

Robert Amory, Jr. Oral History Interview – JFK #1, 2/9/1966
Administrative Information

Creator: Robert Amory, Jr.
Interviewer: Joseph E. O'Connor
Date of Interview: February 9, 1966
Place of Interview: Washington, D.C.
Length: 19 pp.

Biographical Note

Amory, Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and Chief of the International Division at the Bureau of the Budget discusses his role in these organizations, his relationship with President Kennedy and White House staff, and foreign policy issues such as the Berlin Wall, Laos, and Vietnam, among other issues.

Access

Open.

Usage Restrictions

According to the deed of gift signed July 5, 1968, copyright of these materials has been passed to United States Government upon the death of the donor.

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 The copyright law extends its protection to unpublished works from the moment of creation in a tangible form.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

Robert Amory, Jr., recorded interview by Joseph E. O'Connor, February 9, 1966, (page number), John F. Kennedy Library Oral History Program.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

Gift of Personal Statement

By

Robert Amory, Jr.

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, Robert Amory, Jr., 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 harrass 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 5 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 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. I hereby designate Robert Quincy III to have, after my death, the same authority with respect to authorizing access to the aforesaid material as I have reserved to myself in paragraph 2 and paragraph 3.

6. The donor retains to himself during his lifetime all literary property rights in the material donated to the United States of America by the terms of this instrument. After the death of the donor, the aforesaid literary property rights will pass to the United States of America.

Signed

Robert Quincy III

Date

5 July 68

Accepted

James B. Rhoads
Archivist of the United States

Date

July 9, 1968

Understanding Regarding the Use of the
Oral History Interview Conducted by the

*file in
deed book*

John F. Kennedy Library
with Robert Amory Jr.

1. The interview transcript may be made available, on an unrestricted basis, to anyone applying to use the resources of the John F. Kennedy Library. (This includes journalists and students as well as professional historians, political scientists and other scholars.)
2. Copies of the interview transcript (or portions thereof) may be made and given, upon request, to all researchers.
3. Copies of the interview transcript may not be deposited for research use in other institutions, such as university libraries, public libraries and other presidential libraries, without my written permission.
4. The interview transcript may not be published (i.e. reproduced or printed for sale to the general public) in whole or in substantial part without my written permission until 25 years from the date of the interview.
5. Researchers may publish brief quotations from the interview transcript (but not the tape) and may paraphrase or cite the text without my permission.

Signed: _____

Robert Amory Jr.

Date: _____

21 May 73

ROBERT AMORY, JR.
JFK #1

Table of Contents

<u>Page</u>	<u>Topic</u>
1	First impressions of President Kennedy
2	1952 Election
2	Kennedy's position towards Joseph McCarthy in the 1950s
4	American wheat to China
5	Kennedy's working relationship with CIA staff
6	Bay of Pigs
7	Fidel Castro
8	Berlin Wall
9	Meeting in Vienna
9	Laos
11	National Academy of Foreign Affairs
12	Bean Soup Exercise (Basic National Security Policy)
14	Foreign Aid bill
15	Vietnam and the Ngo Dinh Diem crisis
18	Meetings with President Kennedy

Oral History Interview

with

ROBERT AMORY, JR.

February 9, 1966
Washington, D.C.

By Joseph E. O'Connor

For the John F. Kennedy Library

O'CONNOR: Mr. Amory, did you have any contacts with the president, or with John F. Kennedy, before 1961?

AMORY: Yes, they weren't terribly close. But I was in law school when he was in college, and he came into the Spee Club, which was the undergraduate club which I had been in and maintained strong interest in, and I knew him then as a bright and attractive undergraduate. By no means did I finger him as an early Senator or as President of the United States, but I liked him and we got along very well. I saw something of him during 1952 when I was working in the Massachusetts primaries trying to get the nomination for Eisenhower [Dwight D. Eisenhower] rather than for Taft [Robert A. Taft], and working very closely with Cabot Lodge [Henry Cabot Lodge], and used to joke with him about the fact that the Democrats had been in too long, and we were going to get them out if we could get Eisenhower. And then I remember running into him at the Inaugural Ball in 1953; the crowd pushed us almost within touching our faces. We were inches apart, and I remember saying to him, "You bastard, you wouldn't be elected if it hadn't been for that rat..." What's his name? Anyway, publisher of the *New Bedford Standard Times*. The name escapes me.

O'CONNOR: Oh yes, I know who it is. Brewer?

AMORY: Yes, Basil Brewer, who advised all his people in southeast Massachusetts to vote for Eisenhower, but to turn on that so and so Lodge, and "...so you essentially owe your seat to the most radically right element of Republicanism."

O'CONNOR: That's a very interesting question. Did you really feel that way?

AMORY: Well, the statistics more or less show it. I mean a turnover of thirty-five thousand votes, which could easily be accounted for by Basil Brewer's influence in New Bedford, Fall River, and the Cape area, where he was pretty strong, would have meant that Kennedy would have been out, and he would probably be now a relatively junior member of the House Democratic establishment except I don't know if that's fair; he would have bounced back to his feet pretty easily. Anyway, he just grinned his happy grin, and rather pleasantly he said, "I feel sorry for Cabot. I have a high regard for him." And this, of course, showed up later when he picked him to go to Saigon, and otherwise. Then during the senatorial years I saw him very occasionally. I was never part of his social set. I didn't know the Charlie Bartletts [Charles Bartlett] then, as I do now, and hardly knew the Auchincloss [Hugh D. Auchincloss] family. But I saw him once or twice at Newport. I'd see him in the corridors of the Senate; he was always very cordial. And I appeared before him several times when he was on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee just to give briefings, and he was part of the group there. He always asked good questions, but he always seemed generally bored with the session. In other words, he knew more than he was getting even in a secret briefing, good as we tried to make it. And that's really about all till he came into office.

O'CONNOR: Well, really I didn't know that you had any contact with him in 1952, and I'd like to ask you a little bit about that. Do you remember talking to Henry Cabot Lodge at all about that election and why he felt he lost that election?

AMORY: Yes, I had a long plane flight with Cabot Lodge after he was in the UN ambassadorship, and he felt very strongly then that same way. Well, then another incident that's really quite interesting and has been in the press once, but which I think I could throw some light on, relates to Kennedy and McCarthy [Joseph R. McCarthy]. I had always felt that Kennedy was boxed by this because McCarthy was so popular in South Boston and in radical right wing Irish Catholic circles. You know, the super lace curtain Irish were very strong for McCarthy in Massachusetts. And yet I knew that he was instinctively a good gut liberal as he showed when he was an Overseer at Harvard and that kind of thing; he was for academic freedom. He was badly torn. But an amusing, and rather unpleasant, incident took place--I think I'm right, and this date could be checked--in February 1954. It was the hundredth anniversary of the Spee Club's founding, and the banquet was a very well-attended one. Unlike the usual Harvard mid-year club dinner, which used to be sort of a drunken brawl, this one we decided very carefully to limit to champagne so people would stay moderately sober--the undergraduates and the old farts. We had Ray Atherton and Freddy Eaton and other pretty distinguished guys on the program along with John Kennedy. And Eaton in his remarks, somewhat in a malaprop fashion, was talking

about the spirit of Harvard and saying how glad he was that Harvard College had never produced an Alger Hiss, even though the law school had. But he was doubly glad that neither the college nor the law school had produced a Joe McCarthy. Whereupon Jack Kennedy stood up and interrupted him very violently and said, "How dare you couple the name of a great American patriot with that of a traitor!" And a hushed silence fell upon the room and then all sorts of people tried to calm things down. But Kennedy was visibly mad and very short. He didn't right then walk out of the dinner, but he walked out of the dinner right at the very end of the dessert course rather than waiting for the other speeches. The story did appear and was known to some of the political writers in 1960, but I, of course, never confirmed it. I thought it was a private matter. Now that he's dead, I say it for history. But I felt it was a private affair, and he lost his temper and said something I'm sure he would.... I don't say regret in the words, but in the manner in which he did it. It was perfectly clear that Eaton was not trying to make McCarthy a Hiss. He was just saying these were two different types that Harvard College had yet not produced. So that, I think, is illustrative of the ambivalent position that Kennedy was in vis-a-vis McCarthy in the early 1950's.

O'CONNOR: Well, getting back to this 1952 thing again, I wonder if you have any other memories about that. That was an extraordinarily interesting campaign. Kennedy was working from the position of being completely an underdog.

AMORY: Yes, well, let's get my position perfectly clear. I started in the primaries in Middlesex County and was running for a seat in the convention with the strong backing of Lodge and Herter [Christian A. Herter], and I was writing speeches for Chris Herter as well. And then in March I was very abruptly offered a job with the CIA [Central Intelligence Agency] and decided literally in twenty-four hours to accept it and, of course, immediately came under the Hatch Act. So for the rest of the time I was down here heavily involved in an analysis of Russian intentions and capabilities and so on and so forth. So I really didn't have anything to do with the campaign itself, and living in Washington, I didn't subscribe to the Boston papers. So I couldn't really throw any light on the campaign itself.

O'CONNOR: What I wondered was did you get any feeling of overconfidence on the part of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge before this campaign actually began? Did he feel it would be a real struggle or not?

AMORY: Well, I think we all did in the sense, not that Lodge would have trouble with Kennedy--we underestimated his strength--but we were so used to being beaten as Republicans that the idea that a Republican could carry Massachusetts.... In other words, it wasn't till about ten days before the election that you began to get polls and other indications, and David Lawrence [David L. Lawrence] saying that Massachusetts was safe for Eisenhower. And that surprised the hell out of me. Then if I thought about it at all--and I'm possibly just reconstructing--I'd say, "Well, God, if Ike carries it, Lodge is a cinch because Lodge is his fair-haired boy, and he'll get all the kudos for having brought in a liberal internationalist." Liberal, quote-unquote, but then he appeared somewhat more liberal in the domestic affairs than Taft did. So it was a great shock when

you woke up. And I've forgotten, but Eisenhower carried the state by a couple hundred thousand, I think. And, of course, Lodge lost by seventy thousand. So I think that about covers any light I could throw on that. I suppose you've got all sorts of good sources. I'm thinking particularly of young Winship [Lawrence L. Winship] who's now the editor of the Boston Globe and was very candid in covering that campaign. But I think Lodge undoubtedly hurt his campaign there because he spent so much time helping Eisenhower countrywide and sort of thought he could just automatically be returned, sort of like a British Cabinet officer doesn't worry too much about his own district and stumps other districts. I know Lodge was very disappointed at only getting the United Nations job at first, but I think he threw himself into it wholeheartedly.

O'CONNOR: Do you know what he expected from that?

AMORY: I think he hoped for Secretary of State--or Defense. I think he really felt that he should have been offered the list of the Cabinet and have him say "Where do you want me to put your name down?" Though Lodge once admitted to me that he was a lousy executive, I think he's shown in Saigon that he underestimated himself. But he always felt that he was an idea man rather than an executive. He thought of himself as an "idea" Secretary of State.

O'CONNOR: Alright, we can go on from there to any later contacts you had--you mentioned a few of them--on up to 1961.

AMORY: This first little contact was rather interesting on showing how Kennedy was testing the organization that he inherited. The day of his Inaugural, Mrs. Meyer [Eugene Meyer] sent him a long and thoughtful letter urging that, because of the obvious famine conditions in China, he started off with a great gesture of American wheat to the Chinese people, not to the Chinese Administration. And as I recall, Inauguration was a Friday. Anyway, early Saturday morning, I was called over to the White House by Ralph Dungan [Ralph A. Dungan] and handed this piece of paper which had marked on the corner of it in Kennedy's writing, which I knew, "Ask Chet [Chester B. Bowles] and Bob Amory what they think of this." So I got the piece of paper and went back and spent the whole weekend writing an analysis of the problem seven or eight pages long and showed it to Allen Dulles [Allen W. Dulles] Sunday morning. He said, "Oh, this is a policy question. We can't get into this. We're intelligence people." I said, "Goddamn it, Allen, it's a new President. He's going to do things differently. He's asked for this. Now our first response can't be a bureaucratic "No, somebody else." And Allen said, "Well, alright. Dungan's asking for it. Take it over to Dungan and let him read it, but get it back. I don't want that kind of a paper in the White House files." So I went over and showed it to Dungan, and Dungan read it. Somebody later said it was a very good paper. Though it didn't come out firmly one way or the other, it showed the arguments pro and con--what he'd have to consider; what the likely reaction of the Chinese regime would be. It predicted the reaction of the Chinese, essentially, if you made such a gesture. I said, "Now may I have the paper back?" And Dungan says "No," in his rather charming and tough manner. So I said, "All right," and came home and didn't say anything about it. I saw no need in worrying Allen; I'd

get the paper back in due course and get to it. Well, the next week was the National Security Council meeting, and I think it was Kennedy's first--it must have been. And everybody was very new and fresh and sort of introducing each other and their subordinates; Allen introduced me to McNamara [Robert S. McNamara] and things like that, and I sat in the back of the room as I was accustomed to doing while Allen made his briefing. Immediately at the end of the briefing, Kennedy raised this subject. To Allen's horror and to Rusk's [David Dean Rusk] and Bowles' obvious annoyance, he raised the issue and said, "Now, Bob Amory, I understand you think this is probably not too good an idea, but that it just might work. Is that right? And Chet, I asked your views of it, but I haven't got them yet." And it went on otherwise inconsequentially. But it showed how directly he was going to operate. It was an early example he wasn't going to fool around with chain of command or logical places; he was going to go to human beings on problems. Of course, the Agency developed thereafter a very good what we call quick response to the whims or any other desires of the President, and that built it up in those first few months, until Cuba, very favorably. I know from Mac Bundy [McGeorge Bundy] of other little things. The President was quoted, not directly, to me as saying, "By gosh, I don't care what it is, but if I need some material fast or an idea fast, CIA is the place I have to go. The State Department is four or five days to answer a simple yes or no." And so on. So we tried very hard to live up to his high views of us. I don't mean just at the high level. This had a very good morale effect all down the line in the analytical side of the CIA establishment. People were willing to work long hours and to come in at 3 o'clock in the morning because they knew damn well what they produced was read personally by the President immediately upon its delivery to the White House.

O'CONNOR: What was Allen Dulles' attitude toward this?

AMORY: Well, he gradually came around. You see he'd had to be so careful in the days when he and Foster [John Foster Dulles] were together in the thing not to one-up on his brother, and time and again I've heard him respond to Eisenhower, "Yes, Mr. President, that's a tough question, but really it's up to the Secretary of State to answer it." And Eisenhower would accept that. He'd say, "All right, Foster, well, what do you think?" And I think he had conditioned himself that way. Allen was very pleased to have been immediately reappointed. You remember, right after the election, in Hyannis Port, he and J. Edgar Hoover were the first confirmed appointments, announced appointments. But I think he would.... As is natural, a guy young enough to be his son, virtually, it wasn't quite true, but certainly another generation in the presidency, he didn't really feel comfortable with him. I know he liked him and had seen a lot more of him as a Senator than I had. They used to go to neighboring estates. The Kennedy and the Wrightsman estates [Charles B. Wrightsman] adjoin each other in Palm Beach, and Allen was always a very regular visitor to the Wrightsman estate. They'd swim and play tennis and other things together. And he saw a lot of Kennedy in that worst winter he had when he nearly died. He used to go over and chat with him and pay his respects. So Kennedy, I think, was genuinely fond of him. Kennedy also was extremely fond Dick Bissell [Richard M. Bissell], had a very high regard for him. I think he regarded Dick as probably one of the four or five brightest guys in the whole administration.

O'CONNOR: Do you know what this was based on? Was this prior to 1960?

AMORY: Yes, I don't know what it is, but you certainly want to.... Your project has got to get Bissell. He's an infinitely more important character witness, plus Cuba and everything else, than I am. But, anyway, there was a good feeling, a good rapport between the Agency and the president. I would say, just sort of by hunch, that this had a lot to do with Kennedy's relatively unquestioning acceptances of the Bay of Pigs proposal and so on. He got off on a good start, but it was only a very few weeks later, by the end of February, early March, that you started to have the nut-cutting sessions on the Bay of Pigs.

We also worked very hard to be sure we understood the White House staff arrangement. After all, it was commented by many people that Kennedy didn't have a cohesive staff. He had a lot of able staff officers who worked directly for him or in small groups, like the Bundy-Sorensen [Theodore C. Sorensen] team and so on. And very early--this date would be easily available--very early in the administration, I would say the first week in February, Allen took the Alibi Club, a private dining club of some fame, and he had, I would say, the ten top people in CIA, and ten, or it may have been twelve, of the White House Staff; Sorensen.... I remember I sat beside O'Brien [Lawrence F. O'Brien]. It was a pleasant three cocktail dinner, but then a serious discussion went on until 1 o'clock in the morning in which, first, each of us in the Agency described briefly, not a Pentagon formal briefing but sort of a New Yorkerish type of precis, just what did we do, and what are our problems, and what did we see as the important things the White House should be interested in our work. Then they asked questions on it. Why did we get in such a mess in Indonesia in 1958 and that kind of thing. But it was a good hair down thing, and everybody got pleasantly acquainted. From then on out, there was nobody in the key White House staff I couldn't pick up the phone and say, "Hey, Larry," or something like that, "This is Bob." It was, again, a very sensible thing for Allen to have done and, I think, sat well with the people. This came as sort of a head start on State, which is a bad thing in a way to state it that baldly. But it was State's own damn fault. State is so full of the need for everything to be cross-checked in the legal area or the policy area, and they just can't move their papers as fast as they should. We had the same problem with being sure that if we're talking about French North Africa, the African specialists as well as the French specialists had their views in it. But we did it in an hour instead of three days of putting papers out in a messenger car. [Pause]

Well, to continue on first with the sort of more direct contacts that I had with him, I was, as Arthur Schlesinger [Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.] accurately says, not privy to Bay of Pigs, officially. On the other hand, I had all the photo interpretation in the Agency under my command, and my head photo interpreter, Art Lundahl [Arthur C. Lundahl], kept me advised on what they were taking pictures of, so I knew informally what was going on. But I was never in on any of the consultations, either inside the Agency or otherwise. I think it was foolish, not because I would have decided it any differently, but at least on paper I knew more about amphibious warfare than anyone in the Agency. I had made twenty six assault landings in the South Pacific--Southwest Pacific and so on--and of about the size, many of them, as the Bay of Pigs. Whereas the Marine they had advising them had made one in his whole goddamn life, and that was Iwo Jima, which was three divisions abreast. He was a

very able soldier and Marine, but he just didn't know beans about what a small self-contained beachhead would be like.

O'CONNOR: Who was that man?

AMORY: Again my memory is not good enough. It was a simple name like Williams or Harris or something like that. But he was the Marine that was seconded to the Agency by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He's either retired or he's a general now because he was that degree of seniority; he was a colonel then. And he was seconded by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to Bissell at Bissell's request. So there was no question but a bunch of Ivy League amateurs, Corinthians, weren't making military logistical decisions which, of course, the press later charged. So I want to jump from there right on to the days after the fiasco, in which the Bobby Kennedy [Robert F. Kennedy], Max Taylor [Maxwell D. Taylor], Burke [Arleigh A. Burke], Dulles Committee was sitting. There was an awful lot of rehashing going on, and I had some contact then in larger meetings with Bobby and the President as to where we should go from there. I felt the President was genuinely floundering thereafter, and I don't blame him. We haven't done any good anywhere in Cuba since. But he certainly was taking full responsibility for the thing. There were no recriminations. I mean, I know there were none publicly; he stood straight on that. But even in private he treated Allen with the greatest cordiality and almost affectionate loyalty which was the highest type of esprit building thing, that kind of loyalty down in trouble. Bobby was convinced that we could upset Castro [Fidel Castro] by a long campaign of meddling, infiltration and so on. The first time I came into those discussions, I was always negative on that. I said that I don't think this will work; this will just provoke sympathy in the rest of Latin America. The thing to do now is to isolate Castro and treat him like an inoculation. The body is the whole of Latin America; this is the sore arm that's been scratched and poisoned with the thing, but the rest of the body will develop antibodies because of it much propaganda to show up the thing. Take the Cuban refugees; get them the hell out of Florida; get all the young ones in universities in Central America and Venezuela and Colombia where they can talk as Latinos about the horror of the thing, instead of the Yankee Colossus del Norte talking about how dangerous it is to have a little island in the hands of communism. And I felt that I didn't get very far with this. I had a lot of allies on it in the State Department, but....

O'CONNOR: Can you name some of those allies?

AMORY: Oh yes, Henry Owen [Henry D. Owen]....

O'CONNOR: Or was there anybody else saying the same thing that Bobby Kennedy was saying?

AMORY: Almost everybody was saying the same thing Bobby Kennedy was saying. Tom Mann [Thomas C. Mann] was. Of course, Tom Mann was in Mexico City then in those days. He'd left I think. I've forgotten who took his place. Woodward [Robert F. Woodward] or Rubottom [Roy Richard Rubottom, Jr.], I've forgotten which. They weren't terribly active. They don't come through very vividly in my recollection

as to what they did say. But, anyway, again I played a relatively minor role in that, but it was quite a different role from the February and March one which was as a cipher. The rest of the routine developed during the summer that every other day I or my deputy would be the one to bring a special morning briefing to the President. It was a damned early hour. I got out to the Agency at 5:30 in the morning, let's say, three mornings a week. A guy who'd been there all night would have a draft of what he thought the thing ought to be, and we'd finalize it and run it rapidly through a typewriter and a little offset printer, take it in and talk to Max Taylor, Bundy, and Ted Clifton [Chester V. Clifton]. Then very occasionally I would go to the president's office with them. I would say only twice it happened. Otherwise they, after cross-examining me, would go up to the president with the book. I would wait, and they'd come back and say, "Well, the president wants an amplification of this." Or he would even charge us with action: "He wants you to get hold of the Secretary of State, or the Assistant Secretary of State, and be sure that that message is answered by noon," or something--little trivial, ministerial odd things. But you did get this strong impression that his first interest in the morning was the world intelligence, that he really focused on it, that nothing would stand in the way of his grasping everything from the smallest detail that was going on and being very interested in it.

O'CONNOR: Now, are you relating these instances to the Bay of Pigs, or was this the procedure that developed during the year?

AMORY: No. What I'm leading up to now is the Berlin Wall which is the next interesting item in which I figured a little bit. One of those days we brought along a story that Khrushchev [Nikita S. Khrushchev] and the East German authorities were worried about the exodus. It was by no means a clear prediction of a wall. Nobody predicted that. And then suddenly you had this barrier, which wasn't a wall at first. So many people think the wall was built over night. It was a single strand of barbed wire and a lot of armed guards, and the refugees were turned back. Mac and I sat around at first alone early in the morning, and he said, "What the hell do we do now?" By this time I was quite freewheeling, at least with him, and I didn't worry about making policy recommendations. I said, "Mac, there is one thing you can do right here and now, and that is to vividly enhance your commitment to Berlin. I think you ought to send a cable to Norstad [Lauris Norstad]--or whoever was in command then--to send another combat team in this afternoon over the Autobahn." Then Taylor came in, and Mac said, "What do you think about that, Max?" Max said, "That's a hell of a bad idea. We're in a dangerous situation here; this would further maldeployment. Any troops that we have in Berlin will be casualties in the first six hours of fighting. We can't afford to give up five thousand good armed men out of the NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization] shield to that." Well, Mac was more or less on my side, and we pressed that all day. But Kennedy decided in favor of Max Taylor, and the Joint Chiefs agreed with Max. I think two days went by, and then Willy Brandt, the Mayor of Berlin, came in with a personal cable to the President saying exactly what I had said, "For God's sake, send the combat team." So with much hoopla, that afternoon the combat team went in, and Lyndon B. Johnson flew to make the commitment politically dramatic.

O'CONNOR: Were you just guessing, or did you have any information that would lead you

to believe the Soviet Union wouldn't respond if combat troops were sent in?

AMORY: Oh, I knew they wouldn't respond because they hadn't declared any blockade at that point. No, I've been, I won't say an expert on Berlin but I've been on the Berlin task force in the last administration and under this one. I knew how basically cautious they were and that, if properly interpreted, this was an internal security measure of the East Zone. This wasn't a play against Berlin. This was to keep the working population from just attriting itself and making the whole East Europe look unviable. So it was defensive, and I don't think Mac Bundy or anybody else was worried about that. It was the military who were always.... You know, they have 1948 on the brain again. But I think Paul Nitze [Paul H. Nitze] was very active in the task force and was a very sound and solid fellow; and then there was Marty Hillenbrand [Martin J. Hillenbrand] in State; and I guess Foy Kohler was the chairman of it. But all of them were not rattled by this thing and were sort of annoyed at-the degree of, well, annoyance that the president had that something dramatically different had happened, upsetting the world balance of forces. In fairness to him, you've got to crank in a factor which I had no personal contact with at all because I didn't go to Vienna but his exchange with Khrushchev in, what was that, June of '61? When they had the Vienna meeting, he came home and said it will be a cold winter business, that he wondered what would be the next step. And we all worried about that a little. But the wall itself, the barrier first and then the bricked up cinder block wall, was a defensive not an offensive move.

O'CONNOR: But it sounds like Maxwell Taylor was afraid the Soviets would respond if a combat team was put in there. Was he rattled by this, as you put it? He said there would be casualties.

AMORY: Yes. What he was saying, I think, in fairness to him, is that the whole NATO shield is desperately thin--you know, the Germans' forces where only two out of the twelve divisions were combat ready yet; the French had their whole army in Algeria. So he was looking at this and saying, "Gosh, I've got a very inadequate number of pieces to play this chess game, and this is just taking one off the board and putting it in the box, so to speak, which is hopeless." I have a high regard for Max, and I wouldn't want this to indicate that I thought he was a bum general. I think that was a perfectly sensible reaction, and maybe I could have been persuaded that a battalion would be as good as a combat team. I just used combat team as a round lump of things the way a Roman would use legion or something like that. Anyway, then, on Laos I saw a lot of Harriman [W. Averell Harriman] and little of Bundy and others and had something to do with Chet Cooper's [Chester L. Cooper] being put on the delegation to the Geneva meeting there that ultimately settled the Laotian thing. I thought the President showed great skill and restraint in not falling for the contingent plan of putting twenty-five or forty thousand American troops in Laos. And there the Agency was very badly split. The activists in the DDP side were all for a war in Laos. They thought that was a great place to have a war. And then did run a good little small-bore bush league war with their Meo tribesmen which was their responsibility, and they felt a very little more force would turn the thing round, and we could stabilize the situation there. But I felt it was just an impossible logistics problem and that the people of

Laos.... As I've said, the interesting thing about the Laotian war is there still is yet to be the first casualty by a bayonet. Those people just don't like to stick each other. They may throw.... They love mortars, but they fire them from this side of the hill around the other side of the hill, and they say, "We're not killing anybody. The great god Buddha's deciding where the mortar shell falls." You just can't think in terms of making these guys a Prussia of the Far East. And Kennedy two or three times in my presence showed an instinctive grasp of what that thing was and loyally backed Harriman in getting this kind of sloppy peace we have out there. It's pretty sloppy but.... As his military advisors and everybody, I won't say everybody, but lots of people in the State and Defense Departments were pushing for more aggressive action.

O'CONNOR: Various people have commented on the difference between the CIA attitude in Laos, and the State Department and Defense Department. Particularly, they contrast Defense and CIA people with Ambassador Brown [Winthrop G. Brown], who was there at the time. Now, will you comment on this conflict?

AMORY: Well, actually we had several people--I can't remember their dates and things--who were our chiefs of station in Laos, and some of them were activists, to use a simple phrase, and backed Phoumi [Phoumi Nosavan] very hard. But by the time Win was there, our man out there--his name escapes me--was very much on Win's side. And, essentially, it was Embassy Vientiane, including its military and CIA people, who were in favor of Souvanna Phouma [Prince Souvanna Phouma] and against Phoumi, and it was back here.... Parsons [J. Graham Parsons], before he went to Sweden, and his successor.... Who preceded Hilsman [Roger Hilsman, Jr.]?

O'CONNOR: I'd have to look that up.

AMORY: Assistant Secretary for Far East. Who the hell was he? I can't think. There was a short time then before Harriman took over the job. But anyway, that guy and the characters from ISA [International Security Affairs] in Defense, General Krulak [Victor H. Krulak] and Paul Nitze and Bill Bundy [William P. Bundy]. It's long before Bill went over there. Bill was Paul's assistant in ISA of Defense, and they were urging snore action. In other words, the people ten thousand miles away from the thing were the aggressive ones; the ones on the spot just said this wouldn't work. Harriman was the one guy back here, with a small assist from me.... By this time I guess we're getting on into the McCone [John A. McCone] stage. McCone was a terrific activist on it. So I'm talking early '62 now. And then, of course, before that all got settled, I left the Agency in.

O'CONNOR: March of 1962, wasn't it?

AMORY: Exactly, end of March 1962, and went over to the Bureau [Bureau of the Budget] where I stopped having any direct influence, you know, other than over coffee in the White House mess and that kind of thing. And I don't really think there's anything terribly significant thereafter in the foreign affairs part. About the only thing there that I think I could contribute a little to, which makes a very small footnote in

somebody's twenty volume history, is Kennedy's desire to create a National Academy of Foreign Affairs. There had long been dissatisfaction with the Foreign Service and a worry that the War College kind of training was not available to the State Department in the quantities it ought to be and that something really big and good and new should be created. I was put on a task force which, like many task forces, really became a task force of one to get that thing cranked up. I had very strong support from Dave Bell [David E. Bell], who was then the Director of the Budget, and from Mac Bundy. We drafted what we thought was a good proposal and then got a group of consultants down of whom the most significant ones were Don Price [Don K. Price] of Harvard's Littauer and Jim Perkins [James A. Perkins] now president of Cornell. out of that grew Perkins' National Committee of seventy or eighty people who were really just window dressing, but a small executive group of them met together. And I think we came up with a goddamn good proposal. Out of it came a short presidential message and a bill which we got Symington [W. Stuart Symington] to introduce. Most of the rest of it is available on the personal record, but the inside points I'd like to make are, first, that we were up against this Mundt [Senator Karl E. Mundt] Bill that comes up all the time to create a West Point of the Foreign Service--an absolutely horrible idea that you would restrict the Foreign Service to a bunch of kids who were sort of all brought up in a straight and relatively narrow approach to the cold war. At any rate, in order to get some support of those groups, we had to put a few window dressing things in the whereas clauses. But we very carefully were setting up a genuine academic institution which would require a novel experiment in management-control functions. We were going to have, I think, nine trustees of whom five would be public citizens and four would be the Secretaries of State, Defense, Director of AID, and one other man. And it would have academic freedom. This was very serious trouble to a lot of people because they said, "Well, suppose somebody gets up and lectures in favor of letting Red China into the UN? What do you do then?" I said, "Fine. It won't do any harm at all." And they said, "Oh no, this is terrible. The Secretary of State would be embarrassed by this," and so on and so forth, and, "Our friends in Taiwan would have conniption fits." I said, "Well, let them." Not that I'm in favor of that now; I may have toyed with it ten years ago. But it was a good illustrative thing. If you were going to have a first class academic institution and get guys like Bob Bowie [Robert Bowie] to come down and take a two year leave of absence from Harvard to be on your faculty, they damn well wouldn't be muzzled. Well, anyway, Kennedy was good on this all the way through every time the issue was put up to him. Rusk waffled terribly on it; but it was really Bundy, pushed by me, who was getting the matter to Kennedy, and then Kennedy sending it forward. We had good support from Stuart Symington, Lev Saltonstall [Leverett Saltonstall], and quite a few of the Senators, but very lukewarm support from Fulbright [J. William Fulbright]. And then you had the famous devastating Acheson [Dean G. Acheson] letter. Acheson really didn't understand what we were trying to do. It's a shame. I like the ex-Secretary very much, and I think if I could have had an evening with him in his house and explained some of the things.... But he just got a letter of highly loaded questions from Bill Fulbright and responded in his inimitable fashion of slashing advocacy and just tore the thing apart. So it was dead for that session, and then Kennedy died, and Mac said: "It's the last thing I would ever take up with LBJ." So that's what happened, a typical kind of thing that had some chance under a Kennedy leadership, but just doesn't even fit the pattern of a Johnson one.

Well, that was about.... Oh yes, another topic--the Bean Soup Exercise. In the Eisenhower Administration, there was, starting with the first year, a formal exercise whereby the basic cold war strategy.... Well, this had been started with Truman [Harry S. Truman] in NSC-68, NSC-10, 68, and 135. 162 was the first Eisenhower paper. When the Kennedy tide came in, I kept pushing at them to get on with this. Well, George McGhee [George C. McGhee] wasn't interested in it. Then when Rostow [Walt W. Rostow] went over there, he got interested in the exercise and developed a couple of very good first drafts--a long form and a short form. But it was well on into '62; more than a year had elapsed without any high level attention 'to this exercise. I felt it was a very serious thing, not because it meant that Kennedy didn't know what he was up to in the business, but his subordinates and new ambassadors and new people coming in from the field to be on the Joint Chiefs of Staff had no single place to look for just what is our attitude toward East-West trade; just what is our attitude toward travel behind the Iron Curtain; what is our attitude toward proliferation of nuclear weapons. All these things that should be wrapped in one basic document. to show you that you grappled with your problems and so on, they were evading. The exercise just putted along a bit, and then, unfortunately, there was a leak that got to the Hill. The leak involved a new look at China policy, and you can imagine that meant all kinds of things. And Rusk and Rostow rushed down there to put that fire out.

O'CONNOR: You don't know where the leak came from?

AMORY: I wouldn't be surprised if it came from the Far Eastern part of the State Department and/or the Pentagon. There were enough copies of this around. I've never tried to put my finger on it. Putting your finger on leaks in this town is the most futile business that could possibly happen, except where you know you've been the one who.... And then you can say nothing about it. This has happened to me in the course of thirteen, can assure you. [Laughter] Well anyway, Rusk panicked and said, "Well, it's just too dangerous to have in one document all the things we really think about." So he ordered the thing suppressed, all copies returned, and one only would be held in Rostow's office, and one only in the White House. The only thing is he overlooked my irresponsibility because I've got one right here in my drawer [Laughter] which I'm keeping as an ersatz historian for fun. I don't know whether you can put that out. You can chase me down here for it if you want to. It certainly has no sensitivity today. It's three or four or five years old now. Things have changed, but it is a very good document.

O'CONNOR: Well, we would like to have it, frankly. Or we would like to have some....

AMORY: Do you want to borrow it and have it photostated?

O'CONNOR: If you will let me, I'd be glad to.

AMORY: Well, what is your.... I mean, it's still classified Secret.

O'CONNOR: Sure, that's what this will be.

AMORY: Okay. Well, if you'll get it back to me....

O'CONNOR: I will indeed.

AMORY: And maybe you've got others around. But that's, I think, a very interesting....

O'CONNOR: I don't know whether we've got others or not, but if we don't, we'd sure as hell like to have it. You never can tell what we're missing.

AMORY: Okay. Well, just mark it "return to Amory."

O'CONNOR: Indeed I will. Thank you very much.

AMORY: Well, the other thing about it, too, was.... Wait, I was getting away from the mike. The other element that helped kill it was the fact that some of the White House staff, particularly Carl Kaysen, took a dim view of it. They said to me, if you try to lock things into pieces of paper, people think they've done all the work they have to do and will stop thinking." It's sort of the British reaction--ad hoc decisions are much better than any attempt to write contingency plans and that kind of thing. And he's the one that christened it Bean Soup because it's Basic National Security Policy--the consonants make bean soup. So any time he wanted to be pejorative in referring to it, that's the way he did it. And so it was a combination of that kind of nibbling it to death from the bottom and then Rusk taking a powder on the whole exercise that killed it. But it really means that the Kennedy Administration never did do really orderly planning--and the Johnson one hasn't--in the same way the Eisenhower people did. Charlie Bartlett has written some interesting theses on that, and I made a couple of lectures to the Brookings Institution on the difference of technique. They both will work. You can't say one's right, and one's wrong. But my semi-orderly way of thinking about affairs in business missed the thing. You know, in a crude analogy--you can have a lot of fun playing Sunday afternoon touch football, but you'd better not take on the Green Bay Packers with set-piece plays. So there's something to that on both sides.

O'CONNOR: Were those lectures published, or...

AMORY: No, they just died.

O'CONNOR: Well, I mean, does Brookings have a record of the lectures or anything?

AMORY: I don't think so.

O'CONNOR: I'd like to see them, frankly.

AMORY: I'll tell you what they are. No tape was taken of them. They were taught from two and a half pages of illegible notes from this kind of paper, and talked for

an hour and five minutes. I mean this is all something I've lived with a great deal. And it's pretty elementary, most of what I was talking about--the nature of policy planning and so on. I just don't think there's any.... If I give it again or something like that and you want to arrange a tape of the thing, I could do it. But I don't think this really would add very much to your business. It would be better if you got.... Well, the people to get this straight from would be Gordon Gray--probably Cutler's [Robert Cutler] a little too old and too sick. But get Gordon Gray, the last Chairman of the Planning Board, and what he tried to do, maybe Dillon Anderson, who's down in Texas, and then pick up McGhee and Rostow, and just see how they differed on the thing, and then one could comment quite easily on it. Well, let's see, we'd better stop for a minute. I think I've really covered the points that I had really direct connection with the.... Oh no, others will occur to me.

You remember when the foreign aid bill got in trouble, and Kennedy decided that he wanted a high level committee to review it for him. He came up with Lucius Clay [Lucius D. Clay] and company. Well, I fought that tooth and nail. I almost choked I was so mad in Dave Bell's office and said, "It's a bad idea to start with, and these are the wrong people. They're going to poison you." And I think they did. Bell was sufficiently impressed by it to go back to Kennedy and say, "For God's sake, not Lucius Clay. This guy's a pigheaded engineer type who's got a great deal more prestige than he deserves, and it's a wild bull in china shop gamble that you're taking here." And I think that was absolutely right. Out of it came really the death knell of the program that was envisaged when Kennedy first came in of raising the aggregate of foreign aid, probably a constant small percentage of our GNP [Gross National Product]. Now we've had a declining absolute figure and, of course, a radically declining share of GNP going into it, the result of which is the general horror we find places from India to Nigeria and others in. And I've never understood why he lost faith in it. He said before me once that he made a terrible mistake in calling it AID, sounding like charity. Of course, it's a consolidation of the agencies for international development, but he said, "By gosh, the Eisenhower people were right. The only way you can sell this on the Hill is military security. It should have been the International Defense Fund, or something like that." He fooled around with a few words and said, "Well, that isn't it, but you just can't keep the American people long in this particular bind." And, of course, Johnson made more or less that decision final. Now he's come out with this anomalous global baloney on educating everybody before you feed them, and I think that will.... But anyway, the trouble is two billion dollars a year in economic aid just isn't enough to do the business. We'd almost better shut our eyes and say we're going to be indifferent to the needs of the undeveloped world, or get out and do the job better. And I was sort of disappointed in Kennedy's lack of persistence in that field.

O'CONNOR: Do you know who chose Lucius Clay for that?

AMORY: No, I think Kennedy did himself.

O'CONNOR: Yes, I didn't know whether he did or not. I thought....

AMORY: Oh yes, no. I know it wasn't Bell, but you know it could have been Larry O'Brien, O'Donnell [Kenneth P. O'Donnell] or Ted Sorensen. But as far as

the Bureau of the Budget and AID were concerned, it came straight from the White House. It wasn't Rusk, and it wasn't.... Let's see. Dave had been announced as the new director to succeed Hamilton [M. Fowler Hamilton]--that put Dave in the ambiguous position.

O'CONNOR: Of being ready to leave.

AMORY: Of still being in Budget but announced that he was going to be head of AID, and I said, "Jesus, David, they're going to hang a horrible albatross around your neck." And he shrugged and said, "Well, let's not fight City Hall," or something like that. Now Kennedy.... Let's see, I went to the Bureau in '62, so it's another eighteen months. I don't remember anything terribly significant going on, but the fall of '63.... I'll just have to go back and look at Schlesinger's book because I just don't remember anything from that late summer, a thing that did bother me particularly; there didn't seem to be any great international development.

O'CONNOR: Well, Vietnam, the Diem [Ngo Dinh Diem] crisis--the Diem fall really.

AMORY: The Diem fall I had absolutely nothing to do with it. And you're perfectly right. You know, I read the cables in the back room from time to time, and I bumped into Fritz [Frederick E. Fritz, Jr.] Nolting from time to time, socially, but never went to one of the meetings. Well, backing off, you know who first put Ngo Dinh Diem in power? Very interesting. I do have something, but this goes way back to 1954. I was at an after-theater party in Martin Agronsky's house--pleasant, a couple of scotches and some canapes--and got off in a corner with Mr. Justice Douglas [William O. Douglas], and Douglas said, "Do you know who's the guy to fix you up in Vietnam? He's here in this country, and that's Ngo Dinh Diem." Well, I wrote it down in my notebook on the way out as, you know, Z-I-M Z-I-M. I came back and asked the biographic boys the next morning, "Dig me up anything you've got on this guy." "We ain't got anything on this guy." And the next morning meeting I said to Allen Dulles I and Frank Wisner, "A suggestion out of the blue...." But Wisner picked it up and looked at the thing. And that's how "Ngo Zim Zim" became our man in Indochina. [Laughter] The long hand of Mr. Justice Douglas. But as to his fall, I know nothing other than....

O'CONNOR: Yes, you were in the Bureau at that time.

AMORY: Bureau at that time, and by that time in the fall, we were up to our ears in hearings and so on and so forth.

O'CONNOR: You know, when I started trying to think of questions to ask you after you were in the CIA when you were in the Bureau, I wasn't really sure what your office dealt with. It was the international office of the Bureau of the Budget, but I didn't quite know what you did.

AMORY: Essentially, we oversaw all the agencies of the government primarily involved

abroad: Peace Corps, AID, USIA [U.S. Information Agency], Food for Peace, State Department, CIA, and the military assistance program part of the Pentagon, and the military intelligence part of the program. The real reason I was sent there.... Well, let me back off and tell you what is relevant to why I should be doing any talking--why I moved during the Kennedy Administration.

O'CONNOR: I was going to ask you about that.

AMORY: I wrote in my June 1961 25th Reunion Report that I had the best job in the world that I know of outside of the President of the United States or something like that. It was a fascinating job, and I just couldn't have been more happy. And that was even after the Bay of Pigs. Then when Allen was obviously due to go, I was not at all happy with McCone as a selection. In fact, I protested vigorously to Mac Bundy, and Pete Scoville [Herbert F. Scoville] and I both threatened to resign. I thought this appointment was just the wrong thing; this was just a cheap political move to put a prominent Republican in so the heat could be taken off the Bay. We would no longer be part of the Kennedy New Frontier; we would be something that was an incubus that he'd inherited, and so on and so forth. And I thought it was a very bad show, and I intended this to go back to him. Let me see, I'm getting out of order here. No, that's when he was first moving around, that is the right order. Then, very shortly, Kennedy made up his mind and firmly announced McCone. And at that time, by coincidence, they were having trouble with Elvis Stahr [Elvis J. Stahr], and I was approached by Nitze as to whether I would be interested in being Secretary of the Army.

Well, I was just delighted with that. I had started as a private and come out as a colonel, I thought it would be nice if I could wind up as Secretary. [Laughter] But I had no particular qualification for it except I knew a lot. I had served in every combat branch in the army. I knew a lot about the.... You know, I could be a good regimental commander. Whether I could be a good Secretary was another question. And McNamara said no, he'd like to have me on the team, but he wouldn't put me on at that high level at first. Why didn't I come over and be a deputy to Paul for a while? He needed two deputies--one to run Berlin and NATO, and the other to run the rest of the thing; and I would take over the Berlin-NATO part of Defense. I had lunch with Paul at the Metropolitan Club--I could find out in my red book if it's all that significant, but anyway it was about in that time, I would say, of October '61--and agreed to go and told Allen about it and told Mac. And Mac said, "Well, you know I think I'd just better check it out with the president because he's interested in you," and so on. And to my surprise, I got called over to Mac's office, and Mac said, "Bob, it won't wash. The president asks you as a personal favor to give up the idea because there is criticism among scientists and others of McCone's appointment, and if you leave now with your university background, they'll sort of say, 'Well, all the liberals are leaving.'" He said, "You don't think so, but you have a nationwide reputation, you're known to readers of *Time* and others for a few things." A lot of applesauce. Anyway, at the personal request of the President there's nothing you can do. It was his administration. I couldn't say, "Screw you," because he'd just call up Nitze and say to Nitze, "Don't take him."

So I bided my time. And then I thought I had a fair chance for the number two job, and McCone talked to me in those terms when he first came in. I immediately decided I had

been wrong. I didn't know McCone well. I had met him about ten or twelve times before. But, anyway, in the first session he obviously grasped things awfully fast and was not a reactionary, and was obviously going to work with the staff he'd got. And so I knew I was in consideration for that. But when he came up for confirmation, Dick Russell [Richard B. Russell] and Lev Saltonstall--to my knowledge Saltonstall had been a good backer of mine on the little things that I needed his help on--without anything to do with me personally, said, "Well, of course, you're going on with the thing of having a military deputy." McCone said, "Well, I haven't really made up my mind on that." And they said, "Well, it's our opinion, Mr. McCone, that, though the statute explicitly only requires that both not be military, the implicit sense of the Senate and the House was that if one is a civilian, the other should be military, and vice versa." So McCone worried about his confirmation. He said he'd wind up with twelve adverse votes and, of course, that hurt his feelings a lot. No question he wasn't going to make it, but he then said, "Well, if that's your feeling, Mr. Chairman--and Russell, of course, was tremendously powerful--I will be guided by it." So that fed me up. And I figured then that I'd been ten years deputy director, and I was forty-seven. Did I want to go on for another fifteen years doing the same thing? I didn't want to go overseas. I was willing to go overseas; my wife was perfectly happy, but we weren't pressing for a big London or Bonn or Tokyo or one of those jobs there. So then I started to look around again. But I was very casual about the whole thing until Elmer Staats [Elmer B. Staats] came over to me one day and said, "You know, we've really got this problem of intelligence. It's just not working because neither McCone nor Dulles has taken control of the thing from the top, and we think the Bureau's got to get into the act." This sort of inspired me. And he said, "I want to create and readjust and take out of the military division of the Bureau everything to do with military intelligence, put it in one subdivision along with the other international things, and have you head that." Bell and he and I had lunch at the Cosmos Club in February, I would guess, and that just plain intrigued me. I knew I was stale, and I was annoyed. You know, you felt passed over. I didn't dislike Marshall Carter [Marshall S. Carter]; I got to know him and like him very much as years went on. But I was just intrigued by that. So I talked to Bundy, and Bundy talked to the president. The president said, "Well, McCone's all settled in. Now, if Bob really feels he'd be happier over there, the Bureau of the Budget's very close to me." Pleasantly, not wildly enthusiastic about the idea, but he said, "Fine." I had been having mild troubles with McCone. He wanted to break up my part of the empire. You see, the empire had really three satrapies, or whatever you want to call them mine, which was all analysis and overt collection; Bissell's, which was all covert collection and covert action; and then they had a large what the army would call a G-1, G-4 Administrative Support Communications Group. And he wanted to create a fourth one called a Scientific Group which would pull out of Bissell's shop research and development and making of U-2's and satellites and pull out of my shop the scientific analysis. I said both of them are a crazy idea. And Bissell quit more or less on that account. He was going to.... He was in my mood, also. And that was the issue with which I broke with McCone.

BEGIN SIDE 2 TAPE 1

AMORY: Is there a unity, a cohesive and sensible unit to be made of research and development in secret links and appraisals as to where scientific education is

going in the Soviet Union? I felt there wasn't. And we won on this for a while, and then we lost. At the time I just said, "Well let's activate this Bureau of the Budget opportunity." So I called Dave and said I'd come. Once I got there, I found very rapidly that I had made a mistake because I hadn't realized.... I had been told that I reported directly to them and so on. But there were two jobs in the Bureau on the so-called political assistant directorships, and essentially, they told one of these guys that he would have my job, too, to wit, Ken Hansen [Kenneth R. Hansen]. And we fought all the time. I mean, I never lost my temper or anything, but I was unhappy. It was a difficult business. He raided my personnel; he bypassed me to my staff and things like that; and I, frankly, bypassed him to Elmer and Dave and so on. It was just a relatively unpleasant thing. And if it hadn't been for my relations with Bundy and his staff, which were excellent, I would have probably quit very soon. But I knew he was a short-temper and thought maybe when he left, things would be better. And by the time he did leave, they did improve Bill Capron [William M. Capron] and later Harry Rowen [Henry S. Rowen] came in, but by that time I felt that the Clark Clifford committee was really the place to which the president was looking for this coordination of intelligence rather than to my operation, and that we were sort of, you know, ministerial again rather than actually policy making. You know, I don't feel it was a useless two and a half years. Then, shortly after the president was assassinated, I was put up for a place in the Export-Import Bank Board, which rather intrigued me--least broke me out of the Hatch Act bureaucracy--and I lost out on that one to a woman. The President went before the Women's [Division of the] Democratic National Committee and promised them thirty appointments in thirty days. And so my name was disapproved, and a lady got it who is a damn competent lady I will say. Then I came up for the Tariff Commission more recently, and I got snowed on that one again by a combination of politics, but largely because I was too close to Bobby Kennedy. That's all beyond the scope of this paper. So now I'm pleasantly active in the practice of law here. Now let's see, one other thing was crossing my mind. [Pause]

O'CONNOR: Let me refresh your memory a little bit. I had five meetings listed here that were pulled from the appointment book that you had with the President. They, strangely enough, were apparently the only five that were listed down though I gather from your conversation that you had others. But I thought this might possibly refresh your memory. It's got the dates and occasionally it's got the number of people that were there--or at least the people--and, occasionally, even the subject, though this is very rare. These were all while you were still in the CIA--just prior to your departure, as a matter of fact. That was a very long one. [Referring to a particular appointment.] I wonder if you could remember what that was. Most of the meetings with the president lasted fifteen minutes; you've got some on there that go more than an hour.

AMORY: I don't think I ever lunched with [Ambassador and Mrs. David Ormsby-Gore] the Harlechs and the president. That's not true.

O'CONNOR: The appointment book is occasionally mistaken, but that's what it says in there definitely under your name.

AMORY: Maybe we forgot to go? [Laughter] [Mumbling-pause] 1600--White House,

president--Standing group. That was disarmament. I think we were about to make an initiative in the disarmament thing. That was a rather large group, I was by no means.... But Bundy would have been chairing the meeting. And I met first with the standing group at 1430, and then it says, "1600, White House, President" so 4:10--that's consistent. There must be a file on that meeting, and I don't recall having made any contribution to it at the time it moved on to the president. The other thing it could possibly be, I remember having a long session with him. Now let's see, Jan. 8. I've been to the Harlech's many times for lunch, but the president was never there. No, that's just wrong. I have down "Lunch with McCone, Bissell, Cabell [General Charles P. Cabell] and Helms [Richard M. Helms]." So that's wrong. Too bad. February 2nd, Jan. 8th, March 1 and 6. We got ready for one. Yes, that was the discussion of the Basic National Security Policy paper. That was on March 6th--and disarmament. And now March 1--Principals meeting, Chris Herter, 11:30 in the morning, White House: 9:30, White House--call Bundy; 11:30, White House. That's pretty short. As I remember, there was one time when he had Spaak [Paul Henri Spaak]. I remember I was sitting in there, and he brought Spaak into a meeting. And I went to other meetings there to get ready.... He used to go along occasionally.... There are many more times than this I have seen him even though one of these turns out to be wrong, but my principal would have been listed. In other words, Dulles or McCone, and I would be brought along. And I might chime in for a few minutes to the conversation. I remember one case where we were getting ready for a session with Adenauer [Konrad Adenauer] on this gut question of whether or not you can fight a conventional war in Europe, and we developed a briefing and translated it into German so it could be given.... We had a very excellent--I think it was a CIA; no, it was a military translator fellow; he's a colonel. But we dress rehearsed that with the President, and then he gave it to Adenauer with, of course, just a few people there, but he sat through the whole rehearsal with simultaneous translation trying to put himself in the place of Adenauer, which is rather an interesting, dramatic way of how thoroughly he prepared himself for a key chief of state's meeting. That could be easily checked on the formal record because, obviously, Adenauer didn't sneak in and out the back door. I should have kept a better diary at the time. Yes, now the one I don't seem to have here--this hour meeting with Bundy. I think that, you see, is the one relating to my.... No, as I recall, it was indirect. I went to Bundy, and Bundy quoted the president to me. Obviously the president wouldn't have met with me for fifty-five minutes about what a GS-18 did; he didn't have time for that. Let me make a note. I've got these other books at home. I'll make a note to check that. Let me see, November what? three? November 3, '61, JFK, question mark. Well, I think maybe the thing to do is to break off here, and you can think of other things.

O'CONNOR: Okay, I've got a lot of other things. You've stimulated a number of questions.

[END OF INTERVIEW #1]

Name List

A

Acheson, Dean G., 11
Addis, John, 26
Alsop, Stewart, 34
Amory, Viscount, 1, 4, 13, 21, 30
Anderson, Dillon, 14
Atherton, Ray, 2
Auchincloss, Hugh D., 2

B

Barnes Tracy, 30
Bartlett, Charles Leffingwell, 2, 13
Bell, David E., 11, 14, 17, 36
Bissell, Richard M., 5, 6, 7, 17, 19, 24, 27,
28, 29, 31, 32, 33
Bowie, Robert R., 11
Bowles, Chester B., 4, 31
Brewer, Basil, 1, 2
Brown, Winthrop G., 10, 25, 26, 30
Bundy, McGeorge, 5, 8, 9, 11, 16, 27
Bundy, William P., 10, 11, 15, 18, 27, 29,
36
Burke, Arleigh A., 7

C

Cabell, Charles P., 19, 30
Cannon, Clarence A., 35, 36
Capron, William M., 18
Cardona, Miro, 30
Carter, Marshall S., 17
Castro, Fidel, 7, 21, 31
Clay, Lucius D., 14, 35
Clifton, Chester V., 8
Cooper, Chester L., 9, 26
Cutler, Robert, 14

D

de Gaulle, Charles, 20
Diem, Ngo Dinh, 15
Douglas, William O., 15

Dulles, Allen W., 4, 5, 6, 7, 15, 16, 30
Dulles, John Foster, 1, 2, 5, 10, 20, 26, 32,
34
Dungan, Ralph A., 4

E

Eaton, Freddy, 2
Eisenhower, Dwight D., 1, 2, 3, 5, 12, 13,
14, 20, 23, 26, 31
Engle, Byron, 25

F

Fitzgerald, Desmond, 24, 27
Fulbright, J. William, 11, 36

G

Gates, Thomas S., Jr., 23
Gaud, William, 36
Gordon, Kermit, 14, 37
Gray, Gordon, 14

H

Hamilton, M. Folwler, 15, 35, 36
Hansen, Kenneth R., 18
Harriman, W. Averell, 9, 10, 26, 33
Helms, Richard M., 19
Herter, Christian A., 3, 19
Hillenbrand, Martin J., 9
Hilsman, Roger, Jr., 10, 26
Hiss, Alger, 3
Hoover, J. Edgar, 5

J

Jackson, Henry M., 34
Johnson, Kelly, 8, 11, 13, 14, 25, 28, 33,
35, 36

K

Kaysen, Carl, 13
Kennedy, Robert F., 1, 5, 7, 11, 14, 25, 33

Kent, Sherman, 31
Khrushchev, Nikita S., 8, 9, 26, 34
Komer, Robert W., 25
Kong Le, 26
Krulak, Victor H., 10

L

Lansdale, Edward G., 21
Lawrence, David L., 3, 6
LeMay, Curtis E., 22
Lemnitzer, Lyman L., 27
Lodge, Henry Cabot, 1, 2, 3, 4
Lundahl, Arthur C., 6

M

Macomber, William B., 37
Mahon, George, 36
McCarthy, Joseph R., 2
McCone, John A., 10, 16, 19, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32
McElroy, Neil H., 23
McGhee, George C., 12, 14
McMillan, Brockway, 29
McNamara, Robert S., 5, 16, 23, 24, 29
Meyer, Eugene, 4
Mossadegh, Mohammed, 29
Mundt, Karl E., 11
Mundt, William, 11

N

Nitze, Paul H., 9, 10, 16, 27, 34
Nolting, Frederick E. Jr., 15
Norstad, Lauris, 8
Nosavan, Phoumi, 10

O

Owen, Henry D., 7

P

Parsons, J. Graham, 10, 26
Parsons, Jeff, 10, 26
Passman, Otto E., 35, 36
Penkovsky, Oleg, 34, 37
Perkins, James A., 11

Phouma, Souvanna, 10, 25, 26
Price, Don K., 11

R

Raborn, William F., 29
Ray, Manuel, 2, 30
Roosevelt, Kermit, 29
Rowe, James H., Jr., 33
Rowen, Henry S., 18
Rubottom, Roy Richard Jr., 7
Rusk, David Dean, 5, 11, 12, 13, 15, 26, 31, 32
Russell, Richard B., 17

S

Saltonstall, Leverett, 11, 17
Schlesinger, Arthur M. Jr., 6, 15, 31, 32
Scoville, Herbert F., 16, 21, 29
Shultz, Charles L., 37
Sorensen, Theodore C., 6, 14, 32, 36
Spaak, Paul Henri, 19
Staats, Elmer B., 17
Stahr, Elvis J., 16
Stevenson, Adlai E., 30
Strong, Philip, 28
Symington, W. Stuart, 11, 22

T

Taft, Robert A., 1, 3
Taylor, Maxwell D., 7, 8, 9
Thomas, Albert, 7, 23, 36
Truman, Harry S., 12, 33
Twining, Nathan F., 28

V

Vance, Cyrus R., 29
von Runstedt, Karl R.G., 23

W

Watson, W. Marvin, 33
Wilson, Charles H., 23
Winship, Lawrence L., 4
Woodward, Robert F., 7
Wrightsman, Charles, 5

Wrightsman, Charles B., 5