Abram Chayes, Oral History Interview—JFK#1, 5/18/1964
Administrative Information

Creator: Abram Chayes
Interviewer: Eugene Gordon
Date of Interview: May 18, 1964
Location: Washington, D.C.
Length: 76 pages

Biographical Note
Chayes, Staff director of the Democratic Platform Committee (1960) and legal adviser to the Department of State (1961-1964), discusses John F. Kennedy's (JFK) vice presidential candidacy at the 1956 Democratic National Convention, an advisory group to JFK of Harvard academics that Chayes helped form in 1958, loyalty oaths and McCarthyism, and the 1960 Democratic National Convention, among other issues.

Access
Open.

Usage Restrictions
According to the deed of gift signed on May 9, 1973, copyright of these materials has been assigned to the United States Government. Users of these materials are advised to determine the copyright status of any document from which they wish to publish.

Copyright

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
Abram Chayes, recorded interview by Eugene Gordon, May 18, 1964, (page number), John F. Kennedy Library Oral History Program.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

Gift of Personal Statement

of Abram Chayes

to the

JOHN F. KENNEDY LIBRARY

I, Abram Chayes of Cambridge, Massachusetts, do hereby give to the John F. Kennedy Library, for use and administration therein, all my rights, title and interest, except as hereinafter provided, to the tape recording and transcript of the interviews conducted at Washington, D.C., on May 18, 1964, June 22, 1964, June 23, 1964, and July 9, 1964, for the John F. Kennedy Library. The gift of this material is made subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. The interview is to be opened to general research at the discretion of the Director of the John F. Kennedy Library; his decision to be based on such considerations as potential embarrassment to living persons or their immediate successors, the interests of national security, or potential prejudice to the friendly relations between the United States and foreign nations.

2. Researchers who have access to the transcripts of the interviews may listen to the tape; however, this is to be for background use only. Researchers may not cite, paraphrase or quote from the tape during my lifetime, except with my express permission.

3. I hereby assign literary property rights in this interview to the United States Government.

4. Copies of the interview transcript may be provided upon request to any researcher.

5. This agreement may be revised or amended by mutual consent of the parties undersigned.

Abram Chayes
ABRAM CHAYES

4/12/73
DATE

James B. Rhoads
ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES

May 9, 1973
DATE

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

JOHN F. KENNEDY PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY

Addendum to the Legal Agreement Pertaining to the Oral History Interviews

of Abram Chayes

Interviewed by: Eugene Gordon

I, **Antonia Chayes** hereby remove the restrictions on the use of the tape that states "Researchers who have access to the transcripts of the interviews may listen to the tape; however this is to be for background use only. Researchers may not cite, paraphrase or quote from the tape" of the personal interview(s) conducted with **Abram Chayes** on **May 18, 1964; June 22, 1964; June 23, 1964; and July 9, 1964** currently at the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library.

Antonia H. Chayes — Nov 7, 2013

Donor — Dated

Susan K. Donius — 12/11/13

Susan K. Donius — Dated

Director for Presidential Libraries

Abram Chayes—JFK #1

Table of Contents

Page	Topic
1	1956 Democratic National Convention
35	Lack of support for John F. Kennedy (JFK) at Harvard University in 1956
40, 63	JFK's advisory group of academics, formed in 1958
48	JFK's intellect
52	Archibald Cox
54	National Education Act Loyalty Disclaimer
57	JFK and Joseph R. McCarthy
60	Jury Trial Amendment of 1959 Civil Rights Bill
65	Chester B. Bowles
67	1960 Democratic Platform Committee
68	Robert F. Kennedy and his pre-1960 campaign activities
71	1960 Democratic National Convention
75	JFK's Cuban policy

First of Four Oral History Interviews

with

Abram Chayes

May 18, 1964
Washington, D.C.

By Eugene Gordon

For the John F. Kennedy Library

GORDON: Abe, could you tell me something about the 1956 Convention and what contact you had with John Kennedy [John F. Kennedy] at that time?

CHAYES: Well, actually the first time we—and when I say we here, I mostly mean Toni [Antonia H. Chayes] and me—met Kennedy or had anything really to do with him was in the 1956 Convention. Toni and I went out there together. I had a casual sort of job with Adlai Stevenson [Adlai E. Stevenson] sitting in the Delegate Lounge and welcoming

and interviewing delegates. There wasn't very much to do for Stevenson because he was clearly going to be the nominee, and there wasn't very much for Toni to do. So I sent her off to see if she could find Kennedy. There was talk about his being a potential vice presidential candidate. We were new in Massachusetts. We had been residents in Massachusetts for about a year at the time, and I said she might get some fun out of the Convention by trying to find him and attach herself to his organization.

In fact, we had known a little bit, or thought we knew a little bit, about the origins of the Kennedy-for-Vice President operation because we were fairly close to John Bailey [John

Moran Bailey] as a result of my old job in Connecticut with Chet Bowles [Chester B. Bowles] when Bailey had been the State Chairman.

[-2-]

We really thought that the main purpose of the Kennedy candidacy was an effort to organize the New England delegates into a single bloc where they could have some weight in the Convention. I think they have among the six states some 120 or 130 delegates which is almost as much as New York has, but when that number of delegates is fragmented among six states, they all cancel each other out. The effort was to find some rallying point around which to weld a cohesive bloc of delegates which could have its impact on the Convention. The rallying point that had been selected, at least as we saw it, was Kennedy. He appeared at a number of New England breakfasts in the early stages of the Convention. But when I sent Toni out on Monday of Convention week to find the Kennedy headquarters, there was none.

[-3-]

She was finally referred to his personal room which was in the Drake Hotel way away from the center of activity. And there just wasn't any Kennedy headquarters. By the second day when she went again on this...

GORDON: Which suggests that Kennedy had not had in mind a vice presidential pitch before he came to…

CHAYES: Well, I am convinced that he didn't have a serious vice presidential effort in mind. I think he was perfectly prepared to lend himself to this New England enterprise, and I am sure he was prepared also to garner whatever national publicity which would come from it. But certainly he didn't have any idea about a strong vice presidential effort. That picked up as the Convention moved forward.

There were some interesting touchstones. He narrated, I think, a movie that opened

[-4-]

the Convention as supposedly in competition with the keynote speech, and that was supposed to give him a big boost. There was a competition all along about who was going to nominate Stevenson. And, I think, Kennedy did nominate him. In any event, the decision wasn't made until the last minute, and this business of keeping Kennedy on the griddle for all that time, I am sure, contributed to an attitude of coolness and irritation with Stevenson that persisted far beyond 1956.

In any event, Toni finally hooked up with Kennedy on Tuesday, which was the second day of the Convention. Even then he had a very modest headquarters by Convention standards.

GORDON: By the way, what was your official connection with the.... Did you have an official connection?

CHAYES: No. In the 1952 Convention I had been very

[-5-]

closely involved with the Harriman [William Averell Harriman] operation, but in 1956 we just went out as kind of old Convention fans. In order to have something to do, I had hooked up with the Stevenson operation, but I wasn't in the inner circle. As a matter of fact, I was in the outer, outer circle, and that is why we were really looking around for some other source of excitement and contact with the work of the Convention.

GORDON: It was through your Harvard associations in Boston that you felt a New England connection then?

CHAYES: Well, we knew the New England group through Bailey. We knew Bailey from Connecticut, and it was perfectly clear that Bailey and the other New England leaders were trying to develop a New England group and using the candidacy of Kennedy to precipitate

[-6-]

a sense of unity that had never been there in the New England delegations before. But as you said, Kennedy was willing to go along with this, at least in the early stages, without a very serious—or so it appeared to us—idea of making a real run for it. For example, when Toni finally got in touch with the Kennedy headquarters on Tuesday...

GORDON: Why were they so difficult to reach?

CHAYES: Well, on Monday there wasn't one, and on Tuesday they had just put one up, that is all. Unlike many of the other candidates who were very well advertised and had very well financed and well publicized operations, Kennedy had a very modest one. A very small suite, even at the very end, in the Conrad-Hilton. When Toni came in, she asked one of the girls there who was one of the Washington group—it wasn't Evelyn Lincoln [Evelyn N. Lincoln],

[-7-]

but one of the girls who was working in Kennedy's Washington office—whether there was anything that she could do, and the girl said, "Yes, you could sit down and answer the telephones while I go out and get my hair done." The girl did go out and get her hair done, and I don't know if she ever came back. That, in fact, was the way that the thing was organized. On a very casual basis. I am sure very little money was spent on the entire vice presidential operation.

I had been, as I say, talking to delegates in the Stevenson headquarters, and it became apparent to me that the delegates strength which was pledged to Stevenson—and practically all of it was pledged to Stevenson or was for Stevenson—was very sharply divided between Kefauver [Estes Kefauver], Humphrey [Hubert E. Humphrey] and Kennedy for vice president. And the characteristic

[-8-]

line you would get from a delegate was "I am all for Stevenson, but make sure that he goes for "X" for vice president." And so I began...

GORDON: There were strong feelings about this?

CHAYES: Yes, there were fairly strong vice presidential commitments. So I used to go back to the Kennedy place after I got enough of talking to Stevenson delegates, and I talked to people who later became household words in the Kennedy Administration. Ted Sorensen [Theodore C. Sorensen] we met then, Kenny O'Donnell [Kenneth P. O'Donnell]. I thought fairly early on that there was a chance that Stevenson would not designate his vice president because the strength was so evenly divided that it seemed to me that, whatever selection he made, he was bound to make more enemies than friends. Given that and given his own characteristic inclinations, he might very well not make a selection for vice president.

[-9-]

I tried to peddle this idea to Sorensen and O'Donnell in particular, without success. They kept saying to the very end that that never happened. The presidential nominee always nominates his vice president.

GORDON: What was your impression of Sorensen and O'Donnell at that time. Do you remember?

CHAYES: Well, I knew O'Donnell from college. Not college, really, he was in college when I was in law school, and we had somehow met. We had bumped into each other from time to time around Cambridge. I was never impressed with O'Donnell's, you know, general weight or anything like that. I thought of him—which shows how wrong I was—as a sort of hanger-on of the Kennedy establishment rather than a fellow at the center of it. I don't know what his position was then in 1956. He was much younger than he was at the time of the Administration. But, as I say, I thought

[-10-]

he was a sort of a man more on the periphery of the Kennedy entourage than a very influential figure. Sorensen—Toni saw more of him than I did and came away very profoundly impressed with Sorensen. I saw and met Sorensen, shook hands with him a

couple of times; but Toni was really very, very deeply impressed, and she wrote to him after we got home from the Convention and kept in contact with him much more than I did on the basis of that contact. She saw more of him than I did because she was around the headquarters all day long whereas I was not.

GORDON: Did this impress you, though, as a well-organized disciplined team or more of a kind of a hard working bunch of fellows...

CHAYES: No, it looked to me much more like a gang of people, much like you see around any prominent, driving, vigorous person. We had had a similar gang around Bowles when

[-11-]

Bowles was Governor of Connecticut. I saw a similar gang around Harriman when I worked for Harriman in the 1952 campaign. Much more a group of people bound together by loyalty to a chief—very close and intimate personal relations among them, without organization chart arrangements or a very regularized system of assignments, and so on. The way they communicated with each other was by sitting in a room and talking. Anybody's advice was worth whatever it was worth. Nobody had any sense of precedence or deference in particular. Everybody knew who the leader was and everything oriented itself toward the leader, but except for that very loose and obviously emotionally dedicated kind of commitment, the structure of the group was very loose, very free.

GORDON: Did you get any sense of the kind of ruthlessness, or.... I don't know how to put it, but that

[-12-]

purpose of how without any considerations except the winning feeling that seems to associate itself, at least in my mind, with the name Irish Mafia that came later.

CHAYES: I don't think you would have gotten it then. After all, Kennedy was then really in the second rank even of Democratic politicians. He was not by any means thought of as a guy with a real chance even for the vice presidency. The notion there was that if he got the vice presidency, it would be because Stevenson couldn't stand Kefauver, and Humphrey was too liberal to tie up with Stevenson, and you could gain the Catholic vote, and for other reasons but partly the appeal to the Catholic vote by choosing Kennedy—and that there were things that balanced Kennedy against a middle Southerner like Gore [Albert Gore, Sr.], for example, or Kerr [Robert S. Kerr]. And they were all operating on the assumption

[-13-]

that this was going to be a decision that Stevenson made. That is why everybody was so attuned to the question of who was going to make the nominating speech and who Stevenson was going to designate for that. Well, on Wednesday night—I guess it was Wednesday night or Thursday night, I am not sure which—after Stevenson was nominated, he did in fact throw the Convention open—I think it was Thursday night—to a free choice of the vice president for the first time I think in many, many years—the first time probably in modern history. I will never forget trying to get from Convention Hall back to the Hilton to see what was going to happen; the Kennedy suite was mobbed, that was the most people that were ever in it. And the problem developed to put together a floor organization for a real

[-14-]

fight for the nomination within a matter of 18 hours or less.

There are two things that I remember about that. The first is something serious, and that is that the central effort here was really led by John Bailey. John is an old machine politician. He doesn't have much sense of, or respect for, or feeling for, mass movements in the party or mass participation in politics. In Connecticut he believed in and ran a tightly controlled machine in which leadership was the important thing. I have always remembered that when we tried to register in Connecticut as Democrats, way back in 1949 in New Haven, we really had to run a gauntlet to register as a Democrat and fight our way in. Because the more Democrats that were registered as Democrats, the harder it was to control the party caucus

[-15-]

that nominated the county committeemen and the town committeemen, et cetera. And that is the kind of operation Bailey ran. His contacts were with the machine leaders throughout the country, with people who had much the same kind of philosophy of leadership that he did. Also primarily with Catholic leaders. Lawrence [David Leo Lawrence], Daley [Richard J. Daley], who was the Ohio fellow, I forget. But that was—

GORDON: Mike DiSalle [Michael V. DiSalle]?

CHAYES: No, It was a guy in Cleveland, [Anthony J. Celebrezze], I forget his name. The Boston group, Carmine DeSapio [Carmine D. DeSapio], those were the people that Bailey immediately fanned out to, and it was superbly efficient operation. They did snap to. They didn't have very much use either for Kefauver or Humphrey. Kennedy, for a lot of reasons, was a very attractive candidate to them, and they did, as I say,

[-16-]

snap to and very quickly put together a very powerful organization.

I remember two other things from that night. One was that Toni, with her usual good sense, at about 1 o'clock in the morning said, "Look, this place is mobbed tonight. They have

more people than they can possibly use. They are all going to be here until 4 o'clock in the morning, and then tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock when somebody is really needed, all these people are going to be dead. You know, fagged out and sleeping somewhere. What we ought to do is go home and sleep now so we can appear at 8 o'clock tomorrow morning when there will really be something to do." Which we did. And that meant we really did have quite a good look at the early morning preparations of the vice presidential day itself.

The other was that Mrs. Kennedy [Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy], who

[-17-]

was then just beginning to be pregnant, wandered around that room in what, oh I wouldn't say was a daze, but she kept asking "Really do you think Jack has a chance?" She came up to me, whom she didn't know at all, and in this very, almost bewildered way kept.... We were over near the window, I remember very vividly, looking out, we were up on the 10th or 12th floor of the Conrad-Hilton, which faces Lake Michigan, and you could look right out in the dark over Grant Park and still see the lights shining on the Lake. We stood there in the window looking out, and she kept asking in this, as I say, almost bewildered way, "Do you really think Jack.... Is there any chance? There isn't any chance, is there?" That kind of thing.

Well, we did get back early the next morning. The only person there that time was

[-18-]

John Bailey when we arrived at about 8 o'clock, and he was lining up all the meetings for Kennedy and the Kennedy people to go to prior to the opening...

GORDON: Had he gone to sleep early?

CHAYES: I don't know.

GORDON: Or does he just not need sleep?

CHAYES: Well, he also doesn't drink. You know, John Bailey doesn't drink, doesn't ever take a drink, but at the same time he is not censorious or anything about it. He just sits around and lets other people drink, and thus conserves his energy and increases his intelligence.

GORDON: Had you met Jack by this time?

CHAYES: I had just met him and shaken hands with him a couple of times—not very much. The most I saw of him was on the day of the vice presidential nomination itself.

[-19-]

GORDON: It might be worth, even though they were just fleeting.... Were you surprised? Where was your first contact with him?

CHAYES: Well, actually, I don't really have any remembrances of Jack Kennedy himself. Incidentally, I knew him quite well from that time on. Not intimately by any means, but I think it is well to get down generally what the degree of my relationship with him was.

I never called him Jack, even when he was a Senator. I called him Senator. He called me Abe, he always knew me on a first-name basis, which was perfectly right and proper, but I never felt that I knew him well enough to call him Jack even as a Senator and certainly not after he became President. Well, I probably saw more of him, if you just take hours, after he became President than before. But I was probably

[-20-]

closer to him before he became President than after, and knew more in general about what he was thinking and what his plans were. Before he was President, I saw him maybe a dozen times between 1956 and 1960; after he was President, I would see him two or three times a month, something like that, in one way or another, usually very briefly and without having much personal.... Well, I will turn it around, it was usually much more personal than official. It was usually a personal interchange rather than an official interchange. So that I don't lay claim to being at all in the inner circle. I do lay claim to having seen this man early and seen that he really had something and being with him enough to verify that over time.

Now when we got there the next day I have always thought that this characteristic

[-21-]

of Bailey's, who was really in essence putting the organization together, the characteristic I have talked about, very largely accounted for the terrific showing that Kennedy made. But it also accounted for Kennedy's not going over the top in the vice presidential voting there. Bailey just couldn't conceive of delegates exercising independent judgment. If you look at the California delegation or the Michigan delegation or the Minnesota—well, Minnesota was for Humphrey—but a lot of the mountain states' and plains states' delegations in the Democratic Party aren't pledged; they aren't controlled by leaders; they are, if not largely, at least 50-50 liberal delegations—they were in the 1950's. And if Bailey had used a man like Bowles, for example, just to go around to those delegations and talk to them in behalf

[-22-]

of Kennedy—and Bowles would have had to do so if Kennedy had asked him—he might really have picked up the few votes that Kennedy needed to go over the top. But Bailey just could not conceive that there was any real virtue in talking to delegates as people. And so he never did that, and that never happened.

GORDON: Bowles, I take it, was not committed at that time.

CHAYES: He was a member of the Connecticut Delegation. He was three years an ex-Ambassador. He was looking for a way back into politics. It is true he was an old friend of Hubert Humphrey's, but he didn't really have any commitment to Humphrey and he was one of Bailey's guys, and Bailey could have insisted that he do something of this kind. Bailey never did. As a result, Bowles was out of the thing entirely. That, too, I think, led to a

[-23-]

relationship between Bowles and Kennedy of less than full confidence and less than full give and take that bore its fruit later on in time.

GORDON: You keep mentioning Bailey in connection with these arrangements. Was Kennedy himself in evidence?

CHAYES: I didn't see much of Kennedy until after we got over to the Convention Hall. Even then Kennedy, I think, went to see delegations, he saw people and so on, but it seemed to me—and I may be wrong, because I was observing this from the outside although everything happened in a relatively small room: it was a suite with a main room in a T-shape and then two smaller rooms under each angle of the T. Most of what went on, went on out in plain view, or you could see what was going on. Yes, Kennedy was there when Carmine DeSapio came in for a conference.

[-24-]

The conference was with Kennedy and Bailey and others—I don't remember exactly who.

GORDON: Did Kennedy impress you, well, how? As intense or casual or....

CHAYES: Well, again let me say I didn't see him until later in the day. When the Convention session began I stayed back in the Conrad-Hilton. Then they had forgotten some sheets—there was a mimeographed sheet of Kennedy's agricultural record which they decided they needed over there to distribute to the delegates and...

GORDON: That is his voting record on agricultural matters?

CHAYES: That's right. I think it was the only piece of literature that Kennedy produced for this vice presidential effort. It was a mimeographed sheet of his agricultural voting record. They left it over in the hotel. I was there in the hotel, and they called back for it, so I

[-25-]

volunteered to take it over to the Convention Hall. I delivered it at the Stockyards Inn where there was again a suite where the candidate was waiting while everything went on down on the floor. And there I got quite a good glimpse over a period of a couple or hours of Kennedy.

Some things stand out very vividly in my mind, and it was really observing him in that situation that convinced me that this was the fellow I wanted to be for. It is very interesting to think how little things impress you, having nothing to do really with policy or purpose. One of them was that, as the voting progressed, it looked as though Kennedy was going to win, and the TV and press began to gather outside in the hall outside the room. Now, some of us, Sorensen and O'Donnell and others, were sitting in one room watching the TV, and Kennedy was resting

[-26-]

across the hall in a room that also had a TV set but didn't have a telephone. The phone rang and Mrs. Kennedy was on the phone, and she wanted to talk to him.

GORDON: Jackie, I assume, or Rose [Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy]?

CHAYES: No, No, Jackie. So I went across the hall to knock on the door across the hall to get him over to answer the telephone. Well, he came to the door in his shorts. And there were just a mass of photographers, and particularly a *Time-Life* guy right up in the front row with his camera all set to go, and I had visions of Kennedy in his shorts plastered all over the cover of every magazine in the country. So I stopped him and said, "Look you don't want to go out like that; there is a *Time-Life* photographer right over there." And he sort of banged on the door and said, "Look, I know these fellows. They are not going to take advantage of me." And he said this in a voice that wasn't loud, but

[-27-]

it was loud enough for them to hear. Then he walked across the hall, and nobody took a picture. It seemed to me that was pretty masterful. It was not only masterful in getting across without having pictures taken, but in establishing the sense of confidence and trust, and it made everybody feel good; everybody felt marvelous, and still nobody took a picture.

GORDON: Were there women present among the photographers?

CHAYES: Oh, I don't know.

GORDON: Would he have any reason to know that a man would be on the other side of that door when he threw it open?

CHAYES: Well, he didn't throw it open. He was talking to me through a chink in the door first. No, it wasn't anything like that.
Then later on as the balloting went further, it really looked as though he was

going to win. You know, I mean, everybody

[-28-]

was urging him to go over to Estes Kefauver's suite and shake Estes' hand. You know, not make Kefauver come to him; that that would be a gracious gesture, to go to Kefauver first. And he insisted that you couldn't go until you had won; that you hadn't won, and until you had won, you didn't know how it was going to come out, and he was not going to anticipate the result. Well, all the people around him—the most hard-headed—were sure that he had had it. And he wasn't that is all. It was partly fastidiousness, but it was partly a very hard-headed kind of detachment that surpassed the detachment that anybody around him was able to muster that permitted him, required him in fact, to hold out until he was sure what happened. Then, when he found out what did happen, he went over to Kefauver's suite anyway, as obviously he should.

GORDON: You didn't think he actually had any advance information at that point?

CHAYES: Oh, it was impossible. I mean the thing was

[-29-]

moving so fast. As a matter of fact, it is my feeling, I have always thought so, that if the delegates on the floor had as good information about the ballot count, about the voting, as the TV viewer had, Kennedy would have won. Because at one time he was within 10 votes or something, of having won. And if the people on the floor had known that for certain, he would have gotten the extra 10 votes, you couldn't have stopped the stampede to be the 10th extra vote. But the fact is, the situation is so confused on the floor, people know so little about it, that nobody ever knew that he was that close. I remember once on a ballot when Michigan was called and announced, Michigan casts forty-four votes for Kefauver. Michigan had forty-four votes altogether. This represented a shift of only two or three votes because forty-one

[-30-]

of the votes had already been cast for Kefauver. But placed in the framework of a change of vote at the end of a ballot, it sounded like an immense swing. And indeed I think that was one of the things that started—at least either stemmed the Kennedy tide or developed momentum...

GORDON: As I remember, it was the Gore announcement that really...

CHAYES: Well, then that, yes. Then that was the...

GORDON: That really was a switch. He switched Tennessee's vote...

CHAYES: Yes, that is right. But we all knew that when Gore switched, he couldn't switch his votes to Kennedy. We counted those votes as gone to Kefauver. It was obvious that Gore couldn't take Tennessee votes to Kennedy. That is quite right. But those discountings didn't get themselves onto the floor of the Convention.

[-31-]

No, I don't think there was any advance knowledge. I think it was a very confused thing. He just is the kind of fellow who simply will not count chickens until they are hatched, which was very characteristic of him all along—and one of the very attractive things about him. It was a coolness, a detachment. No lack of passion to win, he was as involved as anybody. But still, being so involved, his ability to withdraw and look at the thing more coolly and with more balance than others, who had much less to gain or lose than he, was a very powerful attribute. Well, that is all we really knew of the Convention.

There was then a great blood brotherhood. I remember at the end of that Convention everybody wallowed in Democratic sentiment. All of the young turks and old turks and middle aged turks marched up onto the platform after the...

[-32-]

GORDON: Kennedy wasn't bitter, was he? Because I think that, watching it, I remember there were many people who felt there might have been cause for bitterness. There was a sudden switch...

CHAYES: There was a sudden switch, and there was a problem with who got recognized from the chair...

GORDON: The question in my mind, and in many people's I was watching it with, as to whether Stevenson had not reneged on his promise to leave it open.

CHAYES: I don't think so. I don't think so. And I think that although Kennedy may have felt for awhile, for a few moments or hours or something, a certain resentment—not resentment because he was not like that, but a disappointment—I think in the end he realized that it really was the best thing for him. And it didn't take too

[-33-]

long. By the time we got back to Cambridge we were clear that Stevenson was not going to win. Everybody knew Stevenson couldn't win that election. So Kennedy, starting from nowhere, had really been the hero, kind of, of the Convention. He had emerged as a national figure; he had narrated the movie; he had nominated Stevenson; he had almost won the vice presidency against much better-organized, much better-known people; and he didn't have to take the stigma of defeat in the election. So I think it didn't take him very long to realize that

he was better off not having had it. Although like all of those things, if you are in the running, you have got to try, and then you get caught up in the try.

But over and over again in the 1960 campaign when he would go to a state whose delegates had not voted for him for Vice President

[-34-]

in 1956, he would always begin his remarks by thanking them for having spared him the defeat. And I think there is no question that he knew that this was a good result for him.

GORDON: So, what happened after the Convention? You went home? What was the next involvement you had with him?

CHAYES: Well, just briefly, before he came back on the scene. It has always amused me that we came back, and the day after the election in November, Toni and I announced for Kennedy for 1960.

GORDON: For President.

CHAYES: For President, that's right. And you hear so much about Kennedy and Harvard in these latter years, but we were very lonely souls in that University in 1956. There was not very much support for Kennedy. Most people were Stevensonians or were looking for some

[-35-]

other so-called liberal candidate. People like Schlesinger [Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.] or Galbraith [John Kenneth Galbraith] weren't close to being for Kennedy. And I remember dinner party after dinner party in which we argued and talked for him. In fact, we would always be driven back to the position that said, "Well, at least don't cut the links between this man and the liberal intellectual group. Don't write him off because at least he is in the running for the presidency. He may be the nominee. And if he is the nominee, we don't want to be completely cut off from him." So, we were thrust back on that kind of a defensive position for two years.

GORDON: What were their objections?

CHAYES: Well, generally, that he was not experienced; that he was not a liberal; that he was a son of Joe Kennedy [Joseph P. Kennedy, Sr.] . The Catholic issue was involved. His position

[-36-]

on McCarthy [Joseph R. McCarthy] in the 50's was very strongly remembered. People of this kind in the academic community who live and vote in and around Boston are very suspicious

of the Irish Catholic political leadership, whom they regard with a certain amount of distaste, a certain amount of feeling that they run the state to no good end.

GORDON: Did they know him at this time really?

CHAYES: Not many of these people knew him very well personally. And it is very interesting that you ask that because that is the way he won the Harvard community—by a series of personal appearances, many of which I arranged, in fairly small groups of faculty people in which he did what he has always been best at; answered questions, submitted himself openly and freely to questions on anything that anybody wanted to ask him.

[-37-]

He demonstrated that way his beautifully subtle and discriminating mastery of both the facts of any problem and the considerations bearing on a solution to it. I remember in particular one night—this may have been as late as 1959—when we set up a meeting for him at the Faculty Club with a fairly large number of law school professors. And that was the night that Mark Howe [Mark DeWolfe Howe] and Paul Freund [Paul A. Freund] and Dick Field [Richard H. Field] and others came home and said, "We are for him." Now, Howe, in particular, was very sensitive to the record of candidates on civil rights and civil liberties and challenged Kennedy very sharply on those matters and came away completely satisfied. And the same with Freund. So that this is the way he got the faculty at Harvard and got the academic community behind him—by a series of relatively intimate personal contacts with them.

[-38-]

GORDON: To go back to 1956, right after the election, were there any other people on the faculty who...

CHAYES: I don't remember any at all. Now there probably were, and in the archives of the Kennedy Library there will probably be even more who claim they were. But the fact is I don't think there were very many. He was not highly regarded in the Harvard community at that time.

GORDON: Did you have any reason to believe that Kennedy and his friends were already working toward 1960 at that time?

CHAYES: I am sure they were. I mean, I didn't have any other reason than my deductions from the Convention, but it was very clear to me, and we would get a little inkling out of Ted Sorensen occasionally. Toni corresponded with him, as I said. But it was clear to me that you didn't do what you

[-39-]

did in 1956, and then walk away from it and leave it.

GORDON: But when you say you declared, you and Toni, this was a private commitment on your part, you didn't join an organization.

CHAYES: Oh no, there was no organization. What we said is, "Looking over the field, this is the man we think is the best man, and we are for him, and we are going to work for him."

GORDON: And when he forms an organization or when he starts making moves in this direction, then we will...

CHAYES: Right, the first move came in about January of 1958, which was an election year, and Kennedy was running for the Senate. Ted Sorensen called me, and a number of others, and said he wanted to put together an academic group to work—not to work in the campaign at all. This group had very

[-40-]

little relation to the senatorial campaign—to talk with Kennedy when he came up, to make available their ideas to him, to discuss his ideas, or comment on his ideas on a no-questions-asked basis.

As a matter of fact, about half of that group were avowed Republicans. Bart Leach [W. Barton Leach] was in that group, Arthur Sutherland [Arthur Eugene Sutherland, Jr.] from the Law School; Henry Kissinger [Henry A. Kissinger] was in the group, although he had worked for Rockefeller [Nelson A. Rockefeller] and, I guess, was going to work for Rockefeller again in 1960. The group was set up as a bunch of people with whom Kennedy could communicate, or people on Kennedy's staff could communicate, to tap expert knowledge on whatever it was they wanted to tap, who would feel free to make whatever comments they wanted, who would feel free to make whatever comments they wanted, who would feel free, if they chose, to send him ideas and

[-41-]

suggestions in their field of study. But there was no political commitment involved at all. There was no organization to that group at all. It was nominally under the chairmanship of Earl Latham [Earl Ganson Latham] who was a half-year at Cambridge that year, but was really then a Professor at Amherst so that there was no way that he could perform organizational or leadership functions. It was very loosely organized. Usually people were activated by a call from Ted Sorensen or somebody down there in Washington and prepared a paper directly for Ted. Kennedy came up to Cambridge to see that bunch maybe three or four times during the year. We had a lunch or something, and Kennedy would talk to us. And again, the most effective part of his talk would be his few remarks. He had even then, as he always did, a terrific sense, a self-deprecatory sense, of humor. But he would talk a very

little about how people in Washington needed the advice of and contribution of people like us in the academic community. He would say that with enough grains of salt on both sides so that you knew that he knew just how much truth there was in it—there is a certain amount of truth in it—and then throw himself open to questions or he would go around.... I remember one time...

GORDON: I have got the feeling from others and from talking to you about this same thing—and I wonder if you would comment on it—that maybe there was salt in it. But wasn't there also (1) a tremendous respect really for these people, and (2) a sense of replenishing himself in some way or freshening his ideas, I don't know how you would put it exactly, by periodic consultation with this group?

CHAYES: There was certainly the first. I don't mean

to say that he didn't have respect for this group. He did. But nobody understood better than he the long route that things have to travel between the scholar and the man who has to do something about it, and the different perspective that each looks at the problem from. So when I say there were grains of salt, all I mean is that really he wasn't snowing anybody. He wasn't really trying to tell us that we were the pillars of the republic, which wouldn't have gone over at all because most of us knew also how much of a contribution we could make.

GORDON: He was very clear on the fact that he wasn't going to take an idea from Cambridge and embody it in the law of tomorrow in Washington.

CHAYES: That is right. And more than that he had a sound perception of the relation between the scholarly community and the governmental community. And that I think gained him more

respect than if he had tried to make more of it than it was. I remember Nixon [Richard Milhous Nixon] much later came around and tried to do the same thing at Harvard and did in a minor way. But one of the problems was that he tried to tell everybody that they were the essential, the indispensable element. That doesn't wash with a group of people, of whatever party, who are really seriously thinking about where they stand as academic people. Kennedy never patronized us, and he never tried to say that we were worth more than we were. But at the same time you had, as you say, the sense that he respected us and what we were doing, and he knew that we did have a real relation to what he was doing. He didn't try to

exaggerate it. Once he went around this whole table of maybe thirty professors, all of them quite distinguished, and asked each of them to say

[-45-]

what it was in his particular field that people should be working at in Washington and weren't. I can't remember what any of us said. I just remember a terrible sense of inadequacy in the response of this collection of brains; nobody really was able to come up with anything terribly important.

GORDON: Where did you meet incidentally?

CHAYES: Oh, sometimes at the Harvard Club, once at the Ritz, once at the Faculty Club. Mostly at the Harvard Club. Three or four times at the Harvard Club.

GORDON: Were the sessions recorded in any way?

CHAYES: No, I don't think there is any record of them at all. They were off-the-cuff sessions. Not that there was anything private, but nobody thought they were historic enough to record.

GORDON: How much were they political as far as he was concerned?

[-46-]

CHAYES: Very little. It was very interesting really from the beginning, and this became more and more intense as time went on. What he asked these people to do was make expert judgments and leave the political discounting to him. He didn't want us figuring out his political problems for him. What amount of trimming or modifying or compromise he would have to do was a judgment that he wanted to make. He didn't want us to make it for him and then give him a doctored version based on our judgment of what he could take politically. This was really very good all the way along. And that was made very explicit too, that he was going to have to make political judgments about what he did with what we supplied. But that they were his judgments, not ours.

GORDON: I think I had in mind a somewhat different sense of political. How much was the whole thing a sort of gimmick to enlist the kind

[-47-]

of support from this important segment of American life?

CHAYES: I think this was a very important part of it. Kennedy knew, I think, quite coldly that as you looked at the range of Democratic candidates—

Stevenson, Humphrey, and so on—he was lacking this association in the popular mind and in the academic mind with academics and intellectuals. And so I think an important part of the conscious motivation here was to establish this kind of contact and was to find a way of winning people of this kind over. On the other hand, it is also true that Kennedy is, as everybody now knows although few knew then, a literate man and a cultured man and a man with an intellectual bent, and he was all the time.

GORDON: Would you answer the question why were people so surprised by it?

CHAYES: Well, because they saw him quite differently,

[-48-]

obviously. They saw him in terms of different stereotypes. He isn't and wasn't the typical sort of scholarly fellow. He wasn't like Woodrow Wilson, who everybody knew was an intellectual, or Stevenson. Like all of his qualities, Kennedy tended to deprecate them in himself and in others. He didn't like any of them to be exaggerated or put up as a sort of overriding objective. He wanted balance among all of them, and so he deprecated all of them to bring them down into balance.

GORDON: Frankly, I think that after three years in office, unless you had read some of the things that were written about Kennedy, just from his speeches and television appearances and behavior in public ways, I don't think that most people still would have the impression of the depth and breadth of his intellectuality.

CHAYES: Well, except you knew that, first of all, his mastery of problems was. The way he dealt with

[-49-]

problems, his characteristic modes of analysis, his verbal style in speech and writing, his knowledge of history, and so on.

GORDON: Did that change, perhaps, in some way? His verbal style I was thinking of.

CHAYES: No, I don't think so.

GORDON: His campaign speeches in '52 and '58 were.

CHAYES: I never heard any in '52, but I heard him speak a lot in '58 and '59, and I heard him speak a little bit in '56. And I didn't find much change. Of course, when he was in the White House, he got to hone things a little more. You have a little more resources to put into these things, and that may develop a higher polish. But essentially, I think he was.... He wrote a book, after all, in 1939, long before he was a figure on the political scene.

GORDON: Of course, his enemies claim that Sorensen wrote it for him.

CHAYES: No, I think the earlier book was also a prize

[-50-]

book, wasn't it? *Why England Slept*. Didn't that have...

GORDON: No.

CHAYES: Well, but it was a book that had had quite an appeal, and it was produced by a kid just out of college, in fact, which is really quite a feat. If you wonder about what Sorensen did, I don't have any knowledge, but I am sure Kennedy had a lot to do with that book, *Profiles in Courage*.

GORDON: Now to get back to '58, what effect did the Disclaimer Affidavit in connection with the National...

CHAYES: Actually that didn't develop until '59. It got there by some stages. First of all...

GORDON: In the first place I am not, frankly, terribly clear what we are talking about. There was a National Educational Act—or do you want to get to this?

CHAYES: Well, let me just get in two things, rather

[-51-]

quick ones. I think the main thing Kennedy got out of the academic group in the '58 period was that Archie Cox [Archibald Cox] out of the Harvard Law School went down to work on the Landrum-Griffin Act. And I think this is another example of Kennedy's just picking excellence. He didn't ask what Archie was, and I don't know what Archie was. I am not sure Archie was a Democrat then, probably he was. But Kennedy just went for the best man in the labor law field, and that was Archie. Archie came down and then worked through the Landrum-Griffin Act with him.

Then, in the beginning of 1960—January of 1960—Sorensen came down from Washington for one of these meetings. It turned out to be a lousy day. It was a Sunday and it rained. Kennedy was grounded in Washington and couldn't get up, so the meeting was called off. But Mark Howe and I

[-52-]

met with Sorensen in the Parker House, and Sorensen laid out what the program now was. I am not sure it was January. It may have been a couple of months earlier, in 1960. But

anyway the point had come to get on the train or get off. This was the time that all people who weren't prepared to commit to the presidential race were supposed to. There were no vindictive departures, but just the same, this was now being turned into a partisan personal piece of machinery, and people were given a full opportunity to make their choice. But they had to make it then.

And then the question was how to give it some more formal organization. Mark and I at that breakfast recommended Archie Cox to Ted. We said the really important thing was to have a fellow in Cambridge who knew Kennedy intimately, who had the confidence Kennedy, and who could reach him on day-to-day basis. Archie was the only one who really

[-53-]

filled that bill at that time because they had worked so closely on the Landrum-Griffin Bill. So out of that meeting Archie was offered and did become the chairman or the director of the Cambridge group for the period of the primaries and the pre-Convention campaign.

One of the issues that I thought was very interesting was, as you say, the National Education Act Loyalty Disclaimer. The Act provided for scholarships or fellowships in various fields of study—I think mostly scientific and not much liberal arts. It required the people who received funds to make a disclaimer. It wasn't an oath or affidavit, but they did have to sign some disclaimer of affiliation with communist organizations. don't even remember whether it went beyond communist to communist-front or Attorney General's list or whatever it was. I think it

[-54-]

was just communist or organizations advocating the overthrow of the government by force and violence. The question of eliminating that disclaimer from the bill became an important issue in the spring of 1960, right during the primary period. Some of the Universities were very strongly against it. Pusey [Nathan March Pusey] of Harvard testified very strongly against it. Some of the Universities took corporate action to dissociate themselves from the program because the funds were paid out by the Universities, and the Universities had to administer the disclaimer which they found peculiarly offensive.

GORDON: You mean some of them refused to participate in the program? In other words, they wouldn't take students with scholarships under this Act?

CHAYES: Well, partly it was because they, the Universities themselves, disbursed the funds so they had to administer the disclaimer. I remember people

[-55-]

saying, "Well, if a student wants to take it with a government agency, that is his business and the government agency's business. But why involve the University in the process of overseeing the beliefs of its students, even this small group of students, when the University by hypothesis ought to be different?"

Kennedy made a very strong effort to knock out the disclaimer. In fact, he got it sharply modified that year, and then later, while he was President, I think it was eliminated altogether. He didn't make, by any means, the best speech on it. The best speech was made by Gene McCarthy [Eugene J. McCarthy]. It is really a classic speech on test oaths and loyalty oaths. But he fought a very dogged fight and, as I say, eventually got some watering down or some modification. I can't remember exactly what it was, but it can be found in the public record.

[-56-]

The real question that I have always wondered about is the motivation of that fight. It was a significant thing in the academic community, but it wasn't the kind of thing that one would have thought Kennedy ordinarily would bother himself with. I always thought at the time—maybe in hindsight I would change or modify the view a little bit, but certainly at the time—and for quite a long while, I thought that the principal reason why Kennedy spent as much time and as much effort as he did in this was to erase or modify the hangover of his...

GORDON: Taint?

CHAYES: Yes, taint. Well, taint is a strong word—but the hangover of his conduct in the McCarthy period.

GORDON: Were you involved in any conferences about his stand on this?

CHAYES: Oh yes. He never mentioned this in any conferences, but he knew very well that one

[-57-]

of the questions that he was almost always asked in any academic gathering, in any group of professors, had to do with the McCarthy business. Students asked him, at least on the eastern seaboard, a good deal. And it was not as easy a record to defend as all that although I think I once knew the whole defense, and if you really knew all the facts, it was not as bad as all that either. It boiled down to a question of taking the initiative. But then, who did take the initiative in those days? There are not many people who, judged by that standard, were entitled to very high marks. But I think he knew that he needed something to offset this memory that was in people's minds. People would say also that Kennedy could have done this with much less risk After all, he was an Irish Catholic, as was McCarthy. He was in Boston. He couldn't

[-58-]

have lost. And so on. Of course, it is easy to discount other people's risks. But there was some sense in which people thought he had a special obligation to take a stand against McCarthy.

GORDON: Did you ever hear him talk about McCarthy?

CHAYES: Only in meetings. I never asked him directly about it.

GORDON: Did you have any clue as to what his personal feelings were or...

CHAYES: Oh, I think he regarded McCarthy with distaste personally. You know McCarthy, if you remember him, is the kind of gross and uncultivated and undisciplined fellow that Kennedy was bound to regard with distaste personally. But I do think he calculated his stance towards McCarthy politically, and I don't think he regretted it in any sense, nor do I think he felt that he had any really moral failure to account for. But I do think in late 1960 he knew that

[-59-]

politically he needed something to offset that, and I think the loyalty oath, or loyalty disclaimer, was an obvious candidate. I know I argued very strongly with Sorensen and others for a strong stand on the issues on this very ground. And then I used it in argument once he took a stand. So I was very sensitive to that part of it.

GORDON: Did Kennedy have any discussions with any of the professors about the technicalities or the spirit, do you get the feeling, or do you know that any of his arguments or thoughts on the subject...

CHAYES: I think Mark Howe wrote some things for him at my request, not only on loyalty oaths, but on civil rights. He consulted Paul Freund—interesting in view of today's discussions—on the Jury Trial Amendment of the 1959 Civil Rights Bill, which was the forerunner of the Jury Trial Amendment in the current bill,

[-60-]

and voted for the Jury Trial Amendment on Paul's advice.

GORDON: I am not sure what that means. He voted for a jury trial?

CHAYES: That's right. The question was whether you could get a jury in a contempt of court proceeding after you had violated an injunction. The argument of the pro-civil rights people was that the southern juries would let everybody off and, therefore, the whole thing would fail. The compromise was worked out that you could get a jury trial if the penalty was more than a certain amount. I think Paul, who is a balanced man-of-the-middle himself, wrote a very good defense of that, and I think more on the basis of Paul's argumentation than anything else, Kennedy decided to vote for the jury trial amendment. I think he was receptive to that kind of argument. I have talked to people about that and I don't

[-61-]

think the vote was dictated so much by politics as it was by Paul's argument.

GORDON: What makes you say Kennedy was receptive to this kind of argument?

CHAYES: Well, because I think he resisted pushing any position to an extreme. He didn't like to push positions to extremes. He knew that if you followed any position logically to its end you got to a dogmatic kind of stance that just was not viable s o he was always looking to balance principles with equally valid principles that were also involved. He always knew that things weren't just one dimensional. This is part of it. And so he was receptive to an argument that would show that, from the point of view of history and constitutional tradition and practice and practicality, the Jury Trial Amendment was a proper kind of accommodation. I think it was in 1959, and I think it may very well

[-62-]

be today. I don't have much trouble with a properly drawn Jury Trial Amendment. I think it is interesting to talk about—in this stage and in the later stage, because the mechanics shifted a little bit after the Convention, but the practical results were no different—just how much Kennedy did rely on the academic group. And I think it is true that on specific legislative matters like Landrum-Griffin, like the Loyalty Affidavit, like the Civil Rights Act, he did get a good deal from them. But on broader policy stances, but on ideas for the future, I think he got less from the academic group. Especially as he got into the campaign, he got less and less from the academic group. We put a lot of stuff down into Washington. Very little of it emerged in his speeches primarily because he got a very good format of his own, and it worked with a crowd, and you just have so many speeches

[-63-]

to make that you can't write them all. A good deal of it got out into statements and releases and things of that kind. They issued statements or formal pronouncements on a number of issues that really came out of Washington rather than out of the campaign train. And often our material got into those. But very, very little of it, I think, got into actual speeches made by the candidate. This was less true in the primary period. He made a fine speech on disarmament in Dartmouth in the New Hampshire primary campaign and that was prepared largely by Jerry Wiesner [Jerome B. Wiesner]. It won Jerry Wiesner to the Kennedy cause when Kennedy made that speech. Jerry always kept wondering why he never got back to that speech. And I suppose he never did until the American University speech really.

GORDON: That was the Test Ban Treaty.

CHAYES: Well, I say that began with the American

University speech. But that was the watershed for Jerry. Later when Jerry was considering whether to come down as Science Adviser, he really made the judgment almost wholly in terms of that speech.

GORDON: It is interesting that you put those speeches together, that you associate them, the American University speech and the Dartmouth speech.

CHAYES: Well, they were. It took Kennedy a long time to get back to the Dartmouth College speech. As to my own personal role at the pre-Convention period, Bowles was made Chairman of the Platform Committee. I had fought with Bowles during the whole spring to come out for Kennedy. He eventually did come out for Kennedy and was given the title of Foreign Policy Adviser. But he never came out whole-heartedly for Kennedy. He always insisted that he would not go into the Wisconsin primary, for instance, and campaign against Humphrey.

And he didn't go into any of the contested primaries and really put it on the line for Kennedy. This was partly because of his friendship with Humphrey and Stevenson. But others were friendly with Humphrey and Stevenson. So it was also partly a measure of the fact that he never really was, in his own mind, committed to Kennedy. He never really knew how fully he accepted Kennedy as a real exemplar of the liberal tradition in American politics or how fully he was accepted by Kennedy. His own status with Kennedy was always a source of concern with him, and that very fact made it less solid than it might have been. That was one of the things that contributed to it not being so solid. I think I was the most influential person in getting him to commit as far as he did. I argued long and strenuously for him to commit and eventually he did, at least for

public purposes, commit himself to Kennedy. Then, what is his name who was then Chairman of the Democratic Party, Paul M. [Paul M. Butler]....

GORDON: Oh, I know the guy you mean, had grey hair....

CHAYES: Yes, tall, thin man with.... Well, he named Bowles as Chairman of the Platform Committee, which was a relief to Bowles because it meant he was then relieved of formal campaigning duties. Chet asked me to be the director of the staff of the Platform Committee. What interests me about this is how little contact Kennedy had at all with the platform. He talked to Chet twice, I think, before the Convention. I flew up with him one time to Boston on his plane. Walt Rostow [Walt Whitman Rostow] was on the same flight, and that meant that I had very little chance to talk to Kennedy. But I

did talk to him a little bit about the platform. The only issue that he was concerned about at all was the civil rights plank and whether the South

[-67-]

would walk out, whether we would be able to get a civil rights plank that was strong enough and the South wouldn't walk out on, and he asked me to stay in touch with him on that. That was the only platform issue he had any worry about at all. There was another interesting matter on that flight; he knew Toni much better than he knew me in 1956. And whenever he saw her afterwards, he kept telling her, he wanted her in Los Angeles for the 1960 Convention. So after he had talked to me a bit on this flight about the platform, why, Walt Rostow took over, and he spent the rest of the time talking to Walt. And I couldn't get a word in edgewise. But I remember just as we were circling to land—and this was the day when those tornadoes hit Worcester; we came down right where the tornadoes were going twenty or thirty miles to the west.

[-68-]

It was quite a landing—I said, "Well, you always said you wanted Toni out at the Convention. Now how are we going to get her out there?" And he said, "Yes, put her on 'X' plane and tell so and so about it." And it happened like that. There wasn't any problem about it. He really did want her out there. And he did take her out there, and that was fine.
He did not see the text of the platform in draft. I think Bob Kennedy [Robert F. Kennedy] read it once in early draft, but spent only half an hour looking at it.

GORDON: Incidentally, I think this is about the first time you mentioned Bob Kennedy.

CHAYES: Yes, this is the first time I met him, at the Convention in 1960.

GORDON: I gather he wasn't much in evidence then.

CHAYES: Not in this aspect. In 1956, he was not much in evidence at all. And in the aspect of

[-69-]

the pre-campaign activities that I am talking about, he wasn't in evidence at all. I mean he just wasn't part of this at all.

GORDON: Do you think he was kept away from the academic community?

CHAYES: Oh, I don't think kept away was the right word. I don't think he was much interested in it, and I don't think he would have been very good at it at that time. I think he would be better at it now. But at that time his interests were

quite different. There were lots of other things that he had to be doing and this really wasn't really worth the allocation of his time or energy, given his talents and his interests.

GORDON: However, you have to admit that it was fortunate that he was not much in contact at that time.

CHAYES: Well, I am not sure. You know, he is also a very profound guy in many ways and I think he would have picked up cues very quickly.

[-70-]

I don't think he would have affronted people if this was part of his task. It just didn't need to be. And I am sure he didn't want it be either, you know.

GORDON: But, to get back to the platform.

CHAYES: Yes, I think Kennedy saw a draft of the platform the day before the Committee had its final vote. That is, he saw it when it was already in print because by the time the Platform Committee had its final vote, it was fairly perfunctory at that point. It was after the drafting committee was through with it and we knew that we were going to get it approved on that basis. Kennedy spent about forty-five minutes looking at it and that was it.

Toni spent a good deal of time in that Convention going around with Schlesinger and Galbraith who were by that time fully aboard. No, Schlesinger wasn't. Schlesinger had the most harrowing

[-71-]

Convention. He sat wringing his hands among all his friends. In the great Minnesota fight, he was there just in a transport of self-division. He really didn't do very much at all. He was divided between Kennedy and Humphrey and Stevenson. Galbraith had by that time made a real commitment, and he was set to the task of rounding up the Stevenson delegates—I mean of talking to Stevenson delegates. Toni went with him and saw a good deal of that and saw some of the delegate operation.

The last day when the platform was over and the floor activity began, I was assigned to Abe Ribicoff [Abraham Alexander Ribicoff], who was the floor leader, as his lawyer and interpreter of the rules of the convention. There were a lot of potential problems about unit votes and all that sort of thing. But it was very interesting. That was the first time I have ever heard a

[-72-]

Convention floor leader having a lawyer. Bob Kennedy told me to go with Ribicoff and I knew Ribicoff from Connecticut where I had seen him before in his early days.

Another thing I remember about that Convention, or one little personal impact I had on it was: I wanted Kennedy to make an acceptance speech devoted to the theme of youth. This was a couple of weeks before the Convention. He was being subjected to criticism as a young man and an inexperienced man and so on. And I thought you could really turn this around as he had done to some extent with the religious issue and say: "You are damn right, we are young, we are born of this generation and so on." And he asked me to write something out for him. I wrote about three pages and sent it to him. He used a little bit of it in the acceptance speech, but the main thing he used it for, or the main impact it had on him, was

[-73-]

that when Truman [Harry S. Truman] came out against him on this ground, he responded to Truman right along this line. He really took Truman on the youth issue. This was about three or four days before the Convention. I do think it had some impact in getting into the Convention on a kind of upbeat and without being defensive at all on the question of how young he was. Of course, in the end that did turn out to be one of the big things about the Administration, that it was young and it represented the vitality of young people and the perspective of the generation—he said it in his inaugural—that had grown up during the war and fought the war and so on.

After the Convention, I went back to Cambridge. Archie Cox went down to Washington to handle not the speech writing operation, but the Washington center for gathering data, and I took Archie's place as the coordinator of the

[-74-]

academic bunch in Cambridge. As I have already said, we had very little impact on the actual statements of the candidate. In fact the reverse. There was one that I remember very vividly. It was toward the end. In one of the debates, he criticized the Republicans on Cuba. And then Nixon came back at him, maybe in the debate, but perhaps later, and said: "Well, what do you mean? What would you do?" So we had to come up with some statements on what he would do on Cuba policy. Everybody up in Cambridge, everybody that I talked to, was for coming out for a more forthcoming and lenient and open Cuba policy, trying to get back to a more normal basis of relations with Cuba. We phoned and telegraphed and sent those down there. This was all in a period of twenty-four to forty-eight hours. But instead, he came out with exactly the opposite, this business about training the refugees and

[-75-]

supporting guerrilla activities and so on. That was perhaps the first foreboding one had that Kennedy and Cuba were going to be linked. I was going to say, you know, it was his stumbling block, but of course that was before the November 1962...

GORDON: Nixon, I remember, gave him a hard time about that too and accused him of being irresponsible. Do you think it helped him or hurt him on the campaign?

CHAYES: Oh, I don't...

GORDON: Do you think he would have done better if he had not followed the hard line?

CHAYES: I don't think it would have made one bit of difference. Basically, I don't think it helped him or hurt him in the campaign. I think it hurt him after the election because it was a prominent remark, and I think it made it very hard for him to take any different stand than he did in the Bay of Pigs business.

GORDON: Well, we are reaching the end of this tape, so why don't we stop here.

[END OF INTERVIEW #1]

Abram Chayes Oral History Transcript – JFK #1
Name List

B

Bailey, John Moran, 2, 6, 15, 16, 19, 22, 23, 25
Barton, W. Leach, 41
Bowles, Chester B., 2, 11, 12, 22, 23, 24, 65, 67
Butler, Paul M., 67

C

Celebrezze, Anthony J., 16
Chayes, Antonia H., 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 17, 35, 39, 40, 68, 69, 71, 72
Cox, Archibald, 52, 53, 54, 74

D

Daley, Richard J., 16
DeSapio, Carmine G., 16, 24
DiSalle, Michael V., 16

F

Field, Richard H., 38
Freund, Paul A., 38, 60, 61, 62

G

Galbraith, John Kenneth, 36, 71, 72
Gore, Albert, Sr., 13, 31

H

Harriman, William Averell, 6, 12
Howe, Mark DeWolfe, 38, 52, 53, 60
Humphrey, Hubert E., 8, 13, 16, 22, 23, 48, 65, 66, 72

K

Kefauver, Estes, 8, 13, 16, 29, 30, 31
Kennedy, Jacqueline Bouvier, 17, 27
Kennedy, John F., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 71, 72, 73, 76
Kennedy, Joseph P, Sr., 36
Kennedy, Robert F., 69, 73
Kennedy, Rose Fitzgerald, 27
Kerr, Robert S., 13
Kissinger, Henry A., 41

L

Latham, Earl Ganson, 42
Lawrence, David Leo, 16
Leach, W
Lincoln, Evelyn N., 7

M

McCarthy, Eugene J., 56
McCarthy Joseph R., 37, 57, 58, 59

N

Nixon, Richard Milhous, 45, 75, 76

O

O'Donnell, Kenneth P., 9, 10, 25

P

Pusey, Nathan Marsh, 55

R

Ribicoff, Abraham Alexander, 72, 73
Rockefeller, Nelson A., 41
Rostow, Walt Whitman, 67, 68

S

Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., 36, 71
Sorensen, Theodore C., 9, 10, 11, 25, 39, 40, 42, 50, 51, 52, 53, 60
Stevenson, Adlai E., 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9,13, 14, 33, 34, 35, 48, 49, 66, 72
Sutherland, Arthur Eugene, 41

T

Truman, Harry S., 74

W

Wilson, Woodrow, 49
Wiesner, Jerome B., 64, 65