mean to make ANTA sound all bad, it wasn't—but ANTA was giving loose instructions, loose guidance, inadequate guidance, and the ANTA group had a different approach. They weren't as aware of some of the horrors that could come from sloppy administration as were we in the State Department.

So I got, what we wanted to do, and Roy and I worked this out—he did the study and it was largely his conception, but he worked it out together in part—that we would take out all artistic judgment and put it in a group outside of government, in which all artistic judgment, any criticism, and any political pressure had to go to them so that it took me out of the position of deciding between one or another congressman, etcetera. Then we would take

administration and put it under the State Department; let us handle it because we knew where the pitfalls were, and in the last analysis the people in the field had to administer in the field anyway.

[-103-]

The administration done in the domestic U.S. was only the smallest fraction of the administration that was required because the American embassy people in the field, USIA, but under the embassy, had to arrange the halls, the acoustics, the lighting, and what have you. And therefore, the administration, the theory that it was being done by ANTA was quite wrong. It was really being done—the domestic side was being done by ANTA, but the field side we felt would be administered better by our own people, directing our own people, than by ANTA, which, again, was just a very complex arrangement.

Now, for the next two years after that report was put into effect, not one time did I turn down the recommendations of the committees and not one time did I accept a political pressure for a selection of an individual. I turned down both Bill Fulbright a second time, and Hubert Humphrey [Hubert H. Humphrey]. After that, both of them—Hubert having been a major force in the bill, originally—after I had turned down Humphrey and Fulbright, and had survived, I could turn to anybody in that Congress and say to them, “I would not even grant a politically-oriented selection to two of the main supporters of the program. They understand it, they have accepted it, therefore, I cannot without....” I made it very clear that if I were put in a position by anybody else, and I meant every word of it, of responding to political pressure on one of those selections, I would resign. Absolutely. Immediately. If we were going to adhere to this it had to be honest, had to be straight, and it was not going to be anything but that if I administered it.

John Gardner, Roy Larsen and I, well, we managed it and everybody was delighted with it, including Bill Fulbright. Actually, Bill and I got along very, very well the whole time. But at any rate the problem of selection: he'd been very well aware of it. Roy had a certain standing with the appropriations committees, being Roy Larsen; Glenn Wolfe was known as a very tough administrator; the artistic judgment came from outside; and we were home. So I simplified what was a very tense situation for a while with incredible congressional pressure. We had the largest—the Cultural

[-104-]

Affairs Bureau had the largest congressional mail in the building, and an enormous amount of it came from the Sioux City Singers' congressman or the Flap Jacks, or something like it, from out in the middle of the country. It was just unbelievable, the pressure. Now, I had a perfect position, and I stuck by it.

HACKMAN: Over what period had the administrative problems on this been developing? Was this primarily within the Kennedy Administration, or does it go back further?

BATTLE: Oh no, it went back further than that. It went back a long way. And it

really, it responded to momentary interest. For example, a little pressure built up at one stage for sending American theater abroad, and they spent—oh, I've forgotten, a half, a third of the year's budget for the Helen Hayes tour which occurred, if I remember correctly, at the end of the Eisenhower [Dwight D. Eisenhower] Administration. Well, the group, they didn't have enough money to have them, to rehearse adequately, an enormous percentage of the costs went into moving scenery, the selection of plays became controversial, every aspect of it, it was.... The notion was all right, but given the budget and the problems they were having with it, it just....

I think the administration of it, the problems, had already started long before. The Joey Adams thing really brought the focus on it because it was so hard to explain why these two or three groups that had been in his group had gone out, just almost indefensible. The reports from the field had not been as disastrous as the very bad publicity back here. It was very bad. Do you remember the hearing on B girls came up at about the time this was—it was about the time I took office—the questions as whether they belong to some artists guild or something? It turned out that Joey Adams was president of that particular guild.

HACKMAN: I had never heard....

[-105-]

BATTLE: The whole thing got all—every press item about Joey Adams and the B girls mentioned that he'd been out for the State Department. You had the feeling we had exported B girls. You see, this was.... It was all just a sordid mess. And Cindy Adams, his wife, wrote an expose. She came back and wrote a column or two, how she had danced with kings and princes and called prime ministers darling and what have you, and it was all this.... It just looked cheap.

HACKMAN: Well, okay, let's move to something else. You mentioned several times the USIA people in the field, and there's always been this controversy over them handling much of CU's programs. Did you try to make any changes here or....

BATTLE: Well, I think I dealt with the changes I made organizationally in CU in another conversation we had. But it was impossible to do anything basic with respect to USIA. It wasn't impossible at all, that's not true, but it was very impractical at that stage to attempt it for a number of reasons. Bill Fulbright wanted CU separate from the State Department. He did not want the program mixed up with propaganda, although the fact that it was administered in the field mixed it up with USIA activities no matter what you did. This arrangement had not been long in force then, anyway.

Ed Murrow [Edward R. Murrow] was at USIA. The relations between CU and USIA were disastrous until Ed and I, really, I think, solved the problem by our own excellent personal relations. I think I went into this one time, too. I believe I did. So that it seemed very impractical at the time....

[-106-]

The issue of reorganization did come up a couple of times. George Ball called me at one point, and if I remember correctly, this started with the White House. He said he wanted to have, by the next morning, my thoughts on the best possible arrangement that could be made with respect to the functions of—this could have been when Ed Murrow left, I don't remember—but at any rate, he asked me what I thought. I said at that stage I thought the head of USIA ought to be Under Secretary of State; that the Assistant Secretary of Educational and Cultural Affairs should be under him; that the AID [Aid for International Development] person, then Leona Baumgartner, who is in charge of human resource development, ought to be under him; that this made one total package dealing with the human element and if you put them together it was, I thought, a much more efficient way to handle it. I did not believe at that point that it was impossible to sell Bill Fulbright on this.

This was kicked around. I've forgotten who did the study—I'm not sure Ralph [Dungan] wasn't mixed up in this. There was a little study done on it and then the idea was dropped. I cannot recall any more than that as to why. It was only for a very few days that this seemed in the making, but it was rather seriously considered for a short time. But I thought these elements, I still feel that I really have no judgment on it.

The Bureau of the Budget was over here the other day asking me about, on the same issues, my thoughts on it now. And, as I said, I have no particular judgment because I think the key thing here is to find out what is most likely to preserve the program, which is being cut so drastically on the Hill now. Is it by splintering off various elements of it, putting it in various parts of government? Is it by consolidation? I don't know what leads to the best chance of getting funds and preservations at the moment. USIA is in high standing with John Rooney and with that particular committee, which was not the case at all in my day. I just don't have any judgment on what his attitude or what Bill Fulbright's attitude would be. Although I've seen and talked with Fulbright on several occasions, I do not know what his thoughts would be on this at the moment.

[-107-]

At that time, I felt this was the pattern that people should work toward and that it seemed to me that the State Department ought to be organized into an Under Secretary of Economic Affairs who was also head of AID, an Under Secretary for Information and Culture and Human Resource Development, who was the head of USIA, and that they all ought to report to the Secretary and to the Deputy, the Under Secretaries. And I thought that this became much clearer and the same pattern on disarmament, it's more or less the pattern of disarmament. So I felt that these were several groupings that could be put in a much neater way than we had done it up until that time. Then I would abolish the second Under Secretaryship. That was the pattern that I felt the wisest. Ideally, I still think so.

HACKMAN: Can you describe your relationship, then, with some of the other agencies who were represented on the Interagency Council? Particularly, Office of Education with McMurrin [Sterling M. McMurrin], was he there? Keppel [Francis Keppel]?

BATTLE: Yes, McMurrin was there in the beginning, but only for a short time. Frank Keppel and I were great personal friends and had an excellent relationship. There was an Assistant Secretary of HEW [Health, Education and Welfare] who was—I can't even remember his name, an ex-congressman at that point—with whom we never had any trouble, really, but it wasn't a very productive relationship.

HACKMAN: A guy named Quigley [James M. Quigley]?

BATTLE: Yes, Jim Quigley. Not much ever came of that. He was much more jurisdictional, much more of a—well, he hadn't the experience, the background, or the interest in the field. We had no conflict, contrary to what he had had with my predecessor, but neither did we have a very meaningful, a very productive relationship. McMurrin and I were not together long enough for me to have any real sense of how we would have gotten along. He left very shortly after I came in. The real relationship that I had that amounted to something was Frank

[-108-]

Keppel, who was, I thought, a joy to work with. And the group that we had then, at that period, if you look at John Gardner and Roy Larsen and Frank Keppel and Ed Murrow and I, you could not have found—we were sort of the key group and there could not have been a better relationship.

Now, there were problems down the line, briefly, between my bureau and the other agencies. I told Ed Murrow and told Frank Keppel that the relationship started at the top and it, as long as my relationship with each of them was sound and based on trust and common purposes, and we didn't put up with any sinister messages being planted around, or any bureaucratic squabbles, or any devious acts by our subordinates, that there wouldn't be anything; it would all go away. We made it very clear to them that we were not going to back either—I wasn't going to back up my people or they, theirs, in this kind of struggle. Once that became established, a lot of the problems went away—they have popped up since—but during that period we just couldn't have had a more ideal arrangement.

I was Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the OAS (Organization of American States) meeting in Bogotá, and Frank was Vice Chairman. I remember going over to lunch with him one day, and I said all of our people are arguing as to which of us should be chairman. And I said, “As far as I'm concerned, you can have it. I couldn't care less.” He then said, no, he thought it was quite wrong and that I had to be the chairman. And I said, well I felt that he was nearer to a Minister of Education but the only reason—I happened to handle a good part of the budget that was going to be discussed in the thing, but it was a Ministers Education meeting, and not an Assistant Secretary of State meeting. He really was nearer it than I was and why wasn't he chairman and I would be vice chairman. He argued that within the hierarchy of government I was senior and this was an international meeting, and therefore, I should be chairman. Well, our subordinates were arguing on just exactly the opposite position, you see. So we had a very, very amusing time in Bogotá together and we really had

a fine time. There was not the slightest friction or conflict of any kind or description. And in fact, there never was.

[-109-]

The other agencies: I had less to do with Defense in these fields, but the relationship there was perfectly good. I had known all of the ones involved—Ed Katzenbach, Norman Paul—I'd known them off and on for many years. And so a lot of that came under the context of the youth committee which I have dealt with separately. I think there were more relationships in the youth context, which I've already covered, than in this central coordinating committee; which really, I must say, as a committee, the structure was less meaningful than that it brought us together in the things that led to the use of the structure. So that it was imperative to have everyone with a sense that there was a structure and that there was a mechanism but the real coordination came in the work that went on down below that led to the meetings. So the meetings were pretty pro forma for the most part while I handled it. I don't know what happened later.

HACKMAN: Can you remember any problems in getting a position for that meeting in Bogotá—not only with Education but with other people in State—on the Alliance for progress or aid?

BATTLE: Yes, I can recall some and I recall some arguments down there. It was an awfully confusing meeting. It was really quite difficult. It was worse than UNESCO in its illusiveness. The Latin American Bureau kept arguing with me that we had to take very firm positions on what were trivia. I let them talk me into a number of them. They said if I didn't do it, it was going to pop up into the context of the OAS here, and that I simply could not accept a number of the things that a lot of my people wanted to brush aside. Well, I felt that on the long haul that I could take a position in opposition, particularly in that we were the main contributors to everything that was going on. If this created a precedent that created difficulty for the political side, I didn't feel it appropriate for me not to take their advice. My own bureau felt that I listened to them more than I should and the AID people also, that it was better just to let some issues go by. Most of them didn't make much difference. But the question was really not that meeting but what it did in terms of the record of the OAS meetings and if we'd accepted it, we'd create a principle that kind of popped out elsewhere.

[-110-]

It was not a meeting that I either remember very much about or had any great sense of pride in at the time it occurred because I didn't feel.... Unlike the UNESCO one where I felt we did get across an approach and an attitude and a sense of active participation rather than just acceptance of what went on, the one in Latin America was rather difficult to come to grips with in any way. Everyone made endless, pointless speeches for hours and hours. All the work stacked up until the last night. Then we stayed there all night trying to decide what

to do with the incredibly large numbers of resolutions, most of which had no validity or no meaning.

Earlier in that evening I recall proposing a procedure that everyone thought was outrageous. It was, in effect, that we appoint a subcommittee to stay there after the meeting had gone and report back, which is what we finally ended up doing, substantially. But I had hoped to avoid what was obviously going to be a series of speeches by every delegate on behalf of his resolution, most of which the copies of them had not even been distributed to delegations. And the texts, the English and the other, the Spanish texts, wouldn't agree, and some, they had not been costed out. They were just—it was just unbelievable—all whipped up, everybody had stuck in a resolution. It was without a doubt the most confused thing. You couldn't possibly act on what they were trying to get us to act on, resolutions you hadn't even received. It was unbelievable. And the confusion was—I'm told this is very typical of OAS meetings, but it was the only one I think I'd ever been to; I can't recall any others—at least not for that long. It was not a very rewarding experience, shall we say.

HACKMAN: Tom Sorensen [Thomas C. Sorensen], in this book he's written on the USIA, says that one of the reasons that Coombs [Philip H. Coombs] went out was because people were dissatisfied with his performance in relation to Latin America. Can you remember there being any feeling like that at the time? And do you think you had less problems working with these people? Or who particularly was....

[-111-]

BATTLE: I don't recall that there was any specific problem with Latin America. I haven't seen Tom Sorensen's book.

HACKMAN: It's not out yet.

BATTLE: It isn't? Phil, his basic problem really was not Latin America, or any one area. It was a basic approach to a bureau that was badly organized, badly structured, staffed by not top flight people, and his belief that—he's not the only one who's made this mistake—he believed that you could separate policy from operation; that he could be a policy person and turn over the operations of the bureau that he was legislatively responsible for, to someone down the line. He made a great point of separating his office from the Bureau. The Bureau ran itself. He just wouldn't have anything to do with it. This is basically what got him in trouble. He got in trouble with a lot of key people on the Hill, and he managed to make some rather bitter enemies around the building. Those were the things that I—I've never voiced this as frankly. I'm always extremely kind to my predecessors, as I hope they will be to me. And Phil, he just would not assume the inevitable requirement for administering the bureau and take the steps that had to be taken. That was the basic problem.

HACKMAN: Okay. Something else: you had mentioned John Gardner and your good relationship with him. That advisory commission which he

headed was set up, I believe, for the first time in May of '62, right after you came in or....

[-112-]

BATTLE: No. As a matter of fact, let me tell you the little story on that. It was one of the first horrors that I had to face. The Commission had just been announced—I would say a matter of a few days before I was designated to be Assistant Secretary. I had nothing whatever to do with Phil Coomb's departure, and I think I told you I was supposed to go out as Ambassador about that time. The appointments had just been made. After Phil resigned, John Gardner called me and said that he thought that, in fairness to me, that I should start and make my own selections, of course, they were officially a presidentially selected group, but undoubtedly the assistant secretary had an opinion. He said he felt the whole group ought to resign and start all over. I said that I had absolutely no desire whatsoever to have that happen, that I thought they'd made a great deal more of the Coombs resignation than I felt that it deserved, that it would focus on—that it would make the whole thing look much more unpleasant and that everyone would read into it. I said I had absolutely no problem personally with Phil Coombs, and it would create a division within the educational world, those who are pro-Coombs or pro-Battle, or whatever. I said this is the last thing I want you to do, and I hope that you will not suggest it to any of the others. I want the group to stay intact and I have absolutely no worries—I didn't know John—about working with him.

Well, John and I had—I told him recently that I thought we had had a rather remarkable relationship while I was in the job of Assistant Secretary and he in the chairman job. He said the best that had existed before or after, and I suspect it's true. We are the same kinds of people, and he and I never saw anything differently. There never was any problem. I had a different approach because I was in the top seat; he was in the advisory seat. But he would immediately recognize the considerations that I had and always tried to help me carry from his vantage point the load that had to be carried by such actions as he could get the commission to take. The same is true of Roy Larsen. And Roy and John got along very well. We were—it was an ideal arrangement. And John and I, really, it could not have been better working with him.

[-113-]

HACKMAN: No problem in defining the role the group was taking?

BATTLE: No. We had much for them to do. They were completing that very massive study; this was underway already. This was the first big undertaking, and it was a very good one. And then we got immediately into other things. They did a lot of stuff. I used that group. I called on them for the study on the cultural presentations program. Roy was statutorily—according to the legislation, as I remember it, one member of the Advisory Committee on Educational and Cultural Affairs had to be a member of the Advisory Committee on the Arts. He was the Chairman of that Committee. He was on the first list and was then also on the second. We also had a terribly

complicated problem involving—and I called on the Advisory Committee to make the study on the East-West Center. Again, it was turned over to Roy. We had a number of less important things that I asked them—and I told them in the beginning, “if you make a finding that I can live with, I will stick by it one thousand per cent.” And I always did. So what we put into effect were really the combined.... But I participated with them, too, and in an interesting way. Roy called me a couple of times, he said, “Now, before I put anything on paper, I want to be sure this is practical, that I haven't missed something.” We worked it out together. I remember that on the way to the UNESCO trip, we met in New York and he reviewed his preliminary findings on the cultural presentation thing. He said, “I want to be sure you can live with this before I get position with the whole Commission and find that it isn't practical or you can't buy it, or what have you.” I had a few suggestions, they weren't vital or major, but this is the way we did everything. And it worked. But there was an enormous trust between them and me, and I think you will get this from everyone of them if you talk to them. It was a unique relationship between an advisory group and an operating hand. USIA was having all sorts of problems with its group. They were having knock-down drag out fights with their advisory committee and I went over and appeared before theirs one time. I was furious with them, too.

[-114-]

HACKMAN: On that major study that came out, I believe in April of '63, you referred to it in your congressional testimony of '62. Any specific political reasons for the delay, or was it just a big job that...?

BATTLE: It was a much bigger job than anyone thought it would be, and they didn't have any sense of urgency. This was done by congressional mandate, if you remember.

HACKMAN: Right.

BATTLE: And my recollection is there was no time put on it. When they got into it, it just took a good deal more time to get it going—the interviews took longer, and the analysis took longer, and they were busy, and they had trouble getting a meeting one time, and it was that sort of thing. I don't recall that there was—I don't remember any political reasons for the delay at all, not at all.

HACKMAN: Okay. Moving to something else. I keep skipping around. You talked about Dungan on personnel, and you talked last time about taking on a couple that Robert Kennedy [Robert F. Kennedy] had recommended when you were working on the youth thing. Can you remember any contacts with Dan Fenn [Dan H. Fenn, Jr.]?

BATTLE: Oh, yes. I had many contacts with Dan Fenn. I knew him very well.

HACKMAN: What kinds of people was he interested in?

BATTLE: Well, my recollection is that Dan worked for Ralph. I had several sessions with Dan on the same things I had similar sessions with Ralph on. I don't make any distinction between the two of them particularly. I remember they were both involved on the Advisory Committee on the Arts, the first round and the second round; that they were both involved in UNESCO appointments. There were other people that Dan would call me up about. A lot of people that he would have individual

[-115-]

applicants he sent over. I don't recall that I took any of them. It's possible that I did, but I don't remember any of them. I remember turning down a number of them.

We had a great flap over the appointment of Catherine Norrell [Catherine Dorris Norrell] as my deputy, which had been agreed to before I came in office. Ralph helped me in trying to stop that; he came within an inch of stopping it. If Bill Fulbright hadn't capitulated, we would have stopped that, but Bill was put in a very awkward position on this. Mrs. Norrell was a perfectly nice woman, but a disastrous deputy assistant secretary. She was totally unequipped for it. I'm fond of her personally, but she just had no claim to the job. Wayne Hays [Wayne L. Hays] got furious because she was appointed to the job and threatened to have hearings and was.... It all had occurred before I came in although it was not announced until quite a long time after. The commitment had been made before I was even designated. I knew about it. Unfortunately, it came to a head in the closing days of the election of '63. How could there have been an election in '63?

HACKMAN: Should have been '62.

BATTLE: '62, a congressional election. That's right; it was '62 because Bill Fulbright was up, and it was very difficult for him not to endorse a former congresswoman from his own state. He got hold of Hays, who was really kicking up, and then both of them dropped it and the appointment was made. It never should have been made. I knew it was going to be disastrous. I did everything I could to stop it, but I did not succeed.

HACKMAN: Who had made the commitment in the first place? Who wanted to bring her on; do you recall?

[-116-]

BATTLE: Yes, as I recall—the person who told me about it was George Ball. And the call had come, if I remember it, to him from Ralph Dungan. It was at the moment when they were talking with me about taking the job, and George said this is one of the problems you're going to have to face. My recollection is, it had to do with the chances of getting—it had to do with Wilbur Mills [Wilbur Daigh Mills] and a redistricting in Arkansas, and the chances of getting a tax bill. That's the issue. And it had to do with.... It was all tied in with Wilbur Mills and pacifying him in the hope of

getting a tax bill. That was the point. They were afraid she was going to run against somebody. She was redistricted, and if she didn't get a government job, she was going to run against someone, and that created a problem for Wilbur Mills, and it was all mixed up. I don't remember the specifics.

HACKMAN: Okay. What about some of the other changes that took place under you, after you came in, didn't Max Isenbergh, did he go out after you came in?

BATTLE: Yes, he went out shortly thereafter. And Max is another who is simply not geared to the job. The job, the Assistant Secretary and Deputy were operating jobs of a major sort.... They were heavily political, you were under constant, constant beatings from the Congress, and within the executive branch, from all the educational world. And there was a tendency, I think, of my predecessors—and I'm very fond of all of them and this is the thing about this; I have no personal rancor against any of them; I'm trying to simply state the fact as I know it—they had a tendency to regard their jobs as who's going to be in charge of cultural things? And yet, they would take no responsibility for the utter mess the cultural presentations thing was in, you see? He just didn't want to have anything to do with all those grubby political horrors. He had had a hearing on the Hill on that same subject and this, too, had. It was the same hearing on Joey Adams. He just went to pieces. He actually, I think, wanted to get out and was delighted that he did. It was at his initiative. He was clearly unsuited to it; he hated it and looks back on it with, I think, complete horror when he thinks of it.

[-117-]

But you're either geared to taking the kind of beating.... It's again, if you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen. And this was the basic problem. Both Moose [Max Isenbergh] and Phil Coombs had many good qualities. They had competence in various fields but it wasn't in the realm of managing an almost dead program and disorganized and shaken bureau.

HACKMAN: Was Katie Louchheim [Kathleen Louchheim] over there when you came?

BATTLE.: Katie? No. Actually, Katie moved around a great deal in the Department. She started in Cultural Affairs. She came up when I was Executive Secretary of the Department and talked with me about getting moved over to Public Affairs because she didn't like the Bureau of Cultural Affairs. She moved over. I talked to—I guess, Roger Tubby [Roger Wellington Tubby] was Assistant Secretary at that point, yes—and I talked to Roger, and I remember mentioning it at a small staff meeting with the Secretary and Under Secretary one day that it was about to happen unless they had some objection. Nobody did so it happened. So I had a little hand in her moving. I had no knowledge, of course, I was going to CU at that point. She had gone and

been out of there for several months before I took over, and then she came back much later after I had left.

HACKMAN: Going back to Fenn's operation. Did you get referrals from his operation or from elsewhere in the White House on the specialist programs, people going abroad and...

BATTLE: Yes, in fact at times I tried to get suggestions from them. I used to see a good deal of Dan and a good deal of Ralph, used to lunch with them from time to time. I saw them fairly frequently. There were times when they would press upon me a politically oriented one that I found real trouble with. Jesse Unruh [Jesse M. Unruh] was one of them. And I was very reluctant to—I had to keep the selection of these people outside of obvious politics for reasons which are perfectly clear. So that we could do this, I'd have to balance this off with a Republican-oriented figure.

[-118-]

Actually, Jesse Unruh worked out very well. He was very stimulating, did very well with student groups and that sort of thing. And he was by no means a disaster, but there were a lot of people on the Hill who just gave me hell about that.

HACKMAN: Strictly for political reasons?

BATTLE: Well, they just.... One was that Congressman from Los Angeles, what's his name? Republican.

HACKMAN: Bob Wilson? No, he's not from Los Angeles.

BATTLE: No. Glenn Lipscomb [Glenard Paul Lipscomb]. Actually, they never did it publicly; they did it privately. But there were occasional messes of that sort. But we balanced that one off. I backed up my selection of Jesse Unruh by actually reading some of the interviews with him which were quite good, and I became convinced that he's a very interesting character. But on the face of it, at that particular moment it looked very political, and it's the sort of thing that could cause real trouble in Congress. But I balanced it with a Republican, got some Republican advice on who it should be, and sort of, in a sense, if it was politically oriented, it was bipartisan orientation.

HACKMAN: Weren't there security problems in Unruh? How did you get around this? Or do you remember that?

BATTLE: I don't recall any security.... We didn't pay him directly. We did not give him any fee. If I recall, we paid his transportation and that was it. We lined up some lectures for him. I don't recall whether in that kind of grant a security clearance was necessary or not. It was not a fell specialist grant; it was a

travel grant only or something of that sort, and he paid the rest of his expenses. That was my recollection.

[-119-]

[BEGIN SIDE II, TAPE I]

BATTLE: It is possible that we didn't even pay his travel, but I think we did.

HACKMAN: All right, something else. Book programs and movement in that area with.... The advisory committee was first Benjamin and Don Wilson [Donald M. Wilson] and then Dr. Baumgartner over at AID, were in on this, weren't they?

BATTLE: Yes.

HACKMAN: Any great movement in this area?

BATTLE: Well, this stemmed from a Bobby Kennedy speech made to, I think, the American Booksellers' Association. I don't recall what happened or how I got involved with it after that, but it stemmed from that speech in which he had called for the creation of a publishers' committee, a book committee, designed to try to increase the flow of American publications into the hands of foreigners. The group was formed. We had a terrible time with that committee because of problems of conflict of interest. And we went through a long legal harangue. I don't recall all the issues, but there was worry that it appeared to be—that if purchases were made of books published by their companies, et cetera, et cetera. Actually, Leona Bumgartner was particularly concerned about that. They all leaned over backwards not to let.... They would take themselves out of the debate, not a show, or anything, if there was any question, because obviously none of them wanted to.... But we did have to go through those long security checks because it was a.... And we had to go through a lot of paper work and it was a mess.

[-120-]

I felt the committee worked very well. It wasn't the idea that Bobby had; it was not thought out before he advanced it. We had to structure the idea after the idea had been advanced rather than going the other way around, which would have been preferable. But it may never have gotten done if that had happened. The committee, I thought, worked well. I would not say that it was a total success.

Don Wilson was very active in it. As a matter of fact, now that I think of it, I think that Bobby dealt with Don, who's a close friend of his, and that Don called me right after the speech was made saying that Bobby had called him. And then he and I talked with Bobby a couple of times about it and created the committee.

My recollection is I took the lead in it because I was in charge of coordinating all programs. It cut across many government departments and therefore I did it rather than USIA

although Don was a member as I remember it. Ed [Murrow] came a couple of times. And Leona did not participate much; she sent a colleague. And she managed to infuriate the chairman two or three times when she came. So we had our little troubles on that score. But the committee was useful. I do not know what it's doing now. I have not had anything to do with it. I've heard from them from time to time over the years after I left the cultural program. But that its utility was, I think, limited. But it seemed to me to be useful. And this is what I felt they felt.

HACKMAN: Any Hill problems that came up in regard to this program?

BATTLE: I don't recall that there were any. I informed the committees, the key committees of it. And I probably would have sent them a letter; I don't remember. I undoubtedly mentioned it in some testimony at some time or other, but nobody objected to it and there was no problem.

HACKMAN: You mentioned several times all the criticism that the program had been given by the press. Was there anything that you, in cooperation with Tubby and then Manning [Robert Joseph Manning], could do to change this other than just the improvements you made in the program? Any particular....

[-121-]

BATTLE: Well, unfortunately this is the kind of thing that—a sensation always draws much greater attention. We got some excellent press on it afterwards. There were several very favorable articles; there were a couple in *Time*; there were two or three in the *New York Times*; there was one in *Life* on the program. There were some in some lesser read publications. It came in for a good deal of praise thereafter. Several of the tours were extremely well received and got a lot of attention—not a lot—it got some attention back here. A round of applause never draws the attention that a red hot, juicy sex item does, and that's the kind of thing that was popping into it, you see. The criticism was always more lurid and reached an audience. The cheaper press would automatically gravitate to that, where a more responsible press would write a few pieces on the success of it. There were numerous pieces written on it—I would have to go back, I expect I have them somewhere in files—but we were very pleased.

We got no really bad publicity after that, except there case involving Pierre Salinger [Pierre E.G. Salinger] that got a lot of low flak at the time. It involved—I can't remember the details of it—it involved a singer named Lulu Porter, I think was her name. Glen Lipscomb is the one I mentioned that objected to Jesse Unruh. He was the one also who got on this particular girl who went to some competition which she won. She had some sort of—she wasn't given grant by us, as I remember, but she was given facilitative service, but had the blessing. It was done in a way that I felt.... It was when I was in Bogotá because I read it in the press when I landed in Miami; that's the first time I'd heard of it. And this caused a great deal of flak because Pierre Salinger was given credit for—he and Pat Newcomb were given credit for having selected her at a night-club they'd gone to. And I do not recall, my recollection is that the case, it was a borderline case, where we had not done much to help but

we had given some sort of facilitative assistance. It never should have occurred; it was very bad, but it wasn't disastrous. We got a little criticism on that one, but that's about the only one that I can recall that we got any flak on.

[-122-]

But we got some congressional criticisms in the course of hearings on cost, on various things. But we also got some praise for it. We got the only increase that the program ever had in budget that year. And it didn't go up much, but it went up a notch or two. It went up from, I think, two and a half million, which it had been since it started—and costs had increased enormously during that period—up to something like 2.7 or 2.8, something like that. It was a relatively small increase, but it was an increase, and we were all quite pleased that we had managed for the first time to get the House Appropriations Committee to give us an increase in the budget. So the improvements did have an effect, and they were noted.

HACKMAN: Any discussion that you can recall during this period of possible programs of any sort in relation to mainland China? Was this discussed at all? Anything involving any of your programs?

BATTLE: No, not involving my programs that I can recall. When I was executive secretary of the Department and the great flood of refugees started to Hong Kong, if you remember, in 1961, I remember getting a little involved in that. But that was not in CU. And we got Ed Korry [Edward Malcolm Korry] to come down and see what could be done about it. That's the only thing.... I remember that particularly. I don't recall any use of this program or any suggested use for Red China.

HACKMAN: Yes. Any serious discussion of movements into any other new geographical areas, Eastern Europe or something like that?

[-123-]

BATTLE: Well, we did.... Yes, there was a great deal of discussion as to the merits of doing Western Europe versus Eastern Europe; with the committee split, the two appropriations committees divided. The split was more evident in the Senate than it was in the House, with Allen Ellender being very much in favor of increasing exchanges with Russia and Eastern Europe and very opposed to any with Western Europe, with others taking exactly the opposite position, including Bill Fullbright who did not want to cut the Western European aspects of it. Moreover, we were beginning to get—I started a real effort to get contributions in the cost of the program for Western European countries, and we were succeeding in that. I felt for that reason, from a political point of view, that it was very difficult to cut back when we had just gotten—cut back U.S. contributions—when we had just gotten them to agree to kick in on it. And I felt that as long as they, in that circumstance that this was violating a tacit understanding if not an actual one. And there was a good deal of discussion on that.

There was also quite a lot in other areas one had to do with the African refugees coming out of the African countries, South Africa, and Rhodesia, and those. We had quite a few grants in there and picked up quite a few people there. Perhaps too many, but we were very—everybody was concerned with that at that time. The other thing, and this is the only fight I ever had with Ed Murrow, I may have told you about this, the flow of African students.

HACKMAN: Lumumba University.

BATTLE: Yes, the flow of African students out of Russia, which I felt that we could not accept if they did not meet standards; it wouldn't work and would end up in disaster. But Ed wanted to approach it from the propaganda opportunity that we had to, as he said, clean out Lumumba University. That was the only argument I think Ed and I ever had. It was solved peacefully, but it was the only one.

[-124-]

HACKMAN: Was the assignment of Cultural Affairs officers to newly independent African countries ever an issue; whether people should be put on embassy staffs?

BATTLE: No. Charles Frankel was to undertake the study of the Cultural Affairs officer and did under the Brookings Institution, and I've forgotten whether they financed it or who financed it. That occurred right after the assassination of President Kennedy; actually the first meeting occurred just a day or two after the assassination. I remember being there and how depressed I was. And Frankel was given that task. There was a good deal of talk as to the nature of Cultural Affairs officers, what they ought to be. There was a good deal of feeling that they ought to be senior cultural figures from outside.

I never had any objection to that, provided that the USIA could budget for the work that had to be done of a more mundane character. I didn't believe they could get the budget for it, and, therefore, I felt that a different kind of specialist grant could meet—I wanted to have specialists in short residence, give them a grant for a year and let them go and stay for a month instead of a lecture or two at a given place, or as long as they felt they were contributing anything. We did some of that. I felt that was the better way to meet it, not necessarily because I was opposed, but I felt they gave a greater variety at any one post. Also, I could not see how you could ever meet the budget problem if you made the CAO a kind of cultural figure rather than an operating person. Somebody was going to have to do all the exchange program work and I could not see how USIA could finance it, and I knew damn well we couldn't. So there was that kind of issue and that kind of discussion.

There was talk at various times about where to put programs. And after we reorganized along geographic lines this became even more.... The conversation on the merits, of various countries became even more acute than it had been before when it was organized in a way that didn't bring forth the political importance of individual countries and the political implications of various situations.

[-125-]

HACKMAN: One other thing that came up about the time of the assassination, and that was the arrest of, is it professor Barghoom [Frederick C. Barghoom]? Can you remember that, in the Soviet Union? Did you get involved in how to handle this at all? We threatened to suspend our cultural program over this.

BATTLE: Yes, I remember it but I cannot.... I remember being involved in it but I don't remember the detail of it. A great deal of the work with Russia was not done—while it was budgeted under me—it was not done by me. Most of it was done by the office of European Affairs, and they negotiated the arrangements. I had comparatively little to do with the Russian program because it was so heavily politically oriented and so involved with our overall relations with the Russians at any given time that I didn't come in to it as much.

HACKMAN: Now, that's all I have on CU. You look pretty tired. I've got a few questions on the period when you were Executive Secretary that I didn't get to do the other time.

BATTLE: Well, let's go ahead and do it.

HACKMAN: Okay. One, we talked previously about Chester Bowles and the problems before he went out. Okay, and the Abe Chayes [Abram Chayes] thing that went to the White House right after Cuba. Hilsman [Roger Hilsman] and others, Hilsman particularly, in his book talks about a memo that Bowles wrote for Rusk right at the end of March in '61 voicing strong opposition to the Bay of Pigs. Can you remember anything about this memo?

[-126-]

BATTLE: Yes, I recall that there was such a memorandum. My recollection is—wasn't this at the time when Rusk was out of the country?

HACKMAN: At the SEATO [Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) meeting, I believe.

BATTLE: Rusk was at the SEATO meeting, and he was then Acting Secretary. He sent the memo to the President and sent a copy to Rusk, or left a copy, that is my recollection. I also recall that—I don't think I saw that memorandum at the time—he told me that he had done it. I remember this because I got very irritated with Ted Weintal [Edward Weintal], who wrote a piece in Newsweek accusing Chet of going behind Dean's back or something of that sort—I don't remember specifically—and I gave Teddy Weintal hell about it because I said he might have checked it or asked something

about this. And at the time that he referred to, he made it appear that Chet had gone to the President over the head of the Secretary, which, as I recall it, was not the case.

HACKMAN: Right, he was acting....

BATTLE: He was Acting Secretary and my recollection is he told me that he was doing this. Chet was very good about this. He was not the most organized man in the world, but he was an ethical man and he did not.... It wasn't a deliberate effort. And what I objected to at the time was this charge that he had.... I also think that it was not just this issue of Cuba, there were other memos that Teddy—and I don't think Teddy made any reference to Cuba in his story; as I remember, it was just a little squib. But the implication was that Chet had done something quite dishonorable with Dean, and that was not the case because he was Acting Secretary, and he was very careful to see, on the memoranda involved, that copies went to the Secretary, and they were available to him on return.

[-127-]

HACKMAN: Okay, okay. I'll skip to something else you talked about Ted Achilles [Theodore Carter Achilles] in the Operations Center; he was the first man there. And Steve Smith [Stephen E. Smith] was his deputy. Can you remember anything about Smith's tenure over there? He didn't stay on....

BATTLE: Yes, I saw Steve a good deal at the time. Ted Achilles—I think I went into the way this appointment got made in the first place. Steve came over; I saw a fair amount of Steve. Of course, it was not then working under me. The Operations Center was not my responsibility at that point.

HACKMAN: You talked about Achilles' appointment, not Smith's appointment.

BATTLE: The Smith appointment, I don't remember how that got made. My recollection is that the President said to Rusk that Steve would like to be involved in something, and he wondered if the new Operations Center wasn't a good place for him. And Dean said yes. I don't recall anything about the appointment except the fact that it was made. Steve came over, I saw him numerous times, liked him very much. We used to have lunch. I had lunch with him several times long after he was no longer there. My recollection is that he made every effort to cooperate. Of course, having the President's brother-in-law working under you, if I'd been Ted, would have been awkward. But that structure was not under me at that time.

So my relationship to Steve—I told him what I thought of it then in several conversations which, as you know, is what later happened; that it really ought to be a service function, it couldn't have an independent role of its own, that it was not a policy formulating group, and that it was a service function to augment the established structures of the Department in times of crises and to serve presidentially or secretarially appointed task forces; but it had no role of its own in the field of policy except to service and help an

appointed, already duly constituted organization, or a new one created by higher authority. That was the concept that I had from the very beginning.

[-128-]

Steve, I think, had some doubt that that was right at the time, although he didn't argue with it too strongly. We had a very pleasant relationship. I enjoyed him. I found him amusing. I remember that he left. I didn't see much of him after that, but a couple of times after he left I lunched with him, and then he went to New York and he didn't come down often, and I saw him very little. On occasion, I would have some sort of contact with him, he called me on the telephone or something. We always had a very amiable relationship.

HACKMAN: Okay. When Bowles went out in November of '61—maybe you can remember something about the other changes. McGhee [George McGhee] came over; Fred Dutton [Frederick G. Dutton] replaced Brooks Hays [Lawrence Brooks Hays].

BATTLE: Bob Woodward [Robert Forbes Woodward] went out as....

HACKMAN: Right, Ed Martin came in....

BATTLE: I mean, not...

HACKMAN: That wasn't...

BATTLE: No, Bob Woodward went...

HACKMAN: Woodward had come in as Assistant Secretary.

BATTLE: A little earlier for Latin America, I think.

HACKMAN: I don't think the move was made exactly at that time.

BATTLE: Okay.

HACKMAN: Walt Rostow [Walt Whitman Rostow] came over from the White House. Harriman [William Averell Harriman] became Assistant Secretary. Okay, can you remember how any of these worked out?

[-129-]

BATTLE: Well, there had been a long effort to fill several of those jobs, and it was obvious that some of them weren't going to last. Brook Hays, a sweet wonderful man, again; he was just miscast. He just was not geared to that job.

Fred [Dutton], actually, is the one who first told me about the fact that this might come about. I remember seeing him at a party at some embassy, and he called me aside and told me this was under consideration. The next day Dean talked with me. The juggling that.... Ralph and Mac Bundy and I had talked several times about the Bowles problem, many times. And it was perfectly obvious that this wasn't going to last indefinitely; it was just a matter of time. The tensions between Bowles and Rusk had increased. I tried, as long as I had anything—I was on very friendly terms with both of them, and still am—I tried to make it work as long as I could make it work, and as well as I could make it work, knowing full well that he couldn't possibly last.

Ralph Dungan talked with me about the changes. I was aware of them although Dean Rusk, as usual, was somewhat secretive about it. He knew I knew about it. He called me on this—as I recall, it was on a Monday that this happened. He called me the night before and said, “I want to be sure you understand what's going on.” And he went over it, and they had changed the assignment of Alex Johnson [U. Alexis Johnson] and George McGhee. When I had last been in touch with him, which was several hours before, either via Ralph or Mac—I don't remember which, Alex was to become Under Secretary and George was to go into the Deputy Under Secretaryship. My recollection is that the President said, “I don't know why I put a career Foreign Service officer in the top job and not give the Democrat, the political oriented one, who is part of the Administration, the top one.” He said, “This seems wrong.” I don't think anyone objected very strongly. And that shift was made. Now I can't remember specifically.... At any rate, it happened in a matter of a few hours. Is that consistent with what you...

[-130-]

HACKMAN: Later, they probably wish they had done...

BATTLE: Yes, I think later it was regretted. But nevertheless, that's what happened. The Dutton shift, I was aware of. I've forgotten what others occurred.

HACKMAN: Rostow came over.

BATTLE: Rostow came over to take the planning job, which surprised me a little bit because I—this had been suggested a long time before and had not worked out, as you know. The Harriman thing, oddly enough, the first suggestion that I ever heard that Averell was to take the Far East job came from Chet Bowles. Chet said, “I really think we ought to do something about that,” and he said, “I think we ought to put Averell on the job.” And I said, “Chet, I don't believe Averell would take it.” He said, “I think he would if the President asked him to.” That's the first time I'd ever heard it. I can't remember any more specifics about it. I was involved with it; I was on the periphery of it. I had talked innumerable times with Ralph and with Mac about the problem. On the actual final assignment of the individuals I wasn't, I didn't sit in on it although I was perfectly aware of it.

I remember the amusing thing was that when Dean called me that night he said, “I think also you'd better right now do a paper for us sorting out our duties.” And I spent that evening trying to define the divisions—which has never successfully been defined—between the two undersecretaries. It worked only when George Ball was undersecretary for economic affairs and has never been entirely satisfactory at any other period. But I remember again, it was deciding what you were going to do after the decision was made, rather than the other way around, which would have been a much more reasonable one.

[-131-]

Then the next day, George Ball and George McGhee and I met down in George Ball's office—next day, in a day or so—and I remember I had given them each a paper, and we sat and talked about this. Ball and Rusk had not known each other very well. Ball had had very little contact with Dean Rusk up until that point. He told me how many times, and I've forgotten, but it was very few that they'd ever had really long meetings together. And I remember talking to both of them and I said to—individually—and I said to Dean Rusk that I felt that the most important thing that could happen in that Department was for the Under Secretary and the Secretary to have an intimate sense of trust and understanding between them; that nobody could give it to them, that they had to create it; they had to develop it, but the whole place hinged on that relationship; and that I hoped that they were aware of it. I said to them at that time, “Stop using me so much. It isn't that I don't want to be in the thing. I enjoy it. But you can't use me for your relationship.” This is what was attempted with Bowles and it wasn't.... There's just no substitute.

I always felt quite free with the two of them, even after that. I remember I would go into Rusk's office occasionally and say, “who's in there?” And they would say, “It's Mr. Ball.” And I would just go on in. I felt perfectly free to do that with them, and I'd stick my head in. Dean is not a person that attracts that kind of relationship easily, but I kind of forced it on him when I felt it was necessary. He didn't really resent it very much, but it isn't the procedure that he's accustomed to. Quite different with George and Chet, who—I would go around and if Ball was busy and if I wanted to see him in the back room, I'd just have them buzz and say, “Ask him to leave his guest to come outside for a moment.” And he'd do it. There was never any question about it. But you didn't do this with Dean, a much more proper person in terms of these things.

[-132-]

But I tried, I was very conscious because I was with the two of them frequently. I was very conscious during those earlier days, much less so later, of trying not to be there part of the time. I tried very consciously to pull myself away from them because I felt it was important that they have the kind of relationship that was really basic to the Department. And they developed it in a remarkable way, quite remarkable. It went on very well. There was never any disloyalty. There was—even though Ball took the position he did on Vietnam—there was never any mistrust, and there was never anything in the least devious about it. He was straight and honest from the beginning.

Both of them would talk with me. And when I came back from Cairo on one of these trips, I remember George saying he wanted to spend some time with me on a non-Middle East problem. And he said it was the Vietnamese thing; he was troubled by it. And we talked at great length about it. He told me how careful he'd been to be sure he wasn't in anyway undercutting Dean. That relationship was a good healthy one.

HACKMAN: Do you remember anything on Vietnam during the Kennedy Administration, any of Ball ever bringing his concern to you?

BATTLE: I was very much.... No, if he had done so, he might have, if he did so it was in a purely personal way because I had nothing to do with

HACKMAN: Right.

BATTLE: And when I became—I don't know whether I said this to you last time—when I went to be Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, I tried to break them of the habit of my face around the seventh floor. Having been on very good terms with both of them and with Averell, the third member of the team at that point—I'd known Averell for twenty years—there was a kind of tendency to draw me into things that I didn't feel were proper. I had enough to do; I wanted to concentrate on CU, and I did not wish to interject myself into things that were

[-133-]

none of my business. I did not succeed. They continued throughout that time, both of them, to draw me into things that were really quite wrong for me to be engaged in. But sometimes, there were a couple of times I can remember, things happened that someone felt Rusk ought to be told about and talked out of or chastised for what he'd done. And I remember a couple of times I was called and someone said, “Will you go and have a word with the Secretary on this subject?”

I remember going in to see him one time, and I said, “Dean, I guess I'm here because I'm the only one in the building who has to tell you unpleasant things.” And I said that, “You've done a very bad thing.” I remember what it was; I'm not going to go into it. And I said, “You get on that telephone and straighten this out.” And he did.

But I tried to keep, because I had known Rusk, and Rusk is—I have a very good relationship with him; we're not intimate in the sense that I am with many other people, not at all the way I was with Dean Acheson [Dean G. Acheson]. Still, I probably have had a closer relationship with him than most of the people around the State Department did. I felt that he needed someone who gave him hell from time to time, and I used to do it—and to tell him what he ought to know. I tried. When I was upstairs I tried to play that role constructively with him. When I went to CU, I tried to end as much of that as possible. I did a great deal less than I had done before, but I still got involved in quite a few things.

Now I always try very hard to promote the Ball relationship throughout that period to the extent that I had leverage on the situation. I had much less when I moved to the sixth floor and wanted much less. But I did try to promote it all during the period.

HACKMAN: Who would the requests come from to go to Rusk after you went to CU?

[-134-]

BATTLE: Oh, it only happened a couple of times. Bill Crockett [William J. Crockett] was the one I was thinking of. He called and said that the issue that had come up that he—well, I don't know why I don't really tell you, I'm going to be able to put a thing on this. I was president of the Foreign Service Association at the time that the Herter [Christian A. Herter] report was done.

HACKMAN: Yes.

BATTLE: And I went—I guess as president of the Foreign Service Association, or I might have gone just because of my relationship to Rusk or something—I went to the lunch where the Herter Committee report was first discussed, and I had to get up and leave to go see Bobby Kennedy before they got to substance. Bill Crockett was very unhappy about what he thought to be a rather brusque way that Rusk had handled Chris Herter. And it was this that he called me about and said, "Would you go up and try to make...." He said he'd had two calls from Jim Rowe and I've forgotten who else, saying that this had really been quite disastrous and they were all upset and so on and so forth. And he said, "Will you go up and tell him so?" And I told Bill, "Why don't you go tell him so? I think you ought to tell him." Well, at any rate, I did. And I remember saying, "Now you get on that phone and call Herter right now and tell him you want to get together with him again, and do it." That was all I remember. It was that sort of thing occasionally, and it wasn't of any major importance. A couple of times little incidents occurred around the building that just because I felt that no one would say....

[-135-]

Now Ben Reed [Benjamin H. Reed], Bill Brubeck [William H. Brubeck], who succeeded me and Ben Reed, who succeeded him, have all had excellent relations with Rusk, and it only took a little time to build them. This was the point, you see. It wasn't that there was anything magic in my relationship with him; there wasn't. But it took them a little time to get on the kind of footing where they would talk with him. But they both did, and they both did admirable jobs there.

HACKMAN: Had you spent much time working with Herter and the people on his committee and then later that Perkins [James Alfred Perkins] committee which came up with the Foreign Service Academy thing?

BATTLE: Well, I met with the Herter group on several occasions, I guess, when I was president of the Foreign Service Association. It must have been at

that period of the study because I happened to have known everyone very well, the whole group, virtually the whole group were all old friends of mine. And it may have been that if it wasn't while I was president, I was called because I had been around there a long time and I knew a great many of them; that's possible. I remember talking with them on several occasions. I had less to do with the Perkins thing. I remember talking with them two or three times, and I think it was the Perkins thing. They called and said I had not appeared officially before them—or it may have been the Herter thing—and did I want to have a recorded transcript? And I said it isn't necessary I've already talked with—I talked to both groups—and the Foreign Service Academy, the Association endorsed. We endorsed the Herter report, too. And both of those occurred, so it must have been that I was president of the Foreign Service Association when these two things occurred. I had a good deal of contact with them.

[-136-]

Actually, Joe Johnson talked with me before the Herter Commission was even set up and asked me whether I thought it was necessary or desirable to have another review of the Foreign Service. I said that it was. I said this is the moment to do it. It's the beginning of an Administration, with a great deal of attention focused on the Foreign Service. It ought to be done. I remember one other rather amusing exchange when I went to appear before—so I must have had an appearance before—the Herter committee in one of its sessions on the seventh floor. I talked at great length and then Jim Rowe said to me—I had known Jim Rowe for many, many years—Jim said to me at lunch that day, we were having a drink after lunch and he said, “My God, Luke,” he said, “you used to be the leader of the mavericks over here, now I find you the head of the establishment.” And he said, “What has happened to you?” I said, “Jim, the thing is the establishment's changed. The Association is....” I tried very hard to make the Association a much more vigorous and active and broad gauged group than it was. We came out, for example, in favor of lateral entry the first time in our history that year. We did a number of quite progressive things. But I remember that statement with considerable amusement; it was very funny at the time.

HACKMAN: I was reading a new book the other day by a fellow named Patrick Anderson called *The President's Men*. It's on White House staffs all the way from Roosevelt [Franklin Delano Roosevelt] up to Johnson. And he talks about a dispute that took place when the Situation Room was set up in the White House over cables and Bundy's operations, access to—he refers to them as routine cables. Can you remember this coming up?

BATTLE: Well, there were several—disputes would be an overstatement—there were several arguments, discussions of one kind or another. I remember Ted Clifton came over once by specific mandate from the President of the United States to talk with me about what had happened on a cable. The issue at that point was not whether it went over there; the issue was the timing of it. In those days we had none of the mechanical devices that have since sped things up enormously, you see. We were still working by dog sled. It took forever to get

[-137-]

things over. And also the pattern of the Department operation over the past had been to send the White House only the most important things, not to flood them with cables. That had been the procedure going back over many years and we found a new, active Administration that wanted to get more paper, wanted to see more of the detail. The staff wanted a great deal more, and it took a bit of time to sort of get a sense of.... We ended up, I think, giving them damn near everything. But in the beginning we went on as we had before, pending an analysis of what ought to go over there.

We tried to shelter them from the thousands of routine ones that were sent. We ended up, I think, sending over everything that came up to the Secretary, and the Under Secretaries went over there too. But in the beginning we sent fewer than that even. It was part of the sorting out process, and it was also deeply involved with our ability to respond quickly and actively. We just didn't have the money or the equipment or the messengers or the arrangements to get the things over. I knew it and was well aware of it, very disturbed about it, still am. The Department is still very far behind, no computers. For example, the storage of date, you have to depend on your memory as much as you do anything written down, or a good set of files but they're the kind of files one might have found in 1907 and not in this day and age when you store all that date and not have to worry about finding it in files.

HACKMAN: Was Bundy sympathetic at all? Or anybody...

BATTLE: Oh, as I told you, Mac and I never had any problem with anything. He'd call up and give me hell occasionally, but I didn't mind that and it was perfectly.... As far as we were concerned, there was no problem of any kind personally and most of the time his criticism was quite right, I thought, and the President's were quite right. But it took a long time to turn that machine from the gearing that it had had during the Eisenhower era when very little was wanted over there and to get people in the habit of sending over the White House mail.

[-138-]

When I was with Acheson in the Truman [Harry S. Truman] era, there were a few pieces a day. But at the beginning of the Kennedy era, it was literally hundreds of pieces a day. It was just an entirely different thing. You had to gear to an entirely different situation. But Mac was very understanding in trying to do this. I talked with him very frankly about it on not one, but many occasions. The second day I came back to Washington, I had lunch with Mac to see how we could improve the operation. We did improve it, I think. But it wasn't a matter of there being any conflict on the subject.

If there was conflict in the sense that I felt we did a very bad job on numerous occasions—I thought at times they were a little too hyperthyroid over there, wanted things too quickly and wanted things that they really shouldn't have their finger in. It wasn't that I really minded; I just didn't think that good government permitted the White House staff to be going down into details of some trivial things to the extent that it did. I blew up at them two

or three times, and I was quite irreverent. I talked back as much as I was talked to and there wasn't any—I had no feeling of being horsewhipped by an uncharitable and unfriendly group at all. I felt very much a part of it, and I used to have lunch with Mac very regularly in those days. And Ralph and Mac and I used to lunch together in the early days. We did not later, but we did in the early days with fair frequency.

HACKMAN: Were these things that people in the Department would bring to you when someone at the White House would come back at them with something...

BATTLE: Well, what I tried to do, you see, what happened in the beginning, and I found this.... Could you stop that for one minute and let me tell my...

[-139-]

HACKMAN: Surely. [Tape Stopped] I had just asked you did things come up to you from other people in the State Department about cables that had gone to the White House and then something had come back from the White House staff?

BATTLE: Well, the problem usually was that people that were on the White House staff would ask people all over the building for a report on XYZ, or a draft on XYZ. One of the first things that I found when I got back there was that we would find two assistant secretaries sitting over contradictory—I think I mentioned that.

HACKMAN: We talked about this, maybe we shouldn't even...

BATTLE: And the real problem I thought was to try to see that on particularly important issues that the Secretary was injected into it and that we sent over a recommendation that, if all areas didn't agree, that it was sorted out and gave the arguments pro and con and the Secretary took a position. So as to bring this about, this is where the main areas of conflict came, the trivial things on what telegrams went over there and the speed with which they went, were primarily mechanical difficulties and not substantive ones.

HACKMAN: I'd heard from someone that you attempted to make some changes in the flow of cables back and forth from the field and State. Any success in this?

BATTLE: Well, I did several times try. I don't know which particular moment they had in mind. I was deeply concerned about what seemed to me to be a Department that was very far behind the times. I got in a couple of computer groups, Westinghouse, RCA [Radio Corporation of America], and some of them,

to see what we could do about it. Nothing happened on it at that point for a lot of reasons. They wanted to go a bit beyond anything I had in mind. But I was trying to get a storage data arrangement set up, and the computer people became so

[-140-]

fascinated with the opportunities, they wanted to talk about things like anticipating an emergency or a crisis and letting information—when the rainfall reached a certain level and unemployment a certain level and there were so many seats held by one party you were about to have a crisis. This was what they were trying to do. I felt this was rot—did I go into this?

HACKMAN: No, no.

BATTLE: I felt this was rot; that what I wanted was storage of data and not that you really move the human element out of this. I may have been wrong, but at any rate, that little episode, I stirred that one up for a while.

Another thing I got deeply involved in was the question of command and control as we called it. This was during the debate over what the Operations Center was to be. I felt that the Secretary was not in a position on behalf of the President really to command all the knowledge that the government had on a given issue. What we were lacking was in the ability to draw from Defense, CIA [Central Intelligence Agency], and from all sources, everything that we needed on a moment's notice and to pull together all that existed on a certain issue or certain subject. This has been markedly improved over the years and I've since handled a number of crises myself. I know that it is much better than it was in those days. But in those days it was pretty bad. I did try to do a good deal about that. I also got involved many times, in many ways, with the general flow of telegrams and tried to jazz them up a bit and to get people to write with a little more vigor in their styles and that sort of thing. But I expect the ones that I mentioned are the two efforts that were most widely discussed and most frequently referred to at the time. They were both controversial when I was involved in them.

HACKMAN: That's really all I have.

BATTLE: We've finished? Well, thank you very...

[END OF INTERVIEW #3]

[-141-]

Lucius D. Battle Oral History Transcript – JFK #3  
Name Index

**A**

Acheson, Dean G., 134, 139  
Achilles, Theodore Carter, 128  
Adams, Cindy, 106  
Adams, Joey, 102, 105, 106, 117  
Allen, George Edward, 98  
Anderson, Patrick, 137

**B**

Ball, George W., 99, 100, 107, 117, 131, 132, 133,  
134  
Barghoom, Frederick C., 126  
Barry, Robert Raymond, 98  
Baumgartner, Leona, 107, 120  
Benjamin, 120  
Benton, William B., 90, 91, 94, 95, 96  
Bowles, Chester B., 85, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131,  
132  
Brubeck, William H., 136  
Bundy, McGeorge, 100, 130, 131, 137, 138, 139  
Byrd, Robert C., 98

**C**

Chayes, Abram, 126  
Church, Frank, 91, 92  
Cleveland, J. Harlan, 87, 89, 92, 93, 99  
Clifton, Ted, 137  
Cooley, Harold D., 98  
Coombs, Philip H., 111, 112, 113, 118  
Cowley, Harold D., 85, 86  
Crockett, William J., 135

**D**

Dungan, Ralph A., 95, 97, 100, 107, 115, 116, 117,  
118, 130, 131, 139  
Dutton, Frederick G., 129, 130, 131

**E**

Eisenhower, Dwight D., 105, 138  
Ellender, Allan Joseph, 85, 124

**F**

Fenn, Dan H., Jr., 115, 118

Frankel, Charles, 125  
Fulbright, J. William, 102, 104, 106, 107, 116, 124

**G**

Gandhi, Mohandas Karamchand, 94  
Gardner, John W., 102, 104, 109, 112, 113

**H**

Harriman, William Averell, 129, 131, 133  
Haussamen, Crane, 95, 96  
Hayes, Helen, 105  
Hays, Lawrence Brooks, 129, 130  
Hays, Wayne L., 116  
Herter, Christian A., 135, 136, 137  
Hilsman, Roger, 126  
Horton, Mildred McAfee, 97  
Humphrey, Hubert H., 104

**I**

Isenbergh, Max “Moose”, 117, 118

**J**

Johnson, Joe, 137  
Johnson, Lyndon Baines, 96, 137  
Johnson, U. Alexis, 130

**K**

Katzenbach, Ed, 110  
Kennedy, Jacqueline Bouvier, 81, 83, 86  
Kennedy, John F., 81, 83, 86, 89, 90, 96, 105, 125,  
127, 128, 130, 131, 133, 137, 138, 139,  
141  
Kennedy, Robert F., 115, 120, 121, 135  
Keppel, Francis, 108, 109  
Korry, Edward Malcolm, 123

**L**

Larsen, Roy E., 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 109, 113,  
114  
Lipscomb, Glenard Paul, 119, 122  
Louchheim, Kathleen, 118

## M

MacLeish, Archibald, 100, 101  
Maheu, René, 89, 90, 91, 92, 99  
Manning, Robert Joseph, 121  
Martin, Ed, 129  
McGhee, George, 129, 130, 132  
McMurrin, Sterling M., 108  
Mills, Wilbur Daigh, 117  
Morrow, John Howard, 99  
Murrow, Edward R., 106, 107, 109, 121, 124

## N

Nasser, Gamel Abdel, 83  
Newcomb, Pat, 122  
Norrell, Catherine Dorris, 116

## O

Otepka, Otto F., 101

## P

Paul, Norman, 110  
Perkins, James Alfred, 136  
Porter, Lulu, 122

## Q

Quigley, James M., 108

## R

Ribicoff, Abraham Alexander, 95  
Rooney, John James, 85, 86, 107  
Roosevelt, Franklin Delano, 137  
Rostow, Walt Whitman, 129, 131  
Rowe, Jim, 135, 137  
Rusk, Dean, 99, 100, 101, 126, 127, 128, 130, 132,  
133, 134, 135, 136, 140, 141

## S

Salinger, Pierre E.G., 122  
Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., 100, 101  
Smith, Stephen E., 128, 129  
Sorensen, Thomas C., 111, 112

## T

Truman, Harry S., 139  
Tubby, Roger Wellington, 118, 121

## U

Unruh, Jesse M., 118, 119, 122

## W

Wade, Robert Hirsch Beard, 95, 96, 99  
Weintal, Edward, 127  
Wilson, Bob, 119  
Wilson, Donald M., 120, 121  
Wolfe, Glenn G., 100, 103, 104  
Woodward, Robert Forbes, 129