

The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training
Foreign Affairs Oral History Project

AMBASSADOR DOUGLAS MACARTHUR, II

*Interviewed by: Charles Stuart Kennedy
Initial interview date: December 15, 1986
Copyright 1998 ADST*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background	
Navy childhood	
Education	
Foreign Service Exam	
Career as a seaman	
Vancouver, Canada	1935-1937
Duties at first post	
Social functions of the Foreign Service	
Training in political reporting	
Naples, Italy	1937
Visa fraud	
France	1937-1942
Embassy staff	
French war preparedness	
German refugees	
Embassy to German invasion	
Moving the French government	
Black Forest	1942-1948
Detention	
France	1944-1948
Liberation of Paris	
Contacts with resistance groups	
U.S relations with de Gaulle	
Rise of NATO	
General Eisenhower	
Supporting General Weygand	
Yalta conference	
Russian support of French communist party	

Liberating concentration camps Negotiations with Russians	
Brussels Foreign Minister Henri Spock	1948-1949
Western European Division European Defense Community Relations between State and Defense Departments	1949-1951
Paris Working for General Eisenhower Greece and Turkey German admission to NATO Working with SHAPE staff U.S relations with Russia General Ridgeway Organizing Secretary Dulles' trips	1951-1953
Counselor of the State Department Duties and responsibilities Four power meetings Dealing with Minister Molotov "Positive loyalty" Secretary of State Dulles and Rusk Foreign policy decision making Decolonization Establishing SEATO Austrian treaty Berlin Conference San Francisco summit Geneva summit of 1955 Suez Crisis Hungarian revolt U.S. attitudes towards Far East	1953-1956
Japan Appointment and previous experience with Japan Education, Research, and Development Economic situation Japanese import barriers Prime Minister Kishi Negotiating the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Kishi's resignation and Eisenhower's visit General MacArthur's legacy	1956-1961

Belgium	1961-1965
Political system	
Belgian colonies	
Belgium	1961-1965
Decolonization	
Foreign Minister Spaak	
Taking of hostages in Belgian Congo	
Operation Red Dragon	
Reactions to hostage rescue operation	
Role of CIA	
Congressional Relations	1965-1967
Appointment	
Dealing with Congress	
The need for military forces	
Israeli lobby, Chinese lobby	
Austria	1967-1969
History of Austrian politics	
European Free Trade Association	
Ethnic variations	
Kurt Waldheim	
Conclusion	
Foreign Service as a career	

INTERVIEW

[Note: This transcript was not edited by Ambassador MacArthur.]

Q: Mr. Ambassador, you come from a distinguished military family. Your father was a career naval officer; your uncle was a preeminent military man of the 20th century; your grandfather was Arthur MacArthur, the boy colonel, later our man in the Philippines. What sort of impact did this have on your early boyhood?

MACARTHUR: I think Navy families are a little bit like those ladies of easy virtue; they follow the ships or fleet around, wherever it happens to be--East Coast, West Coast. So at a very young age, we got used to different environments, totally different, East Coast, West Coast, New England, Virginia, Washington. I wouldn't say that one develops a wanderlust, but one develops a curiosity after a while about what's happening in the outside world.

In my case, when I was about 12 or 13 years old, my father was asked to command a ship that took the Secretary of the Navy on a good-will tour to Japan, China. Because the

Secretary had a boy my age, he wanted to take the boy along. So my father was invited to take myself and my brother. When we came to countries like Japan and China, where there were all sorts of ceremonial events and important people, we were often left in the charge of a vice consul. This made a very deep and lasting impression on me at that age, because they spoke the language of the country, they seemed to know a lot, and showed us and explained all sorts of things to us about the country. that otherwise we never would have understood. That was when I decided that I would probably like to be a member of the Foreign Service.

Q: When was this trip taken?

MACARTHUR: 1921.

Q: Your brother took a different course, didn't he?

MACARTHUR: My brother, yes. He went to Harvard University, and then he later studied law. But I came from a long line, as they say, of soldiers and sailors. My other grandfather was Admiral Bowman McCall, who led the American contingent to the relief of Peking during the Boxer Revolution, and also fought in several wars himself.

I think perhaps after two generations, I wanted to break away from a purely military background into something else. Yet, I had been taught in my earliest childhood that the first duty of citizenship is to be prepared to defend one's country in the event of need. That was why, when I was studying for the Foreign Service at Yale University, I took an ROTC course.

Q: I noticed that you ended up with a commission, didn't you?

MACARTHUR: Yes. After several years of active service I ended up as a first lieutenant. I would have gone on in the military reserve, but when the war clouds were breaking out in 1938, the State Department issued an order requiring all Foreign Service officers who had reserve commissions to resign. They did that, because they were afraid that if war came along, the people with commissions--and there were a number of us who did have reserve commissions from university ROTC days, would be stripped away, and the Foreign Service would be left fairly bare at a critical time. That ruling was repealed two or three years later, so that one could get reinstated, but I was otherwise occupied at that time and never got around to it.

Q: With this thought of going into the Foreign Service, was this a conscious effort as your schooling moved on, to prepare yourself for this?

MACARTHUR: It was. I went to the public school system, East Coast, West Coast, up and down, until I was about 14 years old. After my father died in 1923, my grandmother supported my schooling my last four years at Milton Academy, a very excellent school outside of Boston, where I was considered a "monster" because in my class of 45, I think 44 went to Harvard, and I was the only one that was a heathen; I went to Yale.

Q: What caused you to go to Yale?

MACARTHUR: Well, I really don't know, except that after four years at Milton with people, all with Harvard backgrounds, I felt that I had acquired enough of a Harvard background, and I wanted to break away a bit. Yale seemed like a good place to break to, although today it doesn't seem that it's very far from Harvard.

Q: What type of courses did you take?

MACARTHUR: I majored in economics and history.

Q: Had you talked to any people, as you moved on, who were involved in the State Department, to sort of guide you?

MACARTHUR: No. No. I took the regular courses that I thought would be required. The Foreign Service examination in those days was quite different. I'll have a word to say about that later on in the day. But one knew generally the areas that had to be covered. There was one additional area that I did not take at Yale, it was not in the undergraduate curriculum, and that was international law. I took a three-month crash course after I graduated in June of 1932. The examination for the Foreign Service was in September, and I took a three-month crash course in international law and a refresher in economics and world history.

Q: Did you acquire the habit of extensive reading on the outside on various subjects?

MACARTHUR: Yes. In the courses that I took at Yale, my professors and instructors knew that I was headed for the Foreign Service, and I took more than the required number of courses to cover a larger area of study. But I had some excellent courses, one given two nights a month, each three hours, by a Russian émigré on the Soviet Union. Russia, at that point, was largely unknown to us students, because we had no diplomatic relations in the 1920s and early Thirties. That came only after Roosevelt came in '33.

Q: What languages did you know?

MACARTHUR: Every person taking the Foreign Service examination had to take a written examination in one language, in which he had to be reasonably proficient. But in addition, he had to pass an oral examination administered by the department after passing the overall written examination. My last year at Yale I had a very nice French instructor in an advanced course in French. This was in the days of the Depression and I used to buy him luncheon once a week so that we could talk only in French, to get a familiarity with speaking French, because unfortunately, then as now, foreign languages are taught abysmally badly in the United States. While one could learn to write and read, the fluency to communicate comes only with the practice of speaking. That, except in most advanced courses, you didn't get.

Q: How did one go about applying for the Foreign Service? You graduated from Yale with the thought of going into the Foreign Service, but how did one do this?

MACARTHUR: In those days, there was an application form. I had let the Department know that I wanted to go into the Foreign Service. In fact, Georgetown University at that time had a School of Foreign Service, where a number of people would go for a refresher course, or even a year or so. One made a formal application to take the examination.

The examinations were about three and a half days, and it was all in writing. The subjects included world history, American history, economics, international law, mathematics, and the language one offered. The examinations were, I think, extremely well designed. They weren't designed to find out how much you didn't know, because obviously, even if you came out of a university with a master's degree, you could only know so much when you're 22 or 23 years old. They were designed to see how well you could express yourself in the written language in the subjects which you knew. So you would have, say, a three-hour morning period on American history, and there would be five or six topics, and they would say, "Write on three of the following topics of your choice." Obviously, one had to know something substantively, but the written expression was important, because if you're 5,000 miles away and trying to convey to the people in the State Department what a situation is, if you can't communicate and express yourself appropriately, they aren't going to get a very good picture of what the situation is in that particular part of the world.

The oral examination in the language of your choice--in my case, it was French--was a very thorough one, administered by a man who was almost bilingual. It was a very useful, because even if you didn't go to that country, you had at least one foreign language. And if you speak one language reasonably well, the second one comes easier, and the third comes easier than the second.

Q: Was French more or less the language of diplomacy, still, at that time?

MACARTHUR: French was largely the most popular of foreign languages. Spanish, I think, came next. For people who went to Harvard, German in those days was obligatory in their freshman year at Harvard. So the Harvard boys had at least one year of German. But one year didn't really prepare one to take the Foreign Service examination. That required several years of preparation at school and college.

Q: How did your contemporaries at college and family friends feel about somebody going into the Foreign Service?

MACARTHUR: It was considered a way-out thing, rather exotic, in a way, because you'd be living in strange parts of the world. I think some of my friends thought I was a little bit crazy. I had some friends at Yale, I remember, who said, "Come on down to Wall Street. You'll make three times more there the first year than you'll make after you've been five years in the Foreign Service." But generally, one's friends were interested and intrigued. The Foreign Service was considered a rather unusual career, and one that had a certain amount of glamour to it.

Q: Did it still have a bit of the taint of being a "plaything" of the idle rich by that time?

MACARTHUR: That's a very good question. When I came into the Foreign Service, I passed my examinations in '32, the year I got out of Yale, but this was the Great Depression, and they took nobody into the Foreign Service then until 1935. Congress said to the State Department, "We're not going to appropriate any money for new people for at least two years." So those who passed the examination were so informed by the Department, and told to go out and find something to do for a couple of years.

I shipped briefly as an ordinary seaman on the Isthmian Line. This line operated by U.S. Steel, went around the world, or out to the Indian Ocean and back, wages were \$18 a month, it took 22 days from Brooklyn to Alexandria, Egypt, nonstop, going about 8 or 9 knots. I did that and stopped off in Egypt between runs because I thought I'd get further exposure to places that I'd never seen.

When I got back, I received notification that the Army was seeking people for active duty. I had a reserve commission, so I served until October 1935 in the Army.

Q: What type of work were you doing?

MACARTHUR: At first I was in Battery C of 6th Field Artillery at Ft. Hoyle [Maryland], and after I'd been some weeks, the CCC, the Civilian Conservation Corps, was set up. At the beginning, it was administered by the regular Army. They were the officer cadres that ran the camps. I went with several officers that were selected from Ft. Hoyle. My first assignment was junior officer with a company of CCC veterans, who had been thrown out of Washington by my uncle [General Douglas MacArthur, then U.S. Army Chief of Staff].

Q: Yes, that very famous episode with Dwight Eisenhower standing beside him, both in breeches and boots.

MACARTHUR: Yes. But I got along quite well with the vets.

In fact, I learned a lot in that camp. As a junior officer, you get all the menial tasks. You're Agent Finance Officer, PX Officer, Mess Officer, Construction Officer. Among these veterans were some fine men, who, because of the Depression, had lost their small business or their farm. I learned about accounting from a remarkable fellow, who helped me set up a post exchange system for our camp, which then became the model that was selected as the Corps Area model.

Eventually I was assigned, to a tour in a boys' camp from the slums of New York, as number two. Later I was put on the staff of the supervising colonel who inspected all the camps in the district every couple of weeks, to audit company books and do things of that kind. So it was not a waste of time at all.

Q: As a matter of fact, looking at this, I would say that your time as a seaman certainly

prepared you for being in the consular business, which is responsible, often, for seamen. In dealing with the administrative tasks and the problems of Americans whom you might never have met if you'd just gone from Milton Academy to Yale, to the Foreign Service, you were getting really an excellent training for your later work.

MACARTHUR: I couldn't agree with you more. It was really very useful.

In those days, when I came into the Service, about 1,000 people took the examination. It was the depth of the Depression and some of them, I think, just took it as a flyer. Of the 1,000, there were 105 who passed the written examination. Then following the oral examination, there were 35 of us who were selected. But in those days, you had no training before being assigned abroad. After you passed your examination, you were called down to the Department, given your railroad ticket or your boat ticket and your passport, and told to go out and report to the place where you were sent, usually a Consulate General. There you would be exposed to the various types of work that you would get in the Service, except a very important part, which I'll touch on-- political reporting.

So you arrived in the post, green as grass, with absolutely no experience or no briefing in the Department. You spent about three months in each of the major sections, and then you were assigned to one until you were called back to the Department to the Foreign Service School. You were usually gone about 15 months on this probationary period. You were not secure in your job until you had passed through the Foreign Service school after this first probationary post.

I was assigned to Vancouver. I started out in the visa section. After about three months in the visa section, I did three months of general work, including shipping--that is, the visa-ing of crew members, the discharge of crew members who sought discharge, the signing and stamping of commercial invoices that had to accompany export shipments to the United States, and general protection work.

While I was doing this work, the old Seattle-Alaska line went on strike. They were controlled pretty much by Harry Bridges' left wing union on the West Coast. There were several strikes, stranding a ship in Vancouver. I went down to witness the discharge of these striking seamen, and by a sheer coincidence, I found that one of the seamen was one of the people that had been with me on the old Isthmian Line when I had taken that ordinary seaman's job. The shipping job was interesting, particularly the discharge of a striking crew. There was the usual tough-minded labor union labor on each ship, if the crew was unionized, as they were on the West Coast. The union leader always wanted to be present when a crew member was questioned so he could intimidate any seamen not favoring a strike. I got involved in what the French call a *prise de bec*, a nose-to-nose, with union representatives, saying the seamen had the right to speak alone with the consul and the captain when he was asked the question of whether he accepted the discharge voluntarily or not, or why he was striking. But it was an interesting experience, where, again, my background on a merchant marine ship taught me a lot in understanding the problems of seamen.

Q: Did you find that your contemporaries in the Foreign Service, which one normally thinks of as being recruited from either the middle or the upper classes of the United States, not being very sympathetic to union problems?

MACARTHUR: No. I think of all the 35 people that came into the Service when I came in, only two or three had any outside income. The rest of us were dependant totally on our salaries, on what we earned. We had no outside income.

Q: What was the salary at that time?

MACARTHUR: The salary was \$2,500 a year, less 5%, which ran to about \$199 a month. You did get a housing allowance, and that, of course, made it possible to live. It wasn't rich living. There were, of course, in upper positions, a certain number of people who had come into the old diplomatic service, before the Rogers Act in 1924, when the Rogers Act combined the consular service and the diplomatic service. Some of them were rather snobbish and affected, but some of them were extraordinarily capable and able people. But when I came into the service in the Thirties, as I say, in the depths of the Depression, you felt you were extremely fortunate to have been selected into the Service; you felt that the Service was an elite service, and there was a great deal of pride in it.

I want to go back, if I may, to make one further observation about training in the first post. In addition to visas, shipping, general protection work, citizenship--that is, passports, registrations of births and deaths etc., there was one other very important type of work, commercial work. I spent three months doing commercial work. Let me say that in those days, when you went out in a large Consulate General, as Vancouver was, the hard working corps of the Foreign Service that gave continuity were the non-career vice consuls. They were people who had worked up from clerical jobs. They were not "career", but they were extremely expert and proficient in their particular line, visas, citizenship work, invoicing, shipping and commercial work.

I had the great good fortune to work three months with a non-career vice consul, Nelson Meeks, who taught me, for the first time, the tremendous importance of commercial work, which was in those days looked down on, not considered terribly important by some "old school tie" boys in some of our embassies. Nelson groomed me, and then sent me out to do several reports. Later, when we were in the Foreign Service school where one spent two or three days in each of the other interested departments-- Agriculture, Commerce, Justice, etc., they distributed some of the reports that they thought had resulted in sales. Among them was a report that I had done on the toy industry in Vancouver under Nelson's excellent supervision. I think that early training in the importance of commercial work and what it means to our companies helped me immeasurably later. I got some very nice letters from the companies that sold some toys to the toy retailers in Vancouver and Victoria.

It was one of the reasons why, in later incarnations, when I became an ambassador, I attached so much importance to the commercial aspect of our work. In the Foreign Service, the commercial attaché is the fellow with the title, but the ambassador is the only one with access to the government at top level, at the prime minister level, at the minister of

commerce level, the minister of finance level. So the ambassador is really the chief commercial attaché. The role of the commercial attaché is to prime the boss--that is, the ambassador-- keep him fully briefed and informed, and when the proper moment comes, prod him into action, to go and raise hell with the prime minister or the appropriate cabinet minister if we're being discriminated against or our industries and our business badly treated.

Q: In Canada, was John Davis the consul general when you were there?

MACARTHUR: Yes. John Davis was the consul general. He was known as "China" Davis. He had grown up in China. When the rape of Nanking took place, he escaped over the walls. He had spent much of his career in China, and had been the son, I think, of an American missionary in China.

Q: I note he was born in Soochow.

MACARTHUR: Yes. He was an extraordinarily decent man, a very able, capable man, a man who never lost his cool, not terribly charismatic, but tremendously capable and very respected, and a very wonderful person. In those days, we must remember that the United States Foreign Service was very small. I have here a booklet published by the State Department in 1936. I'd been in the Foreign Service just about a year. The total number of Foreign Service officers in 1936 was 683. We had 1,619 clerks and 1,291 miscellaneous employees of various kinds. That's a total of 3,647, from janitors to Class 1 Foreign Service officers. We had diplomatic missions in 57 countries, because in those days, we're apt to forget now the number of independent countries was relatively small. There were 20-some countries in Europe, if you include Eastern Europe, Russia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, etc. There were almost 20 in Latin America. That leaves perhaps 12 or 15 for the rest of the world.

In Africa, we had consuls in places like Dakar and Lourenco Marques and a few other places but we only had diplomatic missions in the Union of South Africa, in Egypt, Liberia and I can't remember but think we had one in Ethiopia, too. But elsewhere, South of the Sahara, the whole continent consisted of colonies. It had been whacked up in the Berlin Conference of 1885 by various European powers. In south Asia there was no such thing as India and Pakistan; there was British India. Elsewhere there were other dependencies and possessions such as Malaysia, Singapore, Hong Kong. And in the Middle East, there were a few independent countries at that time, but Lebanon and Syria were French protectorates.

Q: Palestine was a British protectorate.

MACARTHUR: Palestine including Transjordan was in those days, a British protectorate. The world was very small in terms of countries. This meant that you didn't need as many people, but it also meant that you didn't have the burdens then that you have today. Now, with 158 or more countries in the world, if you're an American ambassador in a country that has a reasonable diplomatic representation, you will get all kinds of invitations from smaller countries, newly-independent nations, Africa, the Middle East, Southeast Asia,

Latin American countries. And if you simply don't make an appearance of some kind . . .

Q: These are diplomatic receptions.

MACARTHUR: Yes. And if you don't go they take it as an expression of arrogance and that you're looking down on them, that you have contempt for them. The height of absurdity was reached in my last post in Iran, when on one evening my wife went to two of these parties, I went to two, and we met at a fifth for dinner.

Q: These are the social functions.

MACARTHUR: The social functions. Social functions served a useful purpose in the older days, and they still do. I never went to a social function without first making a list of the things that I wanted to know about. I knew I'd see certain of my colleagues there and also members of the Government. There were certain things cooking in different parts of the world, and you would go primed, while perhaps having a drink, to drop one of those, "By the way, what's going on here? What's doing there?" comments. Or "I've seen this report about this. Is there any truth in it?" Social functions serve a purpose, if you wanted use them for the purpose of acquiring information and finding out what is happening.

Q: Moving back now, after your training, really you were being trained in Canada, on the job. Then you were still on probation. Then what happened?

MACARTHUR: We came back to the Foreign Service school, for about three and a half months. In that school, for the first time, we were exposed to political reporting, because in a consulate general, the consul general did a political report about once a month, unless there were elections or the Embassy wanted to know something about attitudes and the strength of political parties or groups in that particular province of Canada. But the young probationary officer had nothing to do with all that. In the department, for the first time, you were trained in political reporting, and it was rather interesting the way they did it. They would give you some political reports that had been declassified, to read, and then they would assign subjects, like strength of the American labor movement, or the political orientation of some element of our society, things of that kind, and tell you to come back the next day, or two or three days later, with a draft telegram on that particular aspect. They confined it, obviously, to something that you could dig into, and you could gather some background on, such as the political strength of certain movements or political parties, political orientation of agriculture in light of the Depression and things of that kind. This was one of the training tools they used, and it was really quite effective.

Q: Who were the training officers?

MACARTHUR: It was entirely run by the Foreign Service. They were Foreign Service officers, senior officers, usually Class II or III. Of the 683 people that I mentioned, that were in our Foreign Service as Foreign Service officers at that time, roughly 30 were in Class I, the highest class. There were eight classes with numbers--8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1. And then three unclassified classes--unclassified C, which is what you came into as a

probationary vice consul; unclassified B, which, if you got through the school, you were promoted up to unclassified B; unclassified A usually followed a year and a half, two years later. Then you were eligible to get into the numbered bracket of 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1. But there were only about 30 Class I officers, and they kept a list. It was just about 5% of the total number, and they kept the list at that figure during those days very rigorously. So somebody had to retire or die before somebody moved up.

Q: When you were in the State Department, this was during both the time of the Depression, but also Roosevelt. Fascism was beginning to take hold in Europe, the China business, Japan. Did you get much direction or instruction on the world?

MACARTHUR: Yes. We were briefed by the senior people on the Middle East, Latin America, Europe, Far East. Those are the major areas. Africa we were not briefed on, because it was basically all colonies. The Middle Eastern part covered Egypt and Arab North Africa. The rest, south of the Sahara were colonies or dependencies except for the Union of South Africa at the southern extremity. But we were usually briefed a day, a morning and afternoon, on a subject. Sometimes junior officers, somebody below the top, came in and filled in on American exports or commercial interests or special interests of that kind.

To give you an idea on how small our government was then, you must remember that when I came into the service, when I went to the Foreign Service school, it and the State Department were in what is now the Executive Office Building, next to the White House. But not just the State Department--the War Department, the Navy Department, the State Department were all in that one building, with a Secretary of War--we had no Defense Department then--a Secretary of the Navy, we had no Secretary of the Air Force. The Air Force was part of the Army. The chief of staff of the Army, the CNO of the Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, all of us were crammed into that one building.

Q: During your training, did you get a feeling that the United States played an important role, or were we more or less a passive observer at that time?

MACARTHUR: We were still passive observers. We had an interest, but in the 150-odd years since our independence, from 1781 to 1936, we had followed a policy of isolationism. True, an isolationism with a tremendous expansionist drive in our continent and hemisphere, but isolationism from the great world beyond the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. That isolation was still very, very strong.

Indeed, in 1938, when, after Hitler's reoccupation of the Rhineland in 1936, the Anschluss, assimilating Austria into Nazi Germany and the threats against Czechoslovakia, we had the OHIO movement. What was the OHIO movement? OHIO was "Over the Hill in October". That was a movement designed against the legislation that had been passed for inscription for a draft in case there should be the need for mobilization. And the OHIO movement came very close to succeeding. The OHIO movement was in '38, when war, for those of us serving in Europe then, was just a question of when it was going to come.

Q: Inscription was the equivalent of registration, but not conscription, because this was the enabling legislation.

MACARTHUR: That's right. It was the enabling legislation so that there would be lists of people that would be called upon and unscripted--drafted was the word, I think, that was used at the time--if the necessity should arise. It was an inscription process. The OHIO movement was against that--"Over the Hill in October".

Although the President was obviously a man with no previous real experience in foreign affairs, he had enough understanding to realize, as did our embassies and our ambassadors abroad, who reported back to the department and to the President, that we were moving steadily toward a crisis, a very severe crisis that could lead to war, but we were not players in the international game then. That was one reason, perhaps, why our Service was so small. We were interested observers, but not players. We were not active in taking positions and going and beating on governments' doors or prime ministers' desks and doing other things of that kind. We kept informed, we tried to use our influence for peace and so forth, but we were really just observers.

Q: How long were you in training?

MACARTHUR: The school started in January and ended in April. We then had three weeks off, and we took off the end of April, the beginning of May, for our next post.

Q: And your next post was . . .

MACARTHUR: Naples.

Q: Did you pick that?

MACARTHUR: No, no. You didn't pick. [Laughter]

Q: You didn't. [Laughter] You just went where you were told.

MACARTHUR: You went where you were told to go, and there was always that tension, the eve before the posts were going to be dished out, nobody knew. The Department was not quite the sieve it is today. Nobody knew who was going where. Naples was, to me, a very interesting place to go to. It was in Europe, where things were happening. This was 1937. It was a country that was under fascist rule. I was assigned to the Consulate General in Naples, where the major work was citizenship, visas, and shipping. I replaced a man in charge of the citizenship section, and had a very interesting time, because at that time, there were passport fraud gangs in Naples. One gang was selling stolen American passports, and another was actually printing American passports. Now I had an extraordinarily able Neapolitan lady secretary, Miss Miliaccio, who could be charming on the one hand, but tough as nails when she dealt with people that she thought were shady in one way or another. Through Miss Miliaccio, I learned about a man named "Don Antonio". Don Antonio was an ex-member of the underworld, who had been betrayed and done five years

in jail on the island. He was quite bitter about this. I hired him. There were no government funds. I paid him \$25 every time he came with a list of people who had left Italy on false passports if we picked them up. So Don Antonio would come late at night. We had a nice house on the Via Posillipo. He would slide into the garden, knock discreetly, and come in, and give me a list of the names that were on the passports and passport numbers. We would send out telegrams to all the major ports in Europe--Marseille, Cherbourg, Le Havre, Southampton, where they could be picked up en route to the United States. We had an almost 100% record in pick-ups.

But one facet of my work with Don Antonio was a failure, an expensive failure. I could never get him to tell me where these things were produced or who the people were who were producing. All he pretended to know was the names and the numbers of the passports.

Q: You would be breaking his rice bowl, in the old term.

MACARTHUR: I would be killing the goose that laid that golden egg. But at the time, I was making \$2,750 less 5%, and \$25 was a hell of a lot of money in those days. There was never any offer, when we reported to the department, from the Department, to reimburse or do anything about this business. It was up to me to pay.

So to jump ahead a bit, before we go back, the Communist Party suddenly became a heroic party after June '41 when Hitler attacked Russia because they were organized, they had the cadres, they had the secret arms and other things, and they went to work sabotaging rather successfully and committing acts against the German military occupying France.

Q: When the war started in September of '39, what were you doing? What became your role?

MACARTHUR: I did some liaison work with the French foreign ministry, which had asked us to be the "protecting power" of French interests in Berlin. Woody Wallner, was in Paris on a vacation from Spain and we held him over to work on French interests in Germany. He had come into the Service at the same time I came in and spoke excellent French. He was then in Barcelona, I think, or Valencia. He's dead now. As for the Embassy, we kept in close touch with the French on their perceptions of what the Germans were going to do. But the whole emphasis of the reporting was not any longer on the domestic political side, but on the international side and the relationships with Italy, which did not come into the war until June of 1940, when France had fallen, the relationships with neutral Belgium, Holland and the like. The emphasis shifted, with everybody in France but the communists rallying behind the government in time of war, from domestic political reporting, to the relationships with France of countries in Europe that were not yet involved in the war, and their positions and the French attitudes toward them, and the like.

Q: We had a really remarkable crew in Paris at the time in the embassy. Bullitt was the ambassador, Robert Murphy as the . . .

MACARTHUR: They had very able men. Bob Murphy was there, but Ed Wilson was there

the year before him, and Edwin Wilson was extremely able. Bob took his place. But we did have a very able crew. Maynard Barnes.

Q: Freeman Matthews.

MACARTHUR: Doc Matthews, who was one of the best. I'll have more to say about him.

Q: Did you feel that there had been a deliberate strengthening of the embassy at the time? Or was this happenstance?

MACARTHUR: This was pure happenstance. Bob Murphy was consul general. Bullitt liked him, he was a very able man, he had never had a diplomatic appointment before. He'd been in the consular branch in Germany, and he headed a consulate general there. But he knew a lot of people and had political savvy. When Edwin Wilson, who was what we now call the DCM (Deputy Chief of Mission) was transferred to become a minister in Latin America-- Bullitt selected Bob Murphy to replace him as counselor of the embassy. Doc Matthews; Hugh Fullerton had been there for two or three years; Bob Murphy had been there for two or three years. Doc Matthews came in late '38, I think. It just so happened that there were some extremely capable people there.

Q: Tyler Thompson is another one.

MACARTHUR: Tyler was there. Bill Trimble. We had a good team.

Q: Looking back on it and putting yourself in the position you were then, was there a feeling within the embassy staff that France really was--maybe it's the wrong term, but rotten to the core, as they say, or at least there was something wrong with the spirit of France at the time?

MACARTHUR: I think it was more a question of something wrong with the spirit of France. Bullitt had become an absolute Francophile, and he could not see the weaknesses that France had. I'm speaking primarily of military weakness. We had a very able military attaché, Colonel Horace Fuller, and Horace Fuller told Bullitt that the French Army was a very disorganized, incoherent outfit, in effect. Bullitt wouldn't believe him. When war broke out, we thought Paris might be bombed by the Luftwaffe, so I took a little cottage outside of Paris at a village called Gambais beyond Versailles, for my wife and child, so that if there were bombing, they would be out of the way. To take this house, you had to have a notaire for the contract. The notary in France is like a court officer and other things. This little notaire had been mobilized to a unit in Versailles. He took the train in every morning, came back in the evening, went on with his notarial work. And this was characteristic. When they mobilized, it was a farce. Some of the units that were mobilized were no more capable, were no more battle-worthy or capable of action than children. You know, enlisted men went home for the weekend, they went home at night. There was no training. They'd do a little close-order drill or something during the day, but there was no real training, and there was no readying of the reserves that had been called up and mobilized. It was business as usual. It was the so-called phony war - *drole de guerre*.

Bullitt lived with the conviction that the French had, with the Maginot line, and one of the greatest standing armies in the world and that there was no question of a German breakthrough. The French were like ourselves; we slept the same way. Let me cite the most typical example. I served in the Army for a while under Lieutenant Colonel George S. Patton, who later was the famous General Patton, who was absolutely rabid in the early 1930s about armor. He was a cavalry man. He wanted the cavalry of the future armored, and he was 100% right. There was an American gentleman named Mr. Christie. Mr. Christie developed a tank that had the piece (the gun) in the turret, and the machine guns down below, you could lie behind the crest of a ridge, with just the gun protruding over it, and destroy your enemy. As for others, the French produced a tank that they claimed was the best tank in the world called the B-1-BIS. The B-1-BIS had the piece, the gun mounted down low between the tracks, and it had to get up on the ridge and silhouette itself to fire. It was a sitting duck. We on the other hand produced the General Grant tank that had a gun in the left-hand corner of the tank, so that if it were immobilized and lost a track or anything happened, the gun had only a 30 degree traverse and was also virtually helpless. Whereas the Germans and the Russians both bought the Christie rights and produced the Christie type of tank with the gun in the turret with a 360 degree traverse.

But again, this is not the first time this sort of thing has happened. There was a gentleman named Browning, who early in this century came up with a machine gun that our Army ordnance people said was no good. So Browning went to Belgium and founded what is now Fabrique National, one of the great arms producers of the world, which, incidentally, also produces Browning shotguns, the Browning revolver, the Browning automatic, the Browning machine gun, we had a chance for them all, but we just turned them down cold, and they went someplace else.

Q: Did you get any direction from the ambassador? One almost hesitates to say the Secretary of State, because one has the feeling that the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, was pretty much bypassed.

MACARTHUR: He was bypassed.

Q: But did you get any direction both from the embassy and from Washington about what your role was when the war started?

MACARTHUR: I can't recall any specific instruction, but the ambassador certainly made it clear that our role was to do everything we could to build up support for the Allies--that is, the French and the British, who were fighting. I don't recall any specific role. To follow developments with France's relations with the neutral countries, because most countries of Europe were neutral, BENELUX, Scandinavia, Italy, Switzerland, Eastern European countries: this to be abreast of their views and report them in. But I don't recall any indoctrination of any specific kind. I do recall that Bullitt had staff meetings once a week, and in these meetings he would lay out assignments to various officers, saying, "You find out about this or that". But those were details.

Q: Was the pace, I assume, much more hectic? Were you pretty much on a seven-day week?

MACARTHUR: No. We weren't on a seven-day week. The ambassador was sometimes, but not often, in the office on Saturday or a Sunday. But on weekends he operated out of his residence. Telegrams went out and came in, and if he had something for you to do, somebody he wanted to see, or some minister he was going to call on during the weekend period, he would do so and then dictate his telegram to Carmel Offie. Carmel Offie was absolutely incredible. He could take shorthand, he could type, he had a memory like this recorder. He was a fantastic person. So Bullitt operated that way. We had duty officers, of course, at the embassy on weekends in all the various sections but except for one at the chancery, the others were just on call.

Q: Were you contacting mostly other embassy people? You say you weren't working with the political parties then.

MACARTHUR: We did maintain close contact with political leaders to have their views on the war and we worked with the foreign office much more closely, also with people in the economic side of the French Government. The economic and financial side was extremely important. We developed excellent relations with Couve de Murville and Gaston Palewski, both inspecteurs de finance, France's elite, and with some of the other people who later became very prominent in the de Gaulle era. Herve Alphand, who later was ambassador here for some time, and Foreign Office Secretary General Rochat. Financing a war is a big business--trade, economics, the problems of submarine warfare. But we were not in the war. We had sympathies. The President, the American people, they had great sympathy with the French and the British, but we were not in the war. We of course saw people of other embassies to find out their views.

Q: Can you give any reflections on the consular side of the attempts of refugees who fled Germany to try to get out of the country at that time?

MACARTHUR: Certainly, but the big exodus did not come at that time (1939). The big exodus started in May 1940, when the Germans broke through at Sedan. Before that, there were a few people that said, "We'd better get out. War has broken out, and you can't tell what's going to happen." But it was quite manageable. What became unmanageable was when you had about 10 million people on the roads, and you had tens of thousands of Jewish refugees from the low countries and France that were streaming over, trying to get out either through Bordeaux or out over the Pyrenees through Spain and Portugal. The Spanish were not very easy about letting them through, and the Portuguese were not anxious to be inundated by a tremendous group of refugees in Portugal.

Q: This was in May?

MACARTHUR: No, this was later. May was when they started. When the Germans broke through and the refugees started by the end of May, the roads of France, down from the north, if you tried to go north, you couldn't get anywhere. The cars were coming down

three abreast on a three-lane highway, where that's all there was. Wagons, people coming through Paris, these big farm wagons, with the dogs tied underneath, trotting along, or walking along, or dragging along, the kids in the wagons, the guy walking, leading the horses, automobiles crammed with kids in the things, and all the rest of it--that came only in May of 1940. You see, until then it was the phony war, the drôle de guerre, where there was a bit of shooting here, a bit of shooting there, a guy might be killed here, a guy might be killed there. But suddenly, when the Germans hit through the Ardennes, which the French had thought defended itself, to use their phrase, and struck through the Sedan, and then drove first to the sea . . .

The Germans broke through at Sedan, and they turned first, quite properly, to the sea, to encircle the British and liquidate that before they knew that there was nothing between them and Paris. Paris didn't fall until the 12th or 15th of June. But on May 20, we were told, "There is absolutely nothing between the German Army and France that can put up even the slightest kind of a defense." The Germans turned to the sea to roll up the British, liquidate them, and then take over the rest of France.

It was in this period, when they broke through at Sedan, that the refugees started streaming down from the BENELUX countries and northern France, and absolutely clogged the roads. I can tell you that as late as June, when I went to join the French Government at Tours, the roads were impossible. I left at 2:00 o'clock in the morning to get a little bit ahead of the business, and by the time of 6:30 or 7:00, it was four abreast. The stukas would come down and bomb the column to create confusion, so the French units couldn't use the road, and get low-flying aircraft to do a bit of strafing and the like. But that was the bad period, from the 20th of May until the armistice.

Q: Were you prepared for this? How did the embassy react?

MACARTHUR: I don't think anybody was prepared for the extent to which the whole damn thing collapsed--literally--in a matter of several days. Call it a week. Actually, on May 10th, I'd been having the duty, weekends, and we were prepared, in case we had to evacuate Paris, each embassy had a place across the Loire, a chateau or something like that, that the owner had made available if the bombings and so forth were such that you wanted to pull back some of your people and have them located in areas that didn't have military targets or objectives. I drove down one afternoon, would spend the night, and the next day drive back and the next night. It was a one or two-and-a-half hour drive. It was still business as usual.

I got a call, the morning of the 10th, from Carmel Offie, saying, "The Germans have broken through at Paris. Get the hell back right away, quick." We took off. By the time we got past the airfield at Tours, as we were approaching the airfield at Tours, the sirens went off, and we were within about a mile of it, on one of those typical French tree-lined country roads. All of a sudden, these planes swept over, and we pulled the car under a tree, and jumped into a ditch. They started bombing and strafing the airfield. We got back to Paris all right, and there it was. But the lack of preparedness, you can see. From September 1st until May 20th, there had been this war, where both sides appeared to be stalemated along a fixed

line, where no breakthrough, and certainly the Allies, the British and the French, weren't trying to break through; the Germans weren't trying to break through. They seemed to be satisfied that they didn't have the strength. They would suffer too many casualties if they committed themselves into a World War I type of operation, and so there they were.

You recall the *drole de guerre*, the phony war. Business went on as usual in Paris, in the life of the French people, and in the life of France. It was business as usual.

Q: What happened to you, then, when the breakthrough came?

MACARTHUR: I came back immediately. Plans were made for evacuating, because it was quite clear that this was it. Plans were made for evacuating wives and family at once. Bullitt did that, very wisely. They were given a choice. The hope was expressed they would return to the United States, but they were also given a choice, if they wanted to, to go to Spain or Portugal. My wife and I decided that staying in Portugal would be the best bet, rather than go back across the Atlantic. So while some of them left on ships that were going out still from Le Havre and particularly from Bordeaux, my wife and daughter were shipped off to Lisbon.

The news got worse every day, and finally, by the beginning of June, it was quite clear that it was just a question of time. Mr. Bullitt asked me to go down. Bullitt decided that he did not--the French Government had to retreat before the advancing Germans, which was quite clear that they had to do--he did not wish to accompany the government, because the government might go on to--although he didn't put it this way, to North Africa, to continue the fight there, and he had strong ambitions to be either Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy, and he didn't want to be immobilized in North Africa or someplace at that time. So Mr. Bullitt elected to stay in Paris with Bob Murphy and the majority of the staff. He then decided that there would be a small group, a liaison group, that would have to accompany the French Government, and he selected to head that group from the embassy Doc Matthews, then myself and Woody Wallner, who had been reassigned from Spain to Paris, because we needed him for this liaison work with the French on protection of French interests in Germany. The three of us would go, but Bullitt also decided--and talked the President into saying that Tony Biddle would be ambassador-at-large, sort of. They didn't use that term; I've forgotten. He would be an American ambassador near the French Government. Tony Biddle, when Poland fell in September of '39, had retreated through Poland to Eastern Europe, and then when the Polish Government, in exile, was set up in Angers, France, Tony Biddle was there with the Polish Government in exile. So Bullitt communicated with Tony Biddle, and then he sent me in June down to see Tony Biddle and explain the whole deal, and get back to Paris.

I went down, saw Tony Biddle, then detoured by Bordeaux. Our airplanes had no cannons in those days; they had just machine guns. It was quite clear that what was happening between the Luftwaffe and the British RAF that if you didn't have cannons, you might just as well not get up into the air. So we had gotten the plans of the Hispana-Suiza cannon, 20-millimeter cannon, from Switzerland, and they were to be bundled aboard the *America*, which was the last ship that was obviously going to leave Bordeaux, an American ship, and

this captain was a reserve naval officer. The plans were turned over to him. I did not bring the plans down. Our military attaché, brought them down. I had detoured to Bordeaux to see about the last ship out, and that everything had gone well, and to get a reading, then go back to Paris.

I got back to Paris after a very bad day, when the roads were still congested. I was going the wrong way, and the roads were very, very congested. I had had only about four hours' sleep, because there was no place to sleep. The hotels in Bordeaux, the Royal George, and all the hotels were filled with French parliamentarians and politicians and refugees. I started out at 4:00 o'clock in the morning.

Q: Were you driving a car?

MACARTHUR: Yes, I was driving a car. It was the only way to go. Fighting the four lines of people coming down, we were dive-bombed twice and strafed a couple of times. I got back to Paris at about 6:00 or 7:00 that night, and I was told that the French Government decided to move, and that Doc Matthews and Woody had already left with Raymond Bastianello, a code clerk, and Clarence Palmer, a very capable crew of Foreign Service clerks, who had been with us for many years, of senior intellect quality. I was told to rejoin them. So I left at 7:00 o'clock, with the clothes on my back, going on side roads which I knew well out to Gambais, where I had this house, bypassing Versailles and the main roads that were still clogged and congested, on these little secondary roads, picked up a suitcase, filled a suit in it and some shirts and pajamas and a toothbrush, and left at 3:00 o'clock in the morning for Tours, where the government was.

I got there in the morning, about 11:00 o'clock. Normally it would have taken me two hours. I reported to Tony Biddle, who was there, and Doc and Woody. At this time, the French were working on a message for President Roosevelt, which they had let us know they were working on. Paul Reynaud had replaced Daladier as prime minister. So I went with Tony Biddle, who didn't speak much French, spent the night with him at the Chateau Azay le Rideau, and we left at 4:00 o'clock in the morning, because they were afraid Tours would be bombed, and the French Government was about 100 kilometers up in the Loire at the chateau. We got there at 6:00, Biddle and myself, and Reynaud was in a dressing gown, had this vinyl text. He had the final appeal of the French to the American Government, to President Roosevelt, which was basically a propaganda ploy, to exonerate himself more than anything else, because there was nothing we could do.

Q: Yes. I was going to ask what could they hope that we could do?

MACARTHUR: There was nothing we could do, and it was one of those final appeals. You can say, "Well, you know, I appealed, but our friends didn't help us or wouldn't help us," or whatever it might be.

So we talked about ten minutes, and then Roland de Marjorie, the father of the present French ambassador today, I think, a very capable French diplomat, and I sat down and went over and worked out the English translation of this final appeal from Reynaud to

Roosevelt, which was in French. We got an agreement on the English text, that it conveyed all the nuances and the other things. Then I went back to join Doc. Tony Biddle said that he was going to push on toward Bordeaux, because they told us they were moving on from Tours to Bordeaux. So Tony Biddle went directly down to Bordeaux, picked up his wife and went on to Bordeaux, and I went back and met with Doc and joined him where he was located, and then dictated the telegram of this final meeting with Paul Reynaud, the French prime minister, and the text of message. We sent that off. By the time we finished with the PTT, the telegram place, because we had no communications other than the local communications within the community, we left about 7:00 o'clock that night for Bordeaux.

We got down eventually to Bordeaux early in the morning and moved into the house there. The government had arrived. Doc covered the prime minister's office, and Woody and I covered other people that we knew in the foreign ministry with the government there, and some of the ministers, like Georges Mandel, who was later assassinated by the Germans. He was Jewish. We got messages out about what was happening, because this was in the midst of the power business, where Laval and Petain were working to replace Paul Reynaud. This went on until Laval and Petain replaced Prime Minister Paul Reynaud, and in the meantime, the Germans bombed us. To hasten the decision-making process of the French Government with this change, the Germans bombed Bordeaux. We'd hear a bomb drop, and all of a sudden you'd see the columns of debris and smoke coming right towards you. The nearest one hit about 200 meters from us. We took refuge, needless to say, under the desks in the office.

Then the Petain-Reynaud government came in, said they would sign the armistice. The armistice was signed, and it was announced that the government was established in Vichy, and we proceeded from Bordeaux, in our cars, to Vichy.

Q: During this time of change of government, if that's the right term for it, in Bordeaux, your role--really, there was nothing constructive that the United States could do at this point.

MACARTHUR: Absolutely nothing. We were 3,000 miles away, we had no forces mobilized, we had nothing that we could do. There was nothing that we could do. Our voice was absolutely zero. With Laval, you must remember Laval staked everything on a German victory. In fact, you may remember that in '41, after the staff of the Vichy Government had been all set up and established, he made that basic statement, "Je souhaite la victoire allemande"--"I want a German victory." And Laval saw France as Germany's first satellite. With the evil conviction they have of their superiority, Laval was convinced that the French intelligence and everything else would fix everything up if Germany won the war. They would be the first of the satellites, and he had a very special condition by collaborating with the Germans.

Q: So at that point, you moved to Vichy.

MACARTHUR: Yes. We moved, actually, to a little place called La Bourboule, because we had no place to stay in Vichy. Then we got Florence Gould's villa, Villa H(inaudible),

in Vichy, as an office. We moved to Vichy. First, Bullitt came out while we were quartered at La Bourboule, which was about 45-50 minutes away. Bullitt came out and decided that he wanted to go back to the United States, so without waiting for the President, he took off for Portugal, where he could clipper home. The Germans held him for about three weeks in Paris before they let him go. Bob Murphy stayed in Paris temporarily for about another five days to leave Maynard Barnes in charge there and Tyler Thompson. We still had an establishment there, and we were not at war with Germany. Then Bob came down and took over the Vichy operation from Doc Matthews. Bullitt, when he left, he had three cars. He had a Cadillac. In those days, the government didn't furnish ambassadors with automobiles or chauffeurs. The ambassador furnished himself with automobiles and chauffeurs, and so did everybody else, if they had one. He had a Buick, and he wanted this Buick also, so he asked me if I would drive the Buick down, not to be his chauffeur, but to take the French Minister of Air, Guy la Chambre, across the Spanish frontier into Portugal, because Guy la Chambre, who had been in the Deladier Government and then staunchly anti-German, they were afraid that the Germans would go after him and liquidate him. So Guy la Chambre had been given a false American passport by Bob at the ambassador's written instruction, and his wife, (Inaudible) Madou, had been a famous singer and stage actress. So in a convoy with the ambassador, I drove the ambassador's Buick with the former minister of the air and his wife down. We drove from La Bourboule to Barcelona, and we left at about 7:00 or 8:00 in the morning, and we got to Barcelona about 4:00 in the morning. My companions in the car, the minister of air and his wife, were extremely nervous at the border, but that went all right.

Then we drove across the next day to Madrid, and then we drove the next day from Madrid to Lisbon. They communicated with the President, who was now happy with the departure.

Q: That was sort of the end of Bullitt.

MACARTHUR: That was the end of Bullitt. The President wanted him to stay on with the French Government. He wanted him to not pick up and leave, but to stay, because they were convinced that some kind of a French entity would be set up.

Then I stayed in Lisbon for a month or so, because they had nobody there, and there was an influx of thousands of refugees, many of them Jewish, poor bastards. I say "poor bastards," because there was no sympathy from the Portuguese authorities under Salazar, and they put them in camps. I used to go up and get these people out of camps and process them.

Then I went back to Vichy, and I was in Vichy until the end.

Q: I was just thinking, it's probably a good time to cut off now. Then we'll continue this at a later date.

MACARTHUR: We can take on the Vichy part, which leads right into the war, because it was the Resistance thing that led me going to Normandy, which led to the other thing.

Q: Absolutely. Very good.

Continuation of interview, January 29, 1987

Q: Today is January 29, 1987. This is the second of a series of interviews with Ambassador Douglas MacArthur II. I am Charles Stuart Kennedy from the George Washington University Foreign Service History Center.

Okay, Mr. Ambassador, here we go again. This is the new tape. On the last one when we left, you had just finished taking the French Minister of Air, his wife, along with Ambassador Bullitt's car to Lisbon. I recall that you said that there was a large number of Jewish refugees in Lisbon at the time.

MACARTHUR: Yes. As the Germans advanced into Belgium and France, the Jewish communities of those countries understandably, having knowledge of what was happening to the Jewish people in Hitler's Germany, fled before the advancing Germans. The Spanish did not permit them to stay generally in Spain, but funneled them through to Lisbon, to Portugal. When they arrived in Portugal, many of them were placed in a camp or perhaps there were two camps and held in detention because, of course, they arrived with no visas or papers. They were permitted to come to Lisbon to apply at the consulate general for visas to enter the United States. They had brought with them their possessions that they could carry on their person, but documentation to fulfill the public charge requirement of the visa immigration law (that is the requirement that people show they are not likely to become a public charge if they're admitted) was virtually nil, although I recall vividly that some of them had brought with them, particularly from Holland and Belgium, diamond merchants, and others had brought with them diamonds and precious stones. Indeed one pulled the cotton wadding out of a filling place in his leiter and poured out a series of diamonds on my desk. We were lenient with these people. Some of them had relatives in the United States. Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt, the President's wife, took a tremendous interest in their plight. We tried to process them as rapidly and in as orderly a fashion as we could.

Q: At this time, you were seconded to our ...

MACARTHUR: Yes. When I got there with the Bullitt caravan, in which I transported the former French Minister of Air and his wife, I was to head right back to Vichy, but the Lisbon legation (It was not an embassy.) consisted of three officers: the minister, Mr. Pell, who I believe was the father of the present Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Claiborne Pell; the first secretary; and a third secretary. There were thousands of these refugees, not just Jewish people, but other people that had fled before the Nazis. So, I was ordered to remain there for a few weeks. Ambassador Galbraith, who died about a year ago, was assigned to the embassy in Madrid. He was ordered over. Ambassador Elbridge Durbrow, who is now living in retirement in California, who had been in Yugoslavia before the Germans invaded and was on his way home for reassignment . . . All three of us were held for about six weeks in Lisbon to process these refugees.

Q: Were there any instructions on how you were to deal with this? You know, the Foreign Service and the State Department has been criticized, particularly after the war and after the extent of the Holocaust was known, for their sort of strict adherence to the immigration

...

MACARTHUR: All of us in those days, when you entered the Foreign Service, you entered as a probationary vice consul after you passed your oral and written examinations. Your first assignment was invariably at a consulate general where you did visa work, commercial work, shipping, protection work, citizenship, and the like. We were under very formal training and instructions at that time about the requirements that were required of people who were applicants for visas. But in retrospect, we perhaps were too strict, but we stretched the immigration law that the Congress had passed to the maximum extent possible, I think. We encouraged these people if they had friends or relatives in the United States who would undertake to see that they didn't become a public charge to fulfill that requirement, and so forth. The public charge requirement, I think, was the most difficult problem. The rest of the thing, there was a relaxation on temporary visas for refugees. I don't remember the instructions. But the basic requirement was that they show that they would not arrive in the United States and become a public charge.

Q: Did any of the organizations (I am particularly thinking of the Jewish organizations.

MACARTHUR: I don't think that they were very active. It all came so swiftly during the phony war [Sitzkrieg], the general expectation was that France and Britain would be able to hold against the Germans. I don't think anybody had anticipated the swiftness and the extent of the catastrophe that overfell Western Europe north of the Pyrenees, the Benelux countries, and France when on May 10, 1940, the Germans broke through at Sedan, cut off the British, rolled up the French, and took over the continent except for Spain and Portugal. Italy was already in the Axis with Hitler. Yugoslavia had been overrun by the Germany army.

Q: Actually, Yugoslavia was overrun somewhat later, wasn't it?

MACARTHUR: I don't remember the exact time, but the Germans who were amassed on Yugoslavia's border because Austria had become an integral part of Germany after the Anschluss and they had divisions there ready to move right in. The continent was gone for all intents and purposes for the Western World except for Spain, Portugal, and Switzerland.

Q: Then you went back to Vichy.

MACARTHUR: Yes, then I went back to Vichy and had the very good fortune to serve under Ambassador H. Freeman Matthews, Doc Matthews. He was chargé d'affaires in Vichy. I think I perhaps learned more from him in the first six months ...

Q: He wasn't an ambassador at that time?

MACARTHUR: He was not an ambassador. He had been first secretary in Paris. He had

headed a team of three officers: himself, myself, and Woodruff Wallner, who accompanied the French government as the Germans advanced on Paris and the French government retreated first to Tours and then to Bordeaux. We had expected them to go on to North Africa and set up a government there, but in early June the Petain-Laval nomination overthrew the government at Bordeaux. The Petain-Laval government was established, the Armistice was signed, and the so-called government of "Free France" was set up in Vichy. Of course, that government was totally dominated by the Germans and it was fiction, but there were some remarkable and very courageous people who served in that government and who were a most valuable source of information to us and Britain during the time that Britain was standing alone. When I went back to Vichy, chargé d'affaires Matthews, myself, Woodruff Wallner, Ambassador William Trimble, who was later replaced by Tyler Thompson, we were about four officers in the Vichy business.

Q: It is a peculiar thing that our embassy was open in Paris, wasn't it? At least we had somebody there.

MACARTHUR: Mr. Bullitt, for reasons of personal ambition largely, decided to stay in Paris. He was afraid that as the French government retreated to Tours, Bordeaux, and then on to North Africa, he would become deeply involved. He had great ambitions to become Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy. So, that was primarily the reason he stayed in Paris instead of accompanying the French government. When the Germans came in, initially for a period of about two to three weeks, they permitted nobody in or out of Paris, including diplomats who were of neutral and non-involved countries such as the United States. In early July, the Germans having come into Paris around mid-June (perhaps the 12th, 13th, or 14th, something like that), almost three weeks later, Mr. Bullitt, the neutral ambassadors of these countries that were not involved in hostilities were permitted with members of their staff to leave Paris. Mr. Bullitt, Bob Murphy, and several others came down to Vichy where we were already installed (Doc Matthews, Wallner, and myself). We had a little place because they hadn't assigned us the Villa Egan at that time.

Q: That was Mrs. Gould's.

MACARTHUR: When we got to Vichy, our principal task was to try to ascertain what the Germans were up to, what their demands were on the French government, economic and the like, what they were doing, how they were behaving. This information, of course, we could only get through sources who were friendly to the Western cause. I would say that when France fell, there was no organization, there was no resistance, there was nothing to work with. There were a series of individuals, some of whom came up to us privately, usually not at the embassy for fear of being seen by the Gestapo watch that had been put on us, but they said, "If there is anything we can do, let us know." Sometimes they came up and said, "You know, the Germans are doing this, that, or the other thing." You must also remember that at that time with the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact in 1939, the French Communist Party, which was the most abject in its taking orders from Moscow of any of the communist parties of the Western World, was firmly on the German side and they remained on the German side until June of 1941 when Hitler attacked the Soviet Union. Then suddenly these people who had been opposing Britain and France's

"imperialistic war" against the democratic Germany of Hitler suddenly became the great resistance heroes. Why? Because the Communist Party from the beginning of time has had their cellular organization. They have had arms. They have always been prepared to take over a democratic country if circumstances really presented them that sort of a chance. With the attack on Russia and the French party getting its orders from Moscow, it started a series of sabotage actions and assassinations against the Germans which were admired by the French people. They had the secret organization in place to start right out. This is the summer of 1941.

In the period when I returned to Vichy from the end of the summer of 1940 to 1941, by that time, a series of individual people had come together in different groups and formed their own little resistance cell. We were dealing largely with them because we had no confidence whatsoever in the communists, who wanted no part of us because they were allies of Hitler.

Q: Did anybody have the assignment in the embassy in Vichy to make some sort of contact with the ...

MACARTHUR: Let me put it this way: there was no assignment to have some sort of a contact with Vichy. We had an assignment to find out what the Germans were up to, what the demands they were putting on the Vichy government were. Economically it was of great interest to Britain. We met with whoever would come to us or would make contact with us or told us that they had information. Gradually, as these individuals came to coalesce together in different little groups, they maintained contact with us. We tried to limit the contacts within any group because we knew if the Gestapo got them and tortured them abominably, they would inevitably have to give in and tell whatever they knew. Indeed, the one requirement that most resistance organizations that I worked with had was that, if you were taken by the Gestapo, hold out for 24 hours if you can, but hold out for 12 hours, because probably by that time it would be known that you had been taken and the network had been blown and there would be time for people to go underground. In the course of this haphazard business of gathering information, which was really one of the primary objectives . . . We had no commercial, political, or other things other than to persuade the Petain government . . . Our primary objective was to Petain government not to align itself directly with the Germans or to give them any assistance, encouragement, or facilities that would enable them to take over North Africa.

Q: At this time, in the period after the German occupation of most of France and the setup of the Vichy government, what was the attitude of the men in the embassy? What was the American role going to be outside of collecting intelligence? Did you see yourself as eventually going to war with Germany?

MACARTHUR: I think every thinking American knew that it was just a question of time until our vital interests collided with Germany's vital interests and that eventually there would be no way of escaping some kind of a show-down with the Germans, probably in North Africa or the Middle East. You must remember that the United States was singularly ill-equipped then. We had a standing army, but it was the 27th or 29th in the world, less than 200,000 officers. The Ohio Movement showed that the American people were still

living in sort of a dream world where there was all this business of opposition to not being drafted for military service but even to registration for military service in the event that we became involved in the hostilities. So, our role was basically one of doing everything we could to support the British, who were standing alone. Basically, that's what it was. Frequently, the information we gathered we automatically encoded it and sent it to Washington and London so that the British would know. I remember on one occasion . . . Let me first say that in the process of that first year, we began to come in contact with these groups that were forming that became larger and more important. One was Dr. Mazé's group in Brittany. I think I was the only American that knew Dr. Mazé and his group. That is why later, after I had been interned in Germany and came back to this country, the OSS (Office of Strategic Services) wanted to recruit me and parachute me into Brittany before the landings. Joseph Laniel, who was later a Prime Minister of France, who had been a Deputy and Minister, we were in close contact with him and his friends. They basically provided us with bits and pieces of information. Georges Bidault, who later was Foreign Minister and Prime Minister, who had been a professor at the Lycee Henri IV in Lyon, with Pierre Henri Tetchin, who was de Gaulle's first Defense Minister, I met them first in a tiny back room in Qusay, a suburb of Vichy, at night, where they came to offer the services of their resistance organization and provide us with information and so forth.

Q: At that time, was the resistance more a matter of intelligence rather than actually sabotage?

MACARTHUR: Yes. Until Hitler attacked Russia, these resistance people had no weaponry. They had nothing. The Germans confiscated everything, including shotguns. The Germans let it be known that it was the equivalent of a death sentence if you were caught with a weapon in your home, in your place, or anything. The only people that had arms underground were the Communist Party. That is why they were initially the ones that did the type of arms sabotage that you had. The other people did things like blowing up a railroad junction that would slow the passage of material being looted from France to Germany, intelligence, and types of sabotage or delaying in the filling of requisitions that the Germans had placed on the Vichy government to produce so many hundreds of thousands of sheepskin. I remember, after the abortive business to take Moscow in that campaign where the Germans made a terrible strategic mistake in waiting so late to attack Russia in late June rather than going up in May, the first knowledge that we had in Vichy that the Russians were in serious trouble and would not make it to Moscow was in the very early autumn (September or something like that) when one of our friends in the Vichy government came and gave us a copy of a requisition order from the Germans for 200,000 or something like that sheepskins that had to be delivered right away. Obviously, these were for their troops that were in Russia and there wasn't going to be any collapse of Russia if in early autumn they were already ordering these things. The handwriting was on the wall. So, we had other people . . . Germond Vidal, a fine man in the Vichy Interior Ministry, whose wife, when he was blown was later taken to Auschwitz and terrible things happened to her. Germond Vidal who, on the Interior Ministry and police side, kept us acquainted of all the things that the Germans were doing and insisting on in the Occupied Zone as well as in our zone.

But one of the more amusing things that happened was when I was contacted one day by a little socialist worker who worked in a printing plant in Clermont-Ferrand. He contacted me at the request of Léon Blum's daughter-in-law. Léon Blum, the former Prime Minister of France, was Jewish. He was arrested by the Vichy authorities, tried at Bourresol, transported away to Germany. I had known Léon Blum as a young officer in Paris. One of our people lived in the same apartment building with him and I had met him. When he was in prison through one of the prison guards, Blum's daughter would come up and I would give them a little piece of paper in French with the latest news and developments, which they would memorize and destroy. When they visited him, they could tell him what was happening in connection with the war and so forth and so on. This little man was sent to me. He made contact with me clandestinely. He had in his hand a published sheet about 8x12 which was an absolute facsimile of the British leaflet that was dropped called "Courier de l'air." This was beautifully done. The printing was the same. It was a single sheet that was dropped with information on both sides, three or four columns on each side on different things. Well, it was a very subtle and vicious anti-British, anti-Western, anti-democratic propaganda leaflet. So, when this fellow gave it to me and said that they were printing these things and had orders for several hundred thousand to be dropped over unoccupied France by the Luftwaffe, we sent immediately to London a complete summary of what it contained: "The front page contained this in these boxes and the back page contained that." We asked London to get the BBC, which was the one avenue of news for all the people in the occupied countries (There was nothing like it.) to at once get on the BBC and keep continuously going, saying that . . . I forgot to mention that this printing establishment, Pierre Laval, had a material and financial interest in it. So, we told them to get on the BBC broadcast and broadcast continuously in every broadcast for 24 hours to France in the French language to say that Laval, the traitorous Premier of France, was using his printshop and receiving large sums of money from the Germans to reproduce an exact replica of the "Courier de l'air" and this is what it contained. The British did that. The BBC did that. So, the Germans decided not to drop it by air, but they did have these things distributed in various cities by collabos (French term for collaborators). But the amusing thing was that when several of our resistance friends told us separately that when this was all exposed, they would say to us, "You know, the British intelligence service knows everything." In other cases, the British had gotten a bum steer from an obviously planted German source. There had been a protest against the Germans in a town just north of the line of demarcation between occupied and unoccupied France. This was a phony. The BBC broadcast this thing. Within a matter of two hours, we had from three separate resistance groups operating out there that this was false, that it had obviously been done to discredit the BBC because there had been no such demonstration of any kind there, no such thing had taken place, so we got on the BBC and told them to correct it and they corrected it. The Germans were not able to benefit. There were many things that we said.

Q: You felt that you were really working in very close collaboration with the British at this time, not as a neutral country looking after its own neutral interests.

MACARTHUR: Absolutely. There was no question about where our interests lay or what the President's feelings were. Everything he was trying to do was prepare the country for the fact that eventually we were going to have to face it. So, we were, of course,

encouraged to do this thing by the Department. I must say that, later, we had a very serious matter in the Department, but this came really after the end of the war in 1945. I might touch on that later. It was the infiltration into the innermost circles of the United States government by the Soviet Union of two spies, Harry Dexter White in the Treasury Department and Alger Hiss in the State Department, who had access to everything the Secretary saw. So, in the post-war period, we never used anything dealing with the inside information we had on this party and its activities in France. We never used the regular channel because we knew it would get back to the Communist Party in France within 48 hours via Hiss, Moscow, and back to the Party. We used a separate channel set up by Jimmy Dunn and Doc Matthews. Jimmy Dunn was head of all of Europe. I've forgotten what his title was. He was in the Office of European Affairs and DOC was his deputy. We had a special series of memoranda that were sent by air pouch in a double envelope to be opened only by Jimmy Dunn . . . This was in the 1945-1948 period.

Q: Did you know who were the people?

MACARTHUR: We knew who Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White were. Indeed, the Department set up a special office under Ray Murphy on the side to deal with communist matters that Hiss had no access to. It was an incredible performance. I was an admirer of Dean Acheson, but I never really could understand how he could say he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss, someone who had betrayed us and given the most highly classified type of confidential information to the Soviets. You didn't have to be any genius to see immediately after the end of the war what they were up to as they took over all of Eastern Europe.

Q: Let's go back now to the 1941 period. Freeman Matthews was the chargé during most of this time.

MACARTHUR: He was the chargé most of the time and then when Admiral Leahy came, he was transferred to London as a first secretary or counselor of the embassy in London. That was a great comfort to us because he knew intimately the inside picture of Occupied and Unoccupied France and we knew that the communications we sent he was able to give further amplification or explanation or interpretation to the British about various things that we referred to.

Q: I'm a little confused. For a while, we had staff in our several consulates. We also had Nader Barns in Paris.

MACARTHUR: When the Germans took over France, they divided it into an occupied and an unoccupied zone. In the occupied zone, they said, "There will be no diplomatic representation because there is no government but the German Occupation government that rules here." They created the fiction of an unoccupied France that was independent so that diplomats were assigned to the embassy in Vichy, Unoccupied France. We kept a consulate. The Germans treated it as a consulate general. Maynard Barns was in charge of it. Tyler Thompson. That was maintained, I think, perhaps until-

Q: It was closed in May 1941.

MACARTHUR: It was closed then. I've forgotten whether the Germans closed it or whether we withdrew.

Q: If I recall, the Germans closed it.

MACARTHUR: That's my recollection. We wanted to have a listening post in Occupied France in Paris, as well as what we had in the unoccupied zone. They closed down the consulate at Le Havre and in Lille, where we had some sort of an office. But in the unoccupied zone, we had a consulate in Marseille and one in Lyon. In Marseille, to sweeten the pot and make it in Vichy's interests not to let the Germans go too far, we struck a deal with the Vichy government by which we shipped a certain amount of food, basically grain, and petroleum products to Unoccupied France for the use in Unoccupied France of the French civilian population. That stuff came in through Marseille. Similarly, I think we had a consul and one vice consul in Lyon. Paul De Riviere was the vice consul, if I remember correctly. They stayed there until the very end, until the Germans grabbed us.

Q: Were they doing more or less the same thing, keeping contact with ...

MACARTHUR: They were keeping contact with local things and they sent one of their people up every couple of weeks to brief us all. We had strict injunctions from Doc Matthews (very wise, too) not to keep any diaries. One of our greatest worries when Admiral Leahy came was that he kept a diary. It later helped him in his book, "I Was There." But we knew that eventually the Germans would grab us and we knew that if they did grab us, they would grab any diaries, books, or papers that we had and try to identify either by time, place, circumstance, or name some of these people that were risking not just their own lives but their families lives, their wives' and childrens' lives, deportation and death in extermination camps and the like by their activities. So, we kept no papers. We kept cryptic things about certain things that we sent out by pouch. If they were very sensitive, involving the names of resistance organizations and things of that kind, we usually encoded them in the pouch and did not send them in the pouch, but encoded them with a . . . We had a naval code man, who was under Lee Murray, our regular code fellow. He brought over modern coding one time pads and things of that kind that we could use. Until the war came along, we had the most antiquated system in the world. We had the gray code, where you sent personnel and administrative stuff, words and so forth, there were these phrases you used. We had the brown code, which was supposed to be one to use stuff that was confidential. Then we had two other codebooks. I've forgotten what those series were called. They were supposed to be confidential stuff. But it was back in the 18th century. I mean, it was really childish. It was only after France fell and we moved into Vichy that we got supplied with this very fine naval file.

Q: How did you react when you heard that Admiral Leahy was coming? It was sort of an odd assignment at that time.

MACARTHUR: Well, we had it all explained to us. President Roosevelt felt that, Marshal

Petain being a military man, he seemed to be drifting more and more closely toward giving in to German demands. We were desperately worried about North Africa. We knew, if the Germans took North Africa, the Middle East was gone and all the rest of it . . . The thought was that Admiral Leahy, as a most distinguished American military figure, would be able to have a rapport on a career basis, if you will, with Marshal Petain and could perhaps be more influential in slowing down the gradual drift as the Germans tightened their hold on Vichy toward accommodation and assistance. So, we welcomed Admiral Leahy. I happened to know him because he was in the class after my father in the Naval Academy. As a small boy, I called him "Uncle Bill." My father and the admiral had been posted on the same place, perhaps in Newport. They were both in the fleet and the families stayed at Mrs. Korsun's boarding cottages and the like. So, insofar as Admiral and Mrs. Leahy were personally concerned, they were old friends of the family, friends who had known me since I was a child. We had a very pleasant relationship. Mrs. Leahy tragically died of an embolism just before they were scheduled to return to America. My wife went over and stayed with the admiral until the arrangements were made for return to the United States. She stayed at his home. It was a dreadfully sad occurrence. The American ambassador was pretty much isolated in Vichy. None of the people that were helping us, the resistance people, these various leaders, many of whom became very prominent later, would be seen with us publicly or anywhere. If they did, they would immediately be suspect. So, the ambassador lived in splendid isolation. He had friends in the diplomatic corps, the Turk, the Stukie, who was dean of the corps, the Swiss Minister, but there was no American community. There was Ralph Honson of the United Press and Hank Henry of the Associated Press. I guess that was the American community of Vichy. Laura Corrigan, who did good works . . . Mrs. Corrigan- (end of tape)

His name I mentioned. And Laura Corrigan, a very wealthy American woman who had lived in Paris during the war and who came down to the unoccupied zone and took up residence there and contributed a great deal of money to welfare things for the needy and the poor and things of that kind.

Q: What was Admiral Leahy's operating style?

MACARTHUR: Admiral Leahy left his home shopping every morning about 8:50, walked to the embassy, which was about a mile away from his home. He arrived about 9:15, which would give us time to look over the incoming telegrams and the stuff that we prepared for him. Then we would have a meeting with the admiral, go over the incoming tape, the stuff that we prepared to go out the next day, we prepared and laid out later that evening or early that morning to go out as a result of clandestine contacts we may have had during the night . . . The admiral, the ambassador, was accessible. He wanted to be kept right up to the mark on things. If you went over to the Foreign Office, where we had some very close friends, some of whom ended up in Dachau and other places (Some of them never came out.) who passed on information to us. The admiral would want to know before you dictated a telegram or did anything . . . He would want a good run down on what was happening. He had a very hands-on style. In the finest traditions of the Navy, he wasn't just a figurehead that sat back and waited for other people to do. He was the skipper and we were the crew. I might say that the Foreign Office had passed on everything to us that it conceivably picked

up that was of any interest, not just stuff that it picked up, but stuff that it picked up from the other ministries of the Vichy government. I remember very well Stass Osterag (spelling?), who later became ambassador, sent word that he had to see me and we met. I came over to his office, which we were allowed to do. There was nothing in going to the Foreign Office and making a formal call. They were very careful about being bugged.

(Remaining 1 1/2 tapes of January 29, 1987 session not transcribed due to static)

Continuation of interview, March 31, 1987.

Q: Mr. Ambassador, on our last session of January 29, 1987, we finished our interview at the time that you had been repatriated to the United States from detention. You were in the Black Forest, was it?

MACARTHUR: We were on the edge of the Black Forest in Baden Baden. There were three camps in that area, one with British soldiers taken by the Germans in North Africa; another was a mixed bag of various people that had been collected here and there, some of them irresponsible people, or what the Nazis considered irresponsible people from some of the Eastern European countries they had overrun; and I forget what the nature of the third camp was. We were interned in a hotel. Our treatment there was correct, and we had only one extremely painful and disagreeable business when the Gestapo came down and went to work on Thomas Cassidy, our assistant naval attaché in Vichy, their brutal interrogation, and it's no fun to hear someone being interrogated, when the moaning stops, and you know they've passed out. Cassidy was being interrogated probably because he was a contact point with some of our French Resistance people. Actually he worked for Colonel Donovan's OSS organization, and obviously some French contact who had been taken by the Gestapo and tortured had given his name. So the Gestapo came down from (Inaudible), and if it had not been for the intervention of a fine young Swiss diplomat who periodically visited us, his name is Kiya Bordier (phonetic), who was later an ambassador, Cassidy might have ended extremely badly, except rather than just being painfully abused for a couple of days.

Q: You were repatriated after we landed in . . .

MACARTHUR: No, we were taken by the Germans after the Allied landings in North Africa at the beginning of November 1942. The Germans burst into our embassy, although we had so-called diplomatic immunity. They burst into our embassy with tommy-guns and started removing us, when the dean of the diplomatic corps of Vichy, Mr. Stukey, heard what was happening and went to Laval, and said that this would create a major scandal for the Petain/Laval Government if it wasn't stopped immediately. So Laval called the Germans off and said we would be interned and exchanged with the members of the French diplomatic Vichy mission in Washington, headed by Ambassador Henrier.

Well, they interned us, shipped us down to Lourdes, the shrine city in southern France, of

Bernadette fame, but we had been there a very short time when Laval gave the Germans the green light, and a group of SS and German soldiers arrived and bundled us into a train and took us off to Germany to hold as hostages.

We remained in Germany from that time--that's the end of '42--until March of '44, when, finally, an agreement was negotiated for the exchange of our group plus a few very badly wounded Americans against some Germans that had been taken by us in North Africa during the North African campaign, including Ribbentrop's niece and her husband and some other Germans that we had picked up in this country or in transit between Latin America, where they had been active, and this country.

When the agreement was finally reached in '44--the end of February, it was reached, I think, if I recall correctly--part of that agreement was that we would be repatriated to Lisbon, and the neutral Swedish vessel Gripsholm--was it Swedish? Yes. It would carry over those exchangees that the Germans wanted from the United States and the others that had been in North Africa, would be brought together in Lisbon, and we would be exchanged there.

So we left Germany on a sealed train that went through France, to the French border. There we were held overnight to await the final arrangements with the Spaniards for transit across Spain, and we were put in a sealed train, but no longer with the German guards, and dispatched from Confront, which is just below Biarritz on the French-Spanish border. Maybe it wasn't Confront. It was the border point just below Peau to Lisbon.

In Lisbon, after a couple of days processing, we were placed on the Gripsholm and returned to the United States.

Q: Obviously, you had a lot of catching up to do with your family at that time, but sort of moving beyond that, how did the State Department treat you when you came back?

MACARTHUR: Oh, they treated us very well. I think all of us that came back, the war was going on, and we had missed a good part of it. We were anxious to get back to work. I took--I think it was two and a half weeks' leave with my wife. We went down to visit her family in Kentucky, and then I came back and went to work on the so-called French desk, because they had no one there that had been in France during the period of the occupation from '40 to the end of '42 who knew personally some of the Resistance personalities and other people and had some feeling. I was put on the French desk, because they wanted, at the time of the liberation, to ship me back to Paris to head up the embassy political section in Paris when it would be liberated. I'm speaking about the spring, because then the Allied landings in Normandy had not occurred. So this was a preparatory visit.

Well, in the course of the debriefings I had, including those of the OSS, when the OSS discovered that I had worked personally with people like Dr. Mazze, who was the leading Resistance leader in Brittany, and Laniel, from Normandy, and some of the other people, they proposed that I join with them and be parachuted into France at the appropriate time, about three weeks before our landings, which I did not know, and they didn't reveal, if they knew when those would be. I said that was agreeable to me if it was agreeable to the State

Department.

The department felt that a better use of me could be made by having me go into Normandy after we landed, and then at the liberation of Paris, presume a place in the embassy political section, because obviously when France was liberated, there were going to be all sorts of new political leaders who would emerge from the French Resistance, as French Resistance leaders and heroes, and have somebody that would work personally with a number of them, and had the credentials of not only having worked with them, but having also been deported to Germany and gone through that experience, too, which many Frenchmen had gone and never returned from. They felt that this whole combination of background would make me a useful person in the Paris Embassy.

Q: Sounds like they were using more finesse in their personnel policies, at least from my experiences, than normal.

MACARTHUR: The personnel policy--it wasn't personnel policy at all; it was Doc Matthews.

Q: Ah!

MACARTHUR: Later Ambassador H. Freeman Matthews, who had been in charge of the embassy in Vichy from 1940, really, until Admiral Leahy came, when he went to London. He knew intimately the inside picture of a France that was being occupied, but that would emerge, and he was the deputy director, I think, of the whole European department of the State Department under Jimmy Dunn, who also was extremely interested and sympathetic to the idea. So they simply said, "This is the way it's going to be."

In those days, during the war at that time, when it was a question of personnel in critical spots or spots that might become critical, I don't think the so-called administrative and personnel people of the department had much to do with the assignments, because the people that knew the qualities and experience and background were in some of the active policy-formulating departments of the department, the geographic bureaus, and they knew the capabilities, personalities, experience, and so forth. Of course, in this plan, the Defense Department's approval had to be obtained for me to go back into Normandy after the landings; that would be before France was liberated. That represented no problem at all. We had a political advisor in General Eisenhower's headquarters in London, before the landings, and then when the time came for the landings and to send somebody into Normandy, he was a very senior diplomatic personality, former ambassador. And they decided that they wanted, in the rigors of a campaign in Normandy, where you never knew quite what was going to happen, they wanted two people, a younger officer to be the so-called POLAD, political advisor, who really was an advisor on international affairs, to work with General Eisenhower's staff, of course, and also particularly with the G-5 people, who had to do with the relationships with the military, the headquarters, the military, and the liberated civilian authorities in the areas as we gradually liberated them.

So I went into Normandy, went to London first for a couple of days' briefing. I was no hero

in terms of landing in Normandy; the landings had been accomplished, the headquarters had been set up in Normandy, and I flew over in an old C-47 with some officers, and was in Normandy a relatively short time until it was clear that when General Patton broke out and started the big swing up in the encirclement, it was clear that the Germans were going to have to pull back or risk having very, very substantial numbers of their forces trapped.

I went to Bedell Smith, who was General Eisenhower's chief of staff, and said, "I'd like to go in with the T force into Paris for practical reasons connected with the fact that obviously, when Paris was liberated, the National Council of Resistance members, we would know who they were, and I'd like to establish contact with them immediately."

And Bedell laughed at me and said, "Doug, if you went in with the T force and you were shot, everybody in America would say we were putting civilians in front of our military guys to protect them. But you can go in the next day."

So Paris was liberated on the 25th, and I arrived the morning--we left very early--the morning of the 26th, with two general officers.

Q: This is 26 August 1944.

MACARTHUR: August. Yes. With two general officers. We drove up a road that I knew very well, up through Dreux and Houdan and La Queue-les-Yvelines, Trappes, Versailles, and as we headed in, these two general officers had never been in France before the landings, and I was feeling emotionally very charged up, because I had left Paris around the tenth of June 1940, with the Germans pursuing us. I was one of the three people that went to the French Government, the three American diplomats that went with the French Government as it retreated. And to be entering Paris and to see it for the first time, it was a beautiful day, not a cloud in the sky, the sun was warm, I suggested, as we drove in from Versailles, that we go through the Parc de St.-Cloud, which is a bluff above the Seine, just above the bridge of St.-Cloud, where you can look out and see all of Paris. They thought that was an excellent idea, so we went in with our escort and came to that marvelous sort of platform above the river, a cobblestone platform above the river, and there looked out, and before us was the Seine and the Bois de Boulogne, and the Eiffel Tower, and the dome of Les Invalides, the two towers of Notre Dame, and way off on the left was the glistening spire and dome of Sacre Coeur. I must say I was so emotionally moved that tears started streaming down my face to see this beautiful city totally intact.

So we drove in, and after I got set up in the general officers' hotel that had been taken over for the night, I went down to the embassy, where we found a very faithful French woman who had been in the embassy before, who had been kept on by the Swiss. I went into the embassy, and it was intact, except in several places where the fighting had occurred. Bullets had come through the windows, and one had pierced a portrait of a former ambassador. But there was firing still going on, and there were Germans holed up still in the foreign ministry, right across the Seine from La Place de Concorde, and in other places. You could hear the rat-a-tat-tat of machine gun fire as the forces cleaned them up, our American boys and the French boys in the LeClerc division, which General Eisenhower

gave the honor of entering Paris first--quite properly.

Mixed up with all this was the confusion of all these Resistance fellows running around with their armbands, brassards, of different things, saying, "FIFI" or "FTP." (Frontier Terre Partisan was the communist one; FIFI was the Free French Forces of the Interior) with their guns firing guns into the air in joy. [Laughter] And the people of Paris were just absolutely delirious. So it was emotional--still is, when I think of it--highly emotional.

Q: Did you have any instructions? There was this sort of uneasy relationship with General de Gaulle during this entire period. Did you have any instructions how to treat the various Resistance groups, especially those associated with General de Gaulle?

MACARTHUR: No, because by the time we landed, virtually all the Resistance groups, except the communist resistance group, Frontier Terre Partisan, were associated and had pledged allegiance to the Free French of General de Gaulle. There were people that had ambitions to be head of France and one thing or that kind, but there was no problem in dealing with the French Resistance. There was no problem with de Gaulle's people or from the French Resistance people with whom we knew. This was the thing that you had to play by ear. We had no instructions from the department that I recall, other than to establish and maintain contact with all our contacts across the broad spectrum of French political life, including the communists, because we were still allies of the Russians at that time. So that we did, and with the de Gaulle people, there was no problem at all. Some of them were people that immediately were surrounding him, that we had known before, like Gaston Palewski, who became his director of cabinet and sort of eminence, who screened everybody that went in and out, and Couve de Murville, both of whom I had known as inspecteur de finance before the war. There really was no problem at all insofar as the Quai d'Orsay was concerned.

Some of the people that I had worked with in Vichy, including Jean Chauvel, a marvelous man, had escaped and gotten over to London, and he came back and was set up as the secretary general of the French foreign office. So I had access through Jean, whom I knew intimately and whose wife was a great friend of ours, of my wife's. There were really no problems at all.

There was one problem, though, because de Gaulle moved in, but the CNR, the Conseil Nationale de la Resistance, kept its organization intact, kept its leadership, which included people like Bidault, who was later foreign minister and prime minister, Laniel, who was prime minister, and other people. They kept their organization intact and used to have regular meetings, where they felt that they were the people that had gone through the occupation, they knew what the French people wanted and needed, they felt much more than people that had been living in exile in London knew about the requirements of the situation.

So in that autumn, that is, in the early days, end of August, September, right up into October, I think, the CNR, the highest Resistance body, they had grabbed a building that belonged to the Earl of G(inaudible), a very nice building on the Left Bank, a big palatial

residence. The Earl of G(inaudible)'s son being then Lord Forbes, Arthur Forbes, an air commodore in the RAF, they commandeered that building and held regular meetings there, and they used to hold these meetings in the evening. Then I had arrangements with Laniel and a couple of them that I would go over about 10:30 and 11:00, when the meetings broke up. They would brief me on exactly the position they had taken at the meeting, with respect to what they would say to the government, because they did not consider themselves a government; they considered themselves the most knowledgeable advisory body that the de Gaulle people could have. I used to go back to the embassy and write out a telegram in longhand, so that Washington would know. After Mr. Caffery arrived there, with his full approval, I used to go out at 11:30 or 12:00 and let him look at the telegram, and then we'd send it, because that way it would be on the desk of the people here in Washington the next morning at 9:00 o'clock, whereas if we'd waited til the next morning, with the time difference, they wouldn't have gotten it until the following evening or the day after.

Q: Just to backtrack a little, when you arrived, you actually set up the embassy?

MACARTHUR: No. I arrived. I was the only person there. I was the first person into the embassy.

Q: You and the cleaning lady.

MACARTHUR: And the cleaning lady. Well, she was more than that; she was sort of a custodian.

The whole plan had been laid out that the people from North Africa--because we had a mission in North Africa, where General de Gaulle had moved following the successful landings there-- Algiers. We had a mission headed by Selden Chapin. He had the rank, I think, of minister counselor. They called it NEAR--the Free French Government in exile, the so-called Free French Government. They would come up and take over the embassy.

Q: NEAR? You said NEAR.

MACARTHUR: NEAR. You didn't accredit them, too. It was NEAR. Because the whole question--that was one of the thorny questions of the legitimacy of de Gaulle. As long as the de Gaulle government, the Free French, as they called it, was in exile, we had a diplomatic mission. NEAR, I think, was the euphemism they used, rather than accredited to, which would mean that you recognized it as the government before the people of France themselves had had an opportunity to express themselves as to what they wanted in free elections.

Q: I understand.

MACARTHUR: So they were to come up and assume the thing. Well, there was still shooting going on for three or four days after the 25th of August, and they finally, if I recall correctly, arrived up in the first week of September. Then Selden Chapin became chargé d'affaires of the embassy, and he brought up people that had been with him down there. It

was a small group--Jerry Drew, there were about five or six officers. I was sort of set up as the political section, because I had had the good fortune to know so many of these people that suddenly had become very prominent.

I want to go back to one thing, though, that you mentioned. You said your relationships with the various Resistance groups and so forth and de Gaulle people. Our instructions were to keep in touch across the board so that we would be able to assess the situation, including the role of the French Communist Party. You may recall that when the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement was signed in August of 1939, which precipitated World War II, because it gave Hitler's Germany a secure rear in Eastern Europe against Russian business, the French Communist Party denounced France and Britain's imperialistic war against Nazi Germany, and was declared illegal by the Daladier Government, and it went underground. It just laid doggo and did absolutely nothing during the period of German occupation of the first year--that is, from June 1940 until June 1941. Of course, it was the only group that had in existence a secret cellular organization along classical communist lines, an underground, and it laid doggo until June 25-26, 1941, when Hitler's Germany attacked the Soviet Union. Then suddenly, this organization appeared as the leading resistance group, because it had its secret underground organization all in place, it had weapons, it had means of communication, it had people scattered--not scattered, but people in virtually every urban community, and it was prepared to go. And go it did. It started a campaign of sabotage and assassinations of Germans, sabotage of railway lines and things of that kind the Germans used, one thing and another.

But then as the liberation of France came, it became also clear--during this period, when I was there, after, that is, almost a year and a half between '41 and '42 . . .

Q: This was when you were in Vichy.

MACARTHUR: When I was in Vichy, yes. The FTP, the Frontier Terre Partisan, the communist people, I was in touch with some of them, but all they wanted was weapons from us. They didn't want to cooperate with anybody else or anything else; all they wanted was delivery of weapons. There were some arms drops to them made by the British, because it was in everybody's interest to have them creating problems for the Germans.

But at a time when the original, authentic Resistance was just getting really organized, because when France fell, there was no organization, there was another, it was just a few individuals or people or people with some leadership qualities here and there who said, "What can we do to help Britain? What can we do to make it tough on the Germans?" But there was no organization, nothing at all, and these little groups sprang up in different places. Then some of them came together, and then formed their larger reseaux, and then they had cross-relationships. But the Frontier Terre Partisan, the communist group, wouldn't play with any of those groups; they kept to themselves, and they manifested a tendency for complete authority. So that was the situation that existed when France was liberated.

Then we got disquieting reports as the Germans withdrew from Normandy and Brittany, in

some areas where the FTP, the Frontier Terre Partisan, where they were strong, they took out some of the minor Resistance leaders who were known to be anti-communist, and shot them as collaborationists. These reports were disquieting.

So when I arrived in Paris, liberated Paris, at the end of August, in late August, one of the first persons I made contact with was Marcel Cachan, the head of the French Communist Party, who I had met when I worked in the embassy before the war, because I worked for a while with Lawrence Higgins. The embassy was divided into sections; one had the left, and one had the more conservative elements, and another man had primary responsibility for the political thinking of industrial leaders and the like. I worked with him, and I'd met Cachan, had been in his apartment, and Madame Cachan, I think, had been born in Boston, although, I think, of French parents. She spoke accented English. So two days after I arrived in Paris, there were Frontier Terre people all over the place, and I saw a lieutenant of Frontier Terre, and I had prepared a little message to Cachan, saying, "Dear Mr. Cachan, mon cher Monsieur Cachan, I don't know if you . . ." It was in French, of course. ". . . if you remember me or not, but I'm So-and-so, and we met [and so forth]. I'd be happy to see you." I gave it to this lieutenant of Frontier Terre Partisan, who was there and seemed to be in charge of some people that were massed around the Place de la Concorde, some FTP people.

The next morning, I was in the embassy. This was before the people of North Africa had arrived. I was in the embassy, and the next morning a FTP guy--they had a guard. We put a guard at the embassy. He said, "There's someone to see you."

I went down, and he said, "Be standing out on the corner of the Place de la Concorde, right at the corner of your embassy, sharply at 12:00 o'clock, and a car will pick you up and take you to see Monsieur Cachan."

So I went out and stood on the corner, and sure enough, promptly at 12:00 o'clock, a car drove up, a little Citroen, with three people in it--a driver and two tommy gunners with, one in the back and one in front. When I came up, they put me in front, and the two guys with the guns got in back, and we drove out to the so-called red belt of Paris, and we stopped in front of one of those mass small apartment dwellings that had been built for the French workers, and got out. The two tommy gunners escorted me up to the door, and inside the door there was another man with a tommy gun. He checked me again for weapons. Then they took me to an apartment on the first floor, knocked on the door. It was opened by another guy with a gun. I went in and there embraced my friend Mr. Cachan, who I had not seen.

Mr. Cachan then described to me what had happened to him during the war, how he had grown a beard. He showed me a picture. He had a flowing white beard, much more whiskers than Santa Claus. I understand how he was able, with false identities, not to be recognized, because nobody would have recognized him. We had an excellent lunch with his wife, who was very much a part of his political communist life. It was a very interesting conversation.

Then after I'd been with him about two and a half hours, we wound up. I had questioned him about what their plans were for the future, one thing and another, and what the role of the party would be. We had a long back-and-forth about the history of the party in France and what it should be and what its role should be. He made it clear that the French communists were loyal to France, but that it was time for a new era, the people who had been responsible for the war and all the ills of the war should no longer have any role to play, and that the French Communist Party should be the vanguard of a peaceful revolution.

Q: Did the question come up, what would the role of the United States be in the future of France at all?

MACARTHUR: No. They knew that we were deeply engaged and committed. They knew from statements that the government had made that we would do everything we could to alleviate the suffering that was bound to exist in a liberated France that had been deprived of things for so long. But I don't recall any particular probing on his part about our activities or policies, because what everybody wanted in every party, regardless of their own political views, was American aid and assistance to get France back on its feet. So the problem never came up. But I did do a long report which I sent. I used to send these to Doc Matthews in numbered letters, rather than at that particular time, in those first days, we could send telegrams through military channels to the State Department, and we could send things through a form of pouch, which is what I did, because we had no diplomatic pouch. But the military had facilities to get back to the Pentagon, and they shifted the stuff over. So in that first period until we got set up with Selden Chapin and his people and had a code room and our own facilities, and had a diplomatic courier tied in with the one in London, and so forth, I used the military facilities.

Q: You said that Jefferson Caffery came rather soon after.

MACARTHUR: Yes. Jefferson Caffery came in September, the latter part of September. He was obviously Doc Mathew's candidate for the job. Matthews had worked with him as a DCM in Latin America. Caffery had experience. He had served in France after World War I as an embassy secretary. He spoke some French. But Caffery was not a very articulate man. He was very bright and perceptive, but he was not very articulate; he had sort of a stammer or a stutter. But he was bright and ran an excellent embassy, I must say. He knew how to manage his human resources and get the most out of them very well indeed. He, not having been associated with any of the politicians of pre-war France, that the de Gaullists blamed for France's debacle that had occurred to France, he was, in one respect, as pure as snow insofar as they were concerned. He didn't have any close ties to the old guard that had gone out with the war, but some of whom were trying to make a comeback. He got along extremely well with--I say "extremely well"--he got along well with General de Gaulle. I remember that General de Gaulle had a small dinner not too long after Caffery arrived, at which I think there were ten people--General and Mrs. de Gaulle, Georges Bidault and Suzy Bidault as foreign minister and his wife--she was a former career diplomat--Ambassador Caffery and his wife, myself and my wife.

Q: Your wife had joined you by this time.

MACARTHUR: She had joined me by this time. This was the end of October, beginning of November. And two of his staff, Colonel Guy, I think, and one other. But it was a very intimate dinner. The general was very kind to me because I had helped some of his people who had been parachuted in during the Vichy days. The embassy's relationship with not only de Gaulle, but with these disparate Resistance leaders, who were part of the French system because they were all elected to the Parliament in landslides in the first elections and the like, was really very, very good. There were no problems. The problems, of course, arose for France as the communists made it increasingly clear that they planned, eventually, to run the country.

Q: I was looking through the foreign relations series, and I noted that by January of 1945, Ambassador Caffery was saying that the French were very sensitive about some things, that they felt that the United States was treating German prisoners too well, much better than German POWs would be treated by Germans in Germany, and that the United States wasn't giving enough supplies, and that we weren't clearing out the Germans who were still in the channel fortresses, such as St. Lazare, Brest, and all, and that the Americans were treating the French like children, and also the Americans didn't believe the stories about what the Gestapo had done in France. I mean, it was obviously a time of sensitivity.

MACARTHUR: There were these news reports that we got of ill treatment of German prisoners of war. I was not personally involved in any investigations or anything, because, if I recall correctly, these prisoners were largely being held in northern France or Germany. (end of tape)

Q: We were talking about the . . .

MACARTHUR: Yes, the Bureau of European Regional Affairs. It was set up basically to cover two aspects of Europe: European economic integration and NATO, and North Atlantic military cooperation. As I say, if you had several European divisions, each one with their own people, each one with an outlook of their own clients, if you will, it was quite clear that you'd always have problems in sorting those out. So the Bureau of European Regional Affairs was set up under the leadership of Edwin Martin, a remarkably able and capable man, with a very clear and incisive mind, basically an economist. In the division of our roles, Ed's job was obviously to head the bureau, but, basically, his was the masterminding and following the European economic cooperation, this whole process that I've described, of trying to weave Europe together in a fabric, where it would act and work together and become an entity of strength.

My job, on the other hand, was to take care of the military side, the NATO side of the operation.

Q: When you arrived, this was a little pre-NATO, wasn't it?

MACARTHUR: Yes. Well, I think NATO--wasn't it '48 or '49? The treaty was signed, I

think, in '47 or '48. I came there in '49. The NATO treaty--the North Atlantic Treaty, I think, was '47. You're talking maybe about SHAPE.

Q: Yes. NATO came as sort of a response to Czechoslovakia.

MACARTHUR: That's right. That was '46 and '47. So NATO was in being, but it did not have an integrated force. It was not an integrated force. There were elements of the different countries, but there wasn't really a unified command, because the hangover of traditional nationalist feelings, the British certainly weren't going to put their people under a French SACEUR--Supreme Allied Commander; the French weren't certainly going to serve under the British as a Supreme Allied Commander; it was unthinkable to have Germans commanding a unified setup of that kind. Indeed, neither the British nor the French would accept an Italian. The BENELUX countries were too small and had too little participation.

So what we moved toward was an integration of the forces of the various countries, including Germany, which had not been included at that time. What we were trying to move toward was an integration of Allied forces under some form of supreme commander accepted by all parties, but to have a coordinated business, because otherwise, how the hell could you defend against the kind of concentrated strength that the Soviets could bring to bear against you? And that's where the threat was.

In the course of this business, I worked a lot with the Joint Staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The head of the Joint Staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff then was General Gruenther, one of the keenest and most brilliant minds that I've ever been exposed to, political or military--an extraordinary man. I worked over in the bowels of the five-sided building with the staff when the first NATO force goals were developed. To give you an idea of the nature of the problem, the first cut at it was totally unrealistic. The first cut that these guys came up with, these military people, called for 151 divisions.

Q: Good God!

MACARTHUR: This was the first rough cut. Then I was brought over by General Gruenther and his people to talk about it, and I told them how absolutely absurd this was. We certainly weren't going to supply that many, and the European and the rather shaky state of their economic recovery, which was progressing, but certainly couldn't bear a burden of that kind, and that furthermore, the logistical support and so forth was totally unrealistic. That included, of course, forces which we had over here that could be deployed over and so forth, but 151 divisions. So we worked on a number of things.

I was invited to attend by the Defense Department--when people like Frank Nash and other people went over to Europe on trips, they took me along as the State Department member of the group, which was an extremely useful and interesting thing, because they were meeting with defense ministers and defense ministries and military staffs and things of that kind. So I had an extremely interesting time, and we were working along toward these ends. I had charge also of the pulling together of the coordinator plans and policies for the

NATO meetings.

As we moved toward the NATO Council of Ministers in Brussels meeting in December 1949, the Europeans increasingly had bought the idea that the threat was growing greater all the time from the East, and there had to be an integrated command. But they had made clear to us, separately and, in a couple of cases, collectively--usually separately--that only an American would be acceptable to everybody. It would be acceptable, because it would be an absolute assurance of our continuing and full support in the event there was any move against Western Europe, and it would be also acceptable, because there had been an American general who had successfully commanded the Allied forces in World War II and so forth. There were hints that they wanted to get General Eisenhower, by then President of Columbia University, back into harness as Supreme Allied Commander.

So we went to the Brussels NATO meeting, it lasted about three days, terrible weather, cold, freezing. I flew over in the Secretary's plane, Dean Acheson, a wonderful man to be with, with humor, toughness of mind, charm. And at that meeting, the ministers agreed to set up SHAPE as Supreme Allied headquarters for an integrated command, and they also agreed that General Eisenhower would be requested to take that command.

So we came back. Word was out right away. The general was contacted and came down to Washington. He and General Gruenther came over to see Dean Acheson and Doc Matthews, myself, one or two others. We met in the Secretary's office, and then, to my astonishment, because I had not been contacted, at the end of the meeting, General Eisenhower--I brought General Gruenther along, because, as you know, he was going to be my chief I'm accepting, but he would be my chief of staff. Then he said, "I'd like to take one of your people along to be my advisor on international affairs--POLAD, we call it in the military."

And the Secretary said, "Fine. Who's that?"

He said, "It's Doug MacArthur. He's served with me. General Gruenther has a high regard for him." So with that, suddenly from the department, I was assigned as his POLAD.

General Gruenther called me up that evening and said, "We talked about it, and we didn't want one of these stuffy old career ambassadors. We wanted a young fellow. If we didn't like him, we could take him up by his coat and hang him on a coat rack."

Q: You obviously have a distinguished name, not only because of your career, but because of your uncle. But looking at your two careers, you never seem to be in the same place. Did you ever see him much?

MACARTHUR: Before the war, when I was home here at the Foreign Service School, after my first posting in Vancouver, I saw him. He was down here for my grandmother's funeral. She died in the Philippines. She had lived with us for many years before his divorce, when he was married. She went out with him to the Philippines and died there. I saw him then, and I never saw him again until after he was fired by President Truman. I

was on one side of the world, and he was on the other side of the world.

But a number of people in the military were really startled and surprised that General Eisenhower picked me, because he and my uncle did not have the coziest of relationships. He served under my uncle. And I remember that when I passed the Foreign Service examination, in the old days, the State Department, the War Department, and the Navy Department were all in the Executive Offices Building, the whole business. The Army and the Navy had separate buildings for staff, but we didn't. I dropped in to see my uncle before I went off to Canada. It was earlier than that. It was when I was in the Army--'33 to '35. I stopped in once. Major Eisenhower came in with something that required a signature or quick action. It was Ike, who was then a major. He introduced me, and then Eisenhower went out, and he said, "He is a very brilliant officer," he said of Eisenhower. Now their personalities didn't gel at all, because General MacArthur had an austere personality. I'm not quite sure of the word I'm seeking, but rather aloof and a bit distant, whereas General Ike had a rather warm personality. But it did surprise a number of people who knew that there had been a bit of feeling, there was some feeling on Eisenhower's part, that he should take Douglas MacArthur II.

Q: I was wondering, because there was a well known remark that General Eisenhower said at one time, that he had studied dramatics under Douglas MacArthur.

MACARTHUR: Yes.

Continuation of interview, August 10, 1987.

Q: Mr. Ambassador, in a tape that we did before, for technical reasons, we didn't really cover your mission as a young officer to General Weygand very well. I wonder if we could go over that once again. Could you explain how that took place?

MACARTHUR: Certainly. You will recall that the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, which brought us into the war. And shortly after that attack in December, Prime Minister Winston Churchill came to the United States to meet with the President, because that act of the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor brought us into World War II. They discussed strategy and tactics and all sorts of things, the role of the United States, which is all a matter of history. But they also discussed in some detail the question of a second landing, or a landing, rather, in France. They reached the conclusion that the best way to eventually liberate France was to first go in and move in and take over North Africa, which would provide a springboard for either a second front, a dual attack on German-occupied France, or a springboard up through Italy and the like.

The problem that they faced was that in French North Africa there were elements that were not terribly pro-de Gaulle. They wanted to find a French leader that was respected, who could rally the French military, which had some strength in North Africa, to the Allied cause, as well as the general population. And they came to the conclusion that General

Weygand was the person. General Weygand had been in France in French North Africa, and he was known to bitterly oppose any effort by the Germans to take over North Africa, to occupy French North Africa. In fact, he was finally removed from his position of commander of the French forces in North Africa by the Vichy Government at German request.

I might add a personal thought, that the rather difficult personal relationships and feelings that President Roosevelt had for de Gaulle probably played an important part in seeking someone other than de Gaulle to head up the French effort in North Africa.

Q: Do you think President Roosevelt was also looking to the future beyond, to develop a new leader other than de Gaulle to deal with France?

MACARTHUR: Well, he did not personally like General de Gaulle. I mean, that is a matter of record. And I think, basically, he was looking for somebody that the French could rally to other than de Gaulle. I should add, parenthetically, jumping ahead a bit, that at a later date, President Roosevelt also tried to set General Giraud up as an alternative, if you will, to General de Gaulle.

But to go back to the Weygand mission, when this was decided, Doc Matthews, H. Freeman Matthews, who was a consular officer of the embassy in London, and who had been our chargé d'affaires in Vichy, France, and the Vichy Government until he was assigned to London, after Admiral Leahy had arrived and taken over, and who knew, Doc Matthews knew intimately the atmospherics inside the so-called unoccupied zone of France, he was called to Washington to participate in some of these meetings. And then it was decided by Roosevelt and Churchill that an effort should be made to enlist General Weygand on a contingency basis, that if it was necessary to go into French North Africa, we hoped that he would head up the movement in support of Allied landings.

Doc Matthews then flew to Portugal on his way back to England, and there he contacted Butch Leverich, who was a second secretary, as I recall it.

Q: Butch Leverich?

MACARTHUR: Henry Leverich, I think his name was. He was known as Butch, as his nickname. Doc Matthews got Leverich, and had Leverich memorize, in great detail, the instructions which would be sent to the embassy in Vichy, with respect to contacting General Weygand. The instructions were extremely detailed. And I remember that a message came in--I can't remember if it was from the department or from Doc Matthews--to our embassy in Vichy, saying that Leverich would arrive from Portugal with some extremely important instructions for Admiral Leahy, our ambassador, and myself.

We awaited Leverich's arrival in Vichy with great interest, because we didn't have a clue what this was all about, and when he arrived, he gave us, in great detail, the full message. And what the full message involved was A) a completely innocuous but very nice letter from President Roosevelt to General Weygand, a short, friendly letter. This letter was to

serve as the credentials to establish the bona fide of the oral message which would accompany the delivery of this written message. Doc Matthews had suggested that because, obviously, it was impossible for Admiral Leahy, the ambassador, to go anywhere without being followed, and because the admiral did not speak French, that I should be the emissary that carried out this mission, as I was the only officer that had been continuously in France since the fall, since 1940, when the Vichy Government had set up, and knew a great many people, and knew my way around, and had friends in various Resistance organizations and groups. Admiral Leahy concurred in that decision, and I was assigned to carry out the mission.

The first problem was to find out where General Weygand lived. We did not dare go and start asking our French Resistance friends where General Weygand might be found in France, in unoccupied France. We knew he was someplace there after he had been relieved by the Vichy Government of his duties in North Africa. Because we feared that some loose-talking Resistance fellow might say, "Well, I wonder what the American Embassy in Vichy is asking where Weygand is. What's up?" And news could spread swiftly. Secondly, if we asked a Resistance member, who was quite reliable, or we thought was quite reliable, and the Gestapo should pick him up and torture him, and it came out, the mission could be blown also. So all we had heard about General Weygand was that he was living someplace in the south of France, in Provence, someplace near the French Riviera.

So we then developed a cover story, and the cover story was that since I had been in Vichy since the beginning of the Vichy regime, virtually, I was tired, needed a rest, wanted to get away with my wife and daughter from the very ingrown and strange atmosphere of Vichy, which had a collaborationist government, and wanted ten days' rest someplace. And with this cover story, my wife, my daughter, the daughter's nurse, took off in my little Ford car for the south of France, and we proceeded to Cannes, which we had known before the war. And we stayed at a hotel that was open. It was in January by this time. It was cold, damp. There was occasional sleet. But the good life was still going on, and a casino which was open every night for gambling, collaborationists, and people of that sort with money to spend, and so my wife and I decided that the best way--or the only way, really--to try to find out where Weygand lived, without giving away the show, was to go to the casino and have a few drinks of champagne and gamble a bit, strike up acquaintances with some of these people that were there, and then individually, she or I, depending on what personal group we were with, would say something like, "Isn't it a pity that there isn't a single famous well known Frenchman left on the Cote d'Azur, when before the war it was filled with well known personalities like the Windsors and international personalities like the Ali Kahn and all sorts of French wealthy people of various classes and the like?"

So for about four nights, we ruined our alimentary canals by going to the casino each night, gambling, having a few drinks, picking up people here and there, chatting with them, and we tried this gambit on them. And nobody came up with anything. They all said, "Yes, it's very sad that there are no longer any French people here." And we got very discouraged.

By this time, I believe it was a Sunday, it was a very rainy day, the casino wasn't open, and we drove over to Juan les Pins for luncheon, which is a small, little Riviera village just

before the peninsula that sticks out to the east of Cannes, that houses the Hotel de Pacques and some of the famous properties. We found a delightful little bistro, a French restaurant, and there we ran into two couples who were having drinks before luncheon, attractive young Frenchmen and women, and we started chatting with them. They were interested in the fact that we were Americans but spoke French, and they were also interested that we came from Vichy. So we had a few more glasses of wine and had lunch together, and then my wife tried the gambit about, "Isn't it a pity there are no longer French people?"

And one of these girls who lived in Grasse, about 15 kilometers up in the hills above Cannes, said, "Well, there's one famous Frenchman that is still there, and is still down here, and that's General Weygand, who lives at the Hotel So and So, about a kilometer or two from Grasse."

So with this golden nugget of information, we returned to our hotel and ordered a bottle of champagne, and then got ready for the next day. The next day, I asked carefully about the parfumerie, a factory in Grasse that I asked the concierge of the hotel, said that I wanted to go up to Grasse and visit the famous parfumerie, where they made these marvelous French perfumes. So he gave me instructions, and my wife and daughter and nurse, we all took off and drove up that day, just before lunch, and visited the parfumerie, and found out where the hotel was. Then we had lunch. Bought a bit of perfume at the parfumerie, and then we had lunch.

After lunch, we drove to about a half a kilometer from the hotel, which was on a rather deserted road, and my wife and daughter and the nurse got out under the trees, and I walked to the hotel. I arrived, and I had written out a little card to General Weygand, which said, in effect, "Dear General Weygand, I am the nephew of General MacArthur and served with the French Army, and who knew and respected you. I served in the French Army in World War II under General Giraud, and knew and respected you greatly, and I'd like to pay my respects." And I had this all ready in an envelope, addressed to General Weygand. I went into the hotel and asked if the letter, without identifying myself, the note, to be delivered to the Weygand apartment, and I would await a reply.

I got word down to please come up to the apartment. I went up, and there was Madame Weygand, who said the general was out for a walk, but would I not come in and have some tea with her. So I went in and had tea, and we chatted inconsequentially about one thing or another, and then the general returned. I then gave him the rather very nice but innocuous letter from President Roosevelt, and said that the letter which I presented him, which he read and asked me if I would thank the President for his good wishes, I said, "The letter is simply to establish my bona fide. I have a very important and personal message for you from President Roosevelt."

I then started off by saying, which was part of the instructions which I had, which Leverich had memorized and brought from Lisbon, that there had recently been three new international developments of great significance. The first were the serious German military reverses in Russia, which raised questions about a final German victory; the second were the recent British successes in North Africa, which made it impossible for

Hitler to seize the Suez Canal and have control over North Africa and the Middle East; and the third was the entry of the United States into the war as a result of the attack on Pearl Harbor, the entry into the war on the side of the British and the Allies, with this tremendous economic and industrial and military potential, which would greatly increase the strength of the Allies and their ability to successfully prosecute the war against Nazi Germany.

I said that while these developments, in the judgment of our government, meant clearly that Germany could not win the war, they led the American Government, at the same time, to attach particular importance to French North Africa, because what happened in North Africa, French North Africa, could affect the length of the war, the number of people of occupied countries that might die as a result of it, and it could also play an important role, ultimately, in the liberation of metropolitan France.

Knowing, as the President of our government did, of the French sensibilities about being replaced in the French colonies, which the German propaganda had been spreading assiduously throughout France from the moment that France fell, to divide them from the British, saying that the British and later the Americans wanted to take over all French colonies after the war. Knowing this, my instructions included saying to General Weygand that the President wanted him to know that the United States intends to see to it that the integrity of France and her empire is respected after the war, and that the French possessions in North Africa would remain in French hands. The United States had no desire to replace France, nor to see the British or supporters of de Gaulle take over that area, knowing that Weygand, parenthetically, did not appreciate General de Gaulle too much.

I then went on with General Weygand to say that in the light of what was obviously a German objective, which was to seize French North Africa, the President wanted Weygand to know that if there were any indications that the Germans were or might move against North Africa, the United States would be obliged to take protective action to keep French North Africa from falling into German hands. These steps would necessarily include an attack on German forces, should they move into North Africa. In other words, if there was any indication of a change in the status quo of North Africa, we would be obliged to act. And insofar as what changes in the status quo might entail, I listed several, which were: 1) the replacement of the government of Marshal Petain by a government totally under German domination; that is, simply a completely puppet government; 2) the utilization of the French fleet against America or its Allies; 3) the ceding of African bases by the Vichy Government to the Germans. (We knew the Germans had been asking for bases in French North Africa.) 4) A military threat against North Africa, such as preparations for a German attack through Spain or from any other direction; and finally, 5) if there were signs of German infiltration into North Africa, which was clearly an indication of a prelude to an attempt to take it over.

I said that the President greatly regretted that General Weygand was no longer in French North Africa to cope with the German endeavors to take over that vital area, and the principal objective of my call was the President's desire to know whether in the event of any of the eventualities leading to a major threat against North Africa, which I had listed,

occurred, whether General Weygand would be willing to play a role of leadership in French North Africa. The President, I said, believed that no one was as well-equipped and as knowledgeable and as respected as he was to fulfill that role, and that such a mission could greatly speed the liberation of metropolitan France from the Nazi occupation.

General Weygand replied to me that, in effect, he no longer had any role to play, civil or military. He was retired, he was out of action, and he did not feel that he could play any role in the events of the scenario that I had described.

I then said to him that I had been asked specifically by the President to say that if he could not accept the role which the President had in mind, in the event the Germans attempted to take over North Africa, that he would keep entirely secret and to himself the proposal which I had made to him and outlined to him; it was to go no further. And General Weygand replied that he could not, in honor, do so. He was honor-bound to inform Marshal Petain, and he would inform Marshal Petain.

I said that Marshal Petain lived in the Hotel de Pacques in Vichy, which was riddled with collaborationists, and that if he did so, word would probably get back to the Germans very swiftly. And he looked at me and said, "I have ways of doing this so that the Marshal alone will know, and I know the Marshal will not break the confidence that I impose, and that the knowledge of this will go no further."

So that was the end of a mission which ended in failure. But there is, however, an epilogue. I went back to Vichy, and we reported cryptically, as we'd been instructed to do, the message that the initiative had not succeeded. Admiral Leahy sent a telegram which was for the President's eyes only, through a special communication channel which, I think, has been later released. But there is an epilogue. About a month later, after my return to Vichy, the admiral called on Marshal Petain, and I went along, as usual, as the interpreter. And the admiral went in and shook hands with the Marshal and said, "I've brought along, as usual, Mr. MacArthur, to interpret for me."

And the Marshal looked at me with a quizzical smile and said, "Monsieur MacArthur, I believe you've been doing a bit of traveling lately." And he smiled again. In fact, he said, "I think you've been visiting with your family in the south of France." And the Marshal never let anyone know, Laval or any of the others, know about this initiative, which indeed he did keep entirely to himself.

Q: Mr. Ambassador, we're catching up on some portions that were not covered on the last tape. I would like to ask you about the pre-Yalta activities of our embassy.

MACARTHUR: After the date and place of the Yalta Congerence had been agreed to by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, but before the conference was actually held, President Roosevelt sent Harry Hopkins to Europe to meet and consult with various European leaders and with General Eisenhower. He came to Paris, and General Eisenhower put him up at the Brown House, which was a special guesthouse that General Eisenhower had as Supreme Allied Commander. And a little dinner was arranged at Brown House, with

General Eisenhower, Bedell Smith, his executive chief of staff, Winston Churchill flew over from London, Duff Cooper, the British ambassador to Paris was there. I've forgotten who Churchill brought with him. Jefferson Caffery, the American ambassador, was there. And I accompanied Ambassador Caffery to this very small, intimate dinner. Harry Hopkins was the star of the occasion. He was the one who was the occasion for the dinner. I recall, without going into all the details of the discussions and the back-and-forths, the fact that the French had felt very, very insulted--or de Gaulle had felt very insulted--about not being included. I remember that Churchill, I believe it was, who asked Harry Hopkins the following question. He said, "Does the President really believe that as a result of our cooperation with Russia, with the Soviet Union, during the war, that after the war Stalin will change in any way his ambitions and the declared intention of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to see its system triumph throughout the world? Does he really believe there's a good chance or there is a chance of that?"

To which Harry Hopkins replied, "The boss," he said, "feels that after all we've done for the Russians, lend-lease support, cooperation, that there's a good chance, a 50-50 chance that he can turn Stalin into a good Democrat."

I was shocked by this answer, because it was quite clear at that time that the Soviet Union, through the French Communist Party, was doing everything it could to be disruptive inside France and create a situation from which it might--that is, the French Communist Party--might ultimately emerge as the primary influence of any French Government. But there it was.

I should add that we had had, all through that early partial liberation period of France, that is, partial in the sense that the greater part of France had been liberated, sign after sign that the French Communist Party's true intent and certainly there was at that time no Communist Party in the world more totally subservient to Moscow than the French Communist Party. They supported the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact that brought on the war. Then when the Soviet Union was attacked by Hitler, they turned right around, and in the early liberation period, as some of the towns were liberated, the communists, who were perhaps in that area, who, when they happened to be most powerful, would on a number of occasions take out other Resistance leaders who were known for their anti-communist feeling, but were staunch French Resistance leaders, they were taken out and have them shot as collaborationists. They also looted banks. When the Germans withdrew, the FTP, the French Communist Resistance organization, would move right in on a bank and loot it, and we had one very serious incident where a convoy of six FTP trucks was challenged by an American sentry group on a road in France. And instead of stopping, they pulled out their guns and started shooting at our guards. We shot back and killed some of them and captured some of them, and the five trucks were loaded with the French currency that they had looted from a small city that had been liberated several days earlier, and the FTP had seized the money in the banks before our forces arrived and took over the town.

So there were all these indications that the French Communist Party was really trying to bring about a situation where eventually it would be the government of France.

Q: In your role in the political section of the embassy, were you able to report this, even in a wartime situation, where the communists are Allies?

MACARTHUR: Yes. We not only reported it, but I still was acting as the liaison with the SHAPE staff. And the military, of course, our military reported it back once through military channels. We reported it through our channels, because we got it through our military. There were people that told us about this incident. But one must remember that after four years of German occupation, when France was liberated, there was a mess in the sense that there were all kinds of splinter groups, splinter Resistance groups of various kinds while de Gaulle had an overall umbrella over the Resistance. There were individual groups, some of leaders who had centrist or center right aspirations; other non-communist leaders of the socialist-left persuasion, and the political situation was extremely fragmented. There was also a situation at that time where, after the liberation, although de Gaulle moved in and established his government, the National Resistance Council, which was the top Resistance body that brought together the Resistance leaders of many groups into the National Resistance Council, the Conseil National de la Resistance, all groups--except the communists, who refused to participate with other groups, kept to themselves--they held meetings. The National Resistance Council held meetings several times a week on policies that the government had decided. And in those meetings, there were frequently very substantial disagreements within the National Council of Resistance on what should be done in that early post-liberation period.

Because of my friendship with several members of the National Council of the Resistance, including Joseph Laniel, the big Resistance leader from Normandy, and Ito, whom I knew, and Tsetjin, I used to go over at 10:30 at night and wait until the meeting broke up, and then I would get from one or two different sources an account of what they had been up to or what they had been discussing.

So later, when we had a rather chaotic domestic political situation, where the Fourth Republic was finally formed, but in the Fourth Republic, if a prime minister lasted a couple of months, it was almost a miracle, it was, in part, a result of this terrific fragmentation of political views, and the resistance of some people to de Gaulle's government--that is, the initial government that was set up there before the elections were held eventually that brought the constitution in the Fourth Republic, which in itself, because of the instability, some of which I've mentioned, was later replaced by the Fifth Republic.

Q: Running the political section at that time, what was your role? Did you report on this? Were there instructions of how to make them move?

MACARTHUR: I don't recall any instructions. Our role was to encourage, to the extent possible, stability in the French political system, but if you know the French as I know them, it's very difficult for a foreigner to offer suggestions to a Frenchman about what he might or might not be doing, without creating a very, very considerable backlash. And our basic effort was concentrated certainly on reporting. I think, because of my background, I was one that had the very large number of contacts with different people in the French military, as well as the French Resistance people who turned out to be future political

leaders of one kind or another. But we had a special section that dealt with the communist-left, under Norris Chipman, which reported and followed very closely what the communists were doing, and that section of the embassy reported, at the specific request of the department, that felt certain that we had been infiltrated by Soviet moles, and they were proven right, as the Alger Hiss trial later proved, and Harry Dexter White's suicide.

Q: He was in the Treasury.

MACARTHUR: He was the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and worked for the Soviet Union, and committed suicide when it all started unraveling. We had a special office in the State Department, to which Norris Chipman's numbered reports went, and then went directly to Doc Matthews and Jimmy Dunn. Jimmy Dunn was the head of the European bureau, and Doc was his deputy. We did not dare trust at that time reporting on communist activity through ordinary channels, for fear that it would be back to Moscow within 36 hours.

Q: How were you informed of this particular problem?

MACARTHUR: Well, we were informed of it through people like Ray Murphy, who headed the special little office in the department that dealt with this problem. I mean, it was no secret what the Russians were up to then, and that's why many of us were so disappointed at the Roosevelt performance at Yalta. The first thing that you know when you deal with the Russians is that if you get an agreement, you have to nail down every single clause in airtight fashion; otherwise, if you just sign some general agreement that you agree on mother love, and be kind to animals and that sort of thing, the Soviets will run with that 1,000 miles before you can even see them. Certainly that's what happened at Yalta, when they agreed to free elections. I remember later when we challenged Molotov about that at the Berlin Conference, he said, "But the elections are free."

We said, "Yes, elections are free, but you have to be a member of the Communist Party and you can only vote for a single candidate set up by the Party."

Molotov replied, "Yes, but anybody can vote, or they can vote 'no' if they want to, or they can vote for that man or oppose him." And the performance at Yalta was one for which, at that time, when we had the monopoly of the weapon, and we had a great deal of cards to play, with one of which we didn't do ourselves a great amount of good.

Q: Was this perceived at the time, basically throughout the Foreign Service officer corps?

MACARTHUR: Well, it was certainly perceived by those of us in the European bureau, and I think there was no mystification, I think, in the minds of people who had responsibility for Soviet affairs in the Foreign Service. Certainly Norris Chipman had served in Moscow, and that was why he was picked to come to Paris, because he knew there were no scales on his eyes about what the Soviet leadership was really up to in terms of the rest of Europe. And while Chip Bohlen was perhaps never as vocal on the subject of what they were up to as Norris Chipman, I've talked to Chip, I knew him well, many, many

times, and there was certainly not a shadow of a doubt about his understanding of what they were up to. Actually, how we knew that they knew that Hiss and Harry Dexter White were working and passing information to the Soviets, I don't know. I don't know what the details are.

Q: But you knew that in the atmosphere . . .

MACARTHUR: But we knew that both of them were passing things on to the Soviet Union, and we knew that in that atmosphere and with what the Soviets were trying to do through the use of the French Communist Party, if it got back to them, it would make the job that much easier for them, if they knew what we knew about what they were trying to do. So we also had some brilliant people who had left the Party. You must remember that when the French Communist Party was formed, it was a split-away from the Socialist Party, after the Socialist Congress of Tours, in 1917--I think it was 1917; it could have been a little later--the communist wing, there was no French Communist Party then, the ultra Marxist left of the wing splintered away and formed the French Communist Party. And among those people were a number of people who were idealists. One in particular, whose real name I've forgotten now, he had a pseudonym, was a member, until the 1930s, was a member of the Politburo of the Party, and he and another member of the Politburo split away, when finally they understood, during the great Stalin purges, that this was not a great social experiment that was designed to lift the well-being of man and make life a better place for all people, in democratic political surroundings; that it was a simple, total power autocracy with expansionist desire. And indeed, these people, who were close to people in the Communist Party, although they'd split from it, were a very, very valuable source of information to Norris Chipman and to myself, when Norris was away. There were a number of them, and they knew exactly what was up. They knew the leadership of the Communist Party intimately; they knew all about them. They knew they had their feelers into the Party, and so they kept us very, very well informed at that time.

Q: Turning away from dealing with the Communist Party, but dealing with the French Government towards the end of the war, you wore two hats. You were both working with Eisenhower's headquarters and with the embassy. Were there any particular problems?

MACARTHUR: Yes. After I left, after the liberation of Paris, there on General Eisenhower's staff in Normandy, then I was assigned to the--they had a SHAPE liaison group, and I was assigned to that. Then when I was reassigned to the embassy, my official membership in the SHAPE liaison group was severed, but the informal relationship of working with them continued on. So I continued to work with them and be sort of a channel, if you will, middle-level channel, of information that they wanted passed on to the ambassador in the embassy.

And in the military sphere, we ran into one very serious problem just before the end of the war. I think it was in April. As Germany was beginning to collapse and the eastern front was giving way, and we were advancing on the continent, our intelligence had information that the Germans might try to regroup in an Austrian redoubt in the Alps, and if that happened successfully, it could represent a very difficult target because of the terrain, and

we could lose a hell of a lot of Allied lives. So a drive was put on. General Eisenhower mounted a drive which was to kick off and strike--I guess it was across the Rhine and in toward the heartland of the so-called Austrian redoubt, and cut off any connection. In the Allied forces, of course, the French Army was included in the Allied forces under the overall command of General Eisenhower. But the advance was triggered to kick off--I think this was in April of '45, at 5:00 in the morning or something like that. There had been heavy preparatory artillery barrages and things of that kind, and then to the consternation of our forces, of our commander of the Army group of which the French Army was a part, the French Army, instead of advancing in the direction of the line of battle, as indicated in the plans, marched right across the front--I think it was the French Ninth Army or one of the armies--to grab Stuttgart and Ulm. In other words, it advanced at a 90-degree angle, directly across the front of the advancing Americans. We either had the choice of shooting our way through the French or holding up the advance. We held up the advance for 36 hours, and this created a real crisis. The answer was that General de Gaulle had given the orders to the French commander, and he so informed our Army group commander to take these places, and this is part of his move to move into this part of Germany, so that France would have a zone of occupation or a larger zone of occupation than it might otherwise have had. This did nothing, of course, to make our government any happier about General de Gaulle. I think President Truman had taken over by that time. President Roosevelt had died.

Q: Yes, I think that final push into Bavaria had taken place after, probably in late March, early April.

MACARTHUR: I think it was early April. And of course, President Truman, one of our great Presidents, it didn't do much to give him much confidence in General de Gaulle, to have a partner in a war, with a world war going on, who, when the plan has been accepted, or you understand has been accepted, and everybody has their orders to march, suddenly disrupts the whole plan because of his own political objectives.

I had one other interesting experience at that time. As we moved forward in April and started liberating these concentration camps, I alerted the T forces every time we passed through the SHAPE liaison group of the . . .

Q: The T forces?

MACARTHUR: The task forces. The T force is the force that goes in first. It's the attack force, the initial point force, that goes into the area of combat, the objective that you're trying to take. I gave to all CORE and Army headquarters a list of people who had worked with us in the Resistance that I knew personally or whom I knew of because their group had worked with us, who were missing. Because during the period '44-'45, there had been a terrible blood-letting of the French Resistance. A lot of the Rezos, the Resistance groups, had been broken, and a great many people disappeared.

In Dachau, I got word that one of the finest contacts that had done a great deal for us in the Vichy days, with two other people that I had worked with, were alive, had been picked up

alive. They all had tuberculosis and were very ill, but they survived. And then I got word from Gaston Palewski, General de Gaulle's director of cabinet, and his sort of eminence grise, that they would like me to go forward when Dachau was liberated, to see if I could find any of the listed Resistance leaders that they would give me still alive, and if so, if I could evacuate them back at once to Paris. So I went forward to General Sandy Patch's headquarters in a little L5, I guess it was called, a little two-passenger liaison open biplane, and got there the day before the liberation, the night before they were going to move in the next morning, and then went forward and stayed with the medical groups behind the T force, until the T force went in and the shooting stopped.

I went into the camp, and the Germans in these PW camps, (Dachau then had 32,500 people still in it) they divided them up into national groups, a French group, an Italian group, this group, and Dutch, and they quartered them together, and they had one man who, in French, is known as the chef de fil, the head man, and the Germans would only deal with one man in that national contingent. So I went forward, and it was the most ghastly spectacle I've ever seen in my life. As we advanced toward the camp when the shooting stopped, there was a train on the side with about 50 boxcars, a terrible smell coming from it, but there was a trail of bodies from one of the cars. They'd obviously broken open the doors, and there was a trail of skeletons. I couldn't call them bodies; there was nothing but bones and skin. It went about 100 feet and then stopped, where they simply collapsed and died. The rest were just dead bodies in these boxcars. They'd been moved from another camp, and they had never been let out of the boxcars.

I got into the camp, and there was a mound of bodies outside of what was the crematorium, a mound of bodies 12 feet high, perhaps 150, 200 feet long, something over virtually 8,000, 10,000 bodies. There were people dying. As I came in, a man was sitting against the front, just a skeleton with skin, looked up at me, and he whispered something. I leaned over to listen, and I understood him to say, "Cigarette, cigarette." I pulled out a cigarette and lit it and put it in his mouth, and he gave me a beautiful smile, and then he just fell over dead.

But in any event, I finally found the chef de fil of the French, and to my amazement, he was number three or four on de Gaulle's list. I said to him that I had a plane, and I could take 26 people back, and would he designate 26 people, Resistance people, from this list that General de Gaulle had given me to fly back to Paris. And of course, he would be one of them. He looked at me with great pain in his eyes, and he said, "I am the leader of the French group. There are 3,200 Frenchmen here still alive." He said, "They're dying like flies." He said, "I will leave Dachau when the last Frenchman has been repatriated or died, because some of them are never going to make it back." And he did. He stayed three and a half weeks.

Q: With the French dealing with the problems of peace, I believe there were peace negotiations going on during the time you were there.

MACARTHUR: There were indeed, and the embassy was involved to a certain extent. Jimmy Byrnes, our Secretary of State, former Senator Byrnes, came over with a delegation from Washington, but the people in the embassy were drafted to serve on various

subcommittees, working groups, you might call them, international, of the peace council group. I served on a subcommittee of a group that was deliberating the French-Italian border. You remember that after France fell, Italians, who had been neutral until Paris and France fell, stabbed the . . .

Q: The hand that held the dagger in the back.

MACARTHUR: (Laughs) Yes. They stabbed the French in the back, and the French were determined to have a hunk of that Italian territory as a bit of payment for that. I got my first real experience with negotiating with the Soviets. They, of course, were part of the peace . . .

Q: This was about what period are we talking about?

MACARTHUR: We're talking about '46, '47. It's after the war is over and the peace machinery has been set up and so forth. I'll never forget. The Soviets, if they disagreed with--there was general agreement on the Allied side, the British, French, and American side, but the Soviets, when they disagreed, would go on and on and on and on. I discovered later, when I was responsible as coordinator for some of our negotiations in the post-war period with the Soviets, that it's a standing tactic. You wear the guy down. You go on, and you go on, and 8:00 comes, and 9:00 comes, and 10:00 comes, and 11:00 comes, and 12:00 comes. I remember once they simply want to wear you down. Once we were there until 5:00 in the morning, and we just sat it out, and eventually, when they saw they weren't going to get what they were after, they folded up, not then, but the next day, when they saw that we were not going to finally in fatigue or whatever it might be, just sort of say, "Oh, well, what the hell. Let's give an inch here or there," or something like that. But one of the tactics, there are two basic tactics. One is to wear the opposite negotiator that's on the other side down, but the basic tactic is to get language that is so vague and general that it is subject to almost any interpretation that they want to give it, and that is why any negotiation with the Soviets--any negotiation--it's got to be spelled out to the last word and every "t" crossed and every "i" dotted, or else you're going to find yourself that you've got absolutely nothing, and they're proceeding ahead and saying, "Well, the agreement says this and this, and that's what we're doing within the terms of the agreement."

Q: How did the negotiations you were involved in work out, between the French and the Italians?

MACARTHUR: I don't even remember, it was such a small, inconsequential part of the business as a whole. I think there was a section of a small piece of territory, if I recall correctly, but it was not terribly important.

Q: After this period, you were then reassigned to Washington, is that correct?

MACARTHUR: No. In 1948, I was reassigned to Brussels. The department said--Ted Achilles, one of our Foreign Service officers who was in charge of western Europe, said that he wanted me to come back to the department to head up the western European bureau,

but he wanted me to serve in another country before I went back to that position, because, except for Canada, I'd been tied up with France and the aftermath thereof. With the exception of Canada and Italy, I'd been tied up with France almost continuously for eight years. Of course, being tied up with France, I was tied up with other countries, too, because the peace negotiations and the whole business of Europe that had been occupied by Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium and Luxembourg, and all of it was part of our overall hold.

So I was assigned to Brussels, and I went there, and that is where I had the great good fortune to meet one of the great statesmen of that period, Paul-Henri Spaak, Belgium's great foreign minister. When I was there, he was both prime minister and foreign minister. I used to have lunch with him occasionally. I was chargé d'affaires when Alan Kirk was away a couple of times, before he went to Moscow. Admiral Kirk was our ambassador, under whom I served. The wife of the number two guy was very ill, and he was gone for quite a single period of time, so I had the great good fortune of being the chargé d'affaires there on occasion, and got to know Spaak awfully well and some of his people, which helped me a great deal later, when I went as ambassador to Belgium. Spaak was still very much "Mr. Belgium" in terms of foreign affairs. I was in Belgium just under a year.
[telephone interruption]

Q: When you were back in Belgium. We're talking about Henri Spaak.

MACARTHUR: Well, about Spaak. You remember he was the first person that had the guts to face up to the Soviets in the United Nations in 1946, when he made his famous speech. He was a brilliant orator; he never read a speech in his life; he never wrote a speech in his life. He made notes, and he had a mind that worked like a computer; everything fed in and came out in orderly fashion, in the way he wanted it to come in. He made his famous speech to the United Nations, in which he said, "Mr. Vishinsky, we are afraid." It was on what the Russians were doing and the way they were behaving in 1946, moving in and pushing into eastern Europe, toward Czechoslovakia and the like. "Monsieur Vishinsky, nous avons peur," was the way he put it in that famous speech.

Then in about May of that year, I was brought back to Washington.

Q: Before we go to that, I would like to ask one question. Alan Kirk, later he became ambassador not only to Belgium, but to the Soviet Union and then to Formosa, or China.

MACARTHUR: Oh, did he? I'd forgotten that.

Q: How was he as an ambassador?

MACARTHUR: Well, he had no great background at all. He was a very attractive personality, had a charming personality, he was a nice, decent man, and he had no great background. In fact, very little background at all insofar as foreign affairs were concerned. But he used his staff well, and depended, I think, very, very much on staff and also Mrs. Kirk, who was very bright--Lydia Kirk. She wrote a book about Moscow.

Q: Window on Moscow.

MACARTHUR: She was a very bright, articulate woman, and I think she played a very considerable role in his thinking. They also had a very bright son, Roger Kirk, who, I think, is an ambassador.

Q: Yes. I served with him in Saigon.

MACARTHUR: Yes. Admiral Kirk I found a delightful fellow to work for. As I said, he knew how to use his staff. He didn't have a deep background in foreign affairs of any kind, but he had good common sense, and I think if you were used to say what is the first attribute, the most important single attribute that a diplomat can have, I would unhesitatingly myself say judgment and common sense, because without judgment, in the issues that come up, you can get into deep trouble. And Kirk was a man of considered judgment and, as I say, a delightful person to work for. I enjoyed working with him very much indeed.

Q: Then you were sent, after your time in Brussels . . .

MACARTHUR: I returned to Washington and became head of the Western European Division, which consisted then, as I recall it, largely of France and the BENELUX countries, I think. I say France and the BENELUX countries; I think that's correct. We had northern Europe and western Europe and southern Europe.

Q: Germany was a section also, a special case.

MACARTHUR: Germany was a special office in itself, because it was occupied. Jack McCloy was the high commissioner then, and Byroade, Colonel Byroade then, was McCloy's special assistant--the "hatchet man," we used to call him. I liked Hank; we got along well together.

But western Europe was largely France, because there were no major problems. The Belgians were getting along rather well, the Dutch were getting along very well, Luxembourg didn't represent a problem. But France at that period of time had considerable turmoil, and there were all kinds of problems. We were concerned because the Communist Party was still strong. I think in some of those elections about that time, they were still the number one party of France. There were problems in France's possessions--Algeria and the like. So it was mainly a continuation, to a great extent, of following French affairs from the department's viewpoint.

We had one crisis, if you will. Dean Acheson, a marvelous man, was our Secretary of State at that time, and we had one crisis, which was--let's see. Would you turn it off for just a minute?

Q: Yes. [Tape recorder turned off briefly]

MACARTHUR: The most serious problem we had with France then, at that time, involved the so-called European Defense Community. Basic to American policy after World War II, with respect to western Europe, had been the question at the very center of our policy, was the problem of Germany. How could you weave Germany into a western European fabric, economically, politically, militarily, so that the German strings would only be part of the strings that composed that fabric? And if at some future time undependable leadership emerged in Germany, it would become extremely difficult for the Germans to unravel their threads of this European fabric and go their own way, floating between east and west or signing up with the wrong side. And, of course, in pursuit of that policy, we ran immediately into the centuries-old animosity between France and Germany and the bitterness that still existed in that early post-war period on the part of the French, because of the German victory and occupation of France, and the suffering they had gone through, and the rest of it. It was quite obvious to us that without Germany in some form of European fabric, the defense of Europe would be extremely difficult. To try to defend Europe on the Rhine would be logistically, and in other ways, against the kind of forces the Soviet Union had, with no cushion, nothing, would be extremely difficult and highly problematic.

So the problem came up of how could you integrate Germany into a European fabric. Economically, we thought by encouraging European economic integration, which developed into the EEC, and militarily, there had to be some way, because we certainly, with all that we were doing, did not have the resources to put men in the other countries of Europe recovering from the devastation of war, didn't have the resources, we certainly needed a German military contribution at some appropriate stage. And as I recall it, a Frenchman first came up with the idea of the European Defense Community.

Q: It was a French proposal.

MACARTHUR: A French proposal which would integrate at low level, about company or battalion . . .

Q: A brigade level.

MACARTHUR: Well, it was below brigade. I think it was regimental level, units of different countries. I was told later by a Frenchman that it was put up because they thought it was so absurd that it would never fly. But to their surprise and chagrin, the British and ourselves both said, "All right, if this is what it takes to weave Germany into the fabric." The French then walked smartly away from the proposal, and the French prime minister at that time refused to go along. This created very considerable stresses and strains on our relationship with the French, but the damage was repaired fairly swiftly at a later date.

Q: Did we feel that this was going to be a workable system, or was it something that we went along with more for European cooperation than military?

MACARTHUR: Our position was that we would do nothing, we would accept nothing that

couldn't be made to operate militarily with a degree of effectiveness. The thought was that in extremis, our military said this could be made to work. It was not a preferred solution. In fact, it was just above the borderline of unworkability, but they could make it work, and it would bring the Germans in with all the advantages, and overall, the advantages of bringing them in militarily outweighed the absurdity of the proposal, of trying to integrate forces at that low regimental level.

Q: There must have been quite a few conflicts between you and the State Department and the Defense Department.

MACARTHUR: There are always conflicts between the State Department and the Defense Department because of their perception that their responsibility is military, for military security, whereas the State Department has to take into account infinitely broader considerations. It may be fine militarily, but if your friend and ally, on whom you depend, isn't going to agree to it, it's no good at all. And some of the things that the Defense Department has put forward has been things that manifestly would be unacceptable to friends and allies; they just wouldn't agree to it. And if they wouldn't agree to it, they're a non-starter. So diplomacy, I think, is the art of the possible. You have to do what you can with what you've got to work with, always trying to bring the other people along to your persuasion, but that is not an easy task, and it takes time. You know, we're always going to have a difference between a purely military point of view that disregards all the political, social, psychological, and other aspects of a problem. From a purely military point of view, it may look, you know, super. But when you have to take in the other things, and when you are in the position that we're in, where we do not have the resources to assure our own security by ourselves without friends and allies, then you come into a much broader problem of what can you do to achieve this goal, when you can't do it by this narrow military position, because it's unacceptable. What can you do to move it in that direction?

And the difficulty of our position is compounded, of course, by the fact that we have no constituency. The Foreign Service, the State Department, has no constituency whatsoever. The military have the families of millions of people. I'm talking about politics now. We've got no political constituency; we've got no constituency in the news world. There's nothing the news world likes better than to talk about striped pants diplomats and cookie pushers and the like.

Q: We will return to this subject a little more when we cover Eisenhower.

MACARTHUR: Because I think I skipped a beat there. The EDC business came up.

Continuation of interview, October 23, 1987.

Q: Mr. Ambassador, I think the place we should pick this up is when you went with General--and he was then General--Eisenhower when he took command of NATO. What was the nature of your work with Eisenhower?

MACARTHUR: First, let me say that General Eisenhower was a man who had a unique understanding of what it takes to make an alliance work. He had served under perhaps the three most difficult international leaders that existed during World War II. I say difficult in the sense that each one had strong personalities and strong views. They were Franklin Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Charles de Gaulle.

General Eisenhower understood that to make an alliance work, first you had to be perceptive and responsive to more than just the sort of things that military men normally are associated with--that is, force goals and planning and so forth. To make an alliance work, each member has to feel that first and foremost it serves its own enlightened self-interest. And secondly, General Eisenhower realized that in each of the member countries of NATO--there were 12 founding members--each one had its own particular problems or views or domestic political situations or domestic economic situations that politically in that country were important to the party in power.

So what General Eisenhower wanted when he asked me, and indeed honored me by asking me to come to be his advisor on international affairs, POLAD, we call it, political advisor, to be his POLAD, was that I keep him abreast daily of developments in various parts of the world, international developments. Developments in the NATO countries, of course, first and foremost, but also developments in other parts of the world. Why? Because a number of the NATO members were former or still colonial powers who had deep interests in different parts of the world, in Africa, in the Far East, in South Asia, and had deep economic and other political interests in those areas. And what happened in those areas to their interests would obviously have an effect on their policies with respect to NATO and the United States and so forth.

So every morning, five days a week, I picked up about 7:00 o'clock in the morning at the American Embassy a batch of telegrams that had been repeated to me and a summary from the department, which I then drove out to SHAPE at Rocquencourt reading the telegrams on the way out in the car. It was about a 35-minute to 40-minute run out to the headquarters outside of Paris. And I would dictate a summary, a brief summary with one brief paragraph, perhaps not more than four or five lines for each telegram, and then I would go in and brief General Eisenhower. I met with him from 8:15 'til roughly just before 9:00 o'clock every morning.

The general did not like to read telegrams and long briefing papers. He didn't like telegraphese. He really liked to be briefed orally and to be able to interrupt an oral briefing and then get into a discussion about a particular point that interested him, because he knew that it was of interest to other NATO friends and allies. I remember one of the observations he made particularly. I was briefing him on the Middle East, and he looked at me and he said, "Doug, when was the last time that an American Secretary of State made a business visit to the Middle East, a tour of the Middle East or Middle Eastern countries?"

And I said, "General Eisenhower, no American Secretary of State has ever made a tour of the Middle East."

And he said, "My God! It's the backyard of NATO, it is the area from which Europe derives a very vital part of its energy. What happens there will have a profound effect on Europe and the Mediterranean, and the ability of democratic countries to maintain their positions there. And you tell me that no Secretary of State has ever visited or made a business tour of visiting the Middle East."

I mention this only because I'll come back to it later. After he became President, he commissioned Mr. Dulles one week after he assumed the presidency on January 20, 1953, to first make a quick visit to all the NATO countries on his behalf. And then the second visit that he directed in the period when he was President-elect but not had assumed the presidency, was a tour of the Middle East and South Asia.

So the morning briefings were always interesting, because he would have a comment to make or would say, "Will that affect the French view on this or the British view on that? What position are we taking with respect to this matter? Will we get entangled with them?" He was acutely aware of and interested in the ramifications of events that happened in other parts of the world on the effect of our Atlantic alliance. So my first job was to brief him every morning, as I say, from roughly 8:15 to 8:45, 8:50, before he had a 9:00 o'clock staff meeting.

The second job I had was to organize his visits as Supreme Allied Commander to other NATO countries in Europe. We usually would make a swing perhaps to the north--and you must remember this was before Germany was a member of NATO.

Q: Greece and Turkey were not in NATO at that time.

MACARTHUR: Greece and Turkey were not in it, but they came in while he was there. Greece and Turkey came in in '51, September of '51, I think, or October, something of that kind.

But we would make a swing north, where he would hit Norway, Denmark, and then perhaps the BENELUX countries and back, or swing to Italy and over to Portugal. Then when Greece and Turkey came in, we made a visit virtually very, very swiftly after they came in. These visits were--it sounds like a simple thing; you simply organize a trip and say, "Well, we'll do it this way." But you have to take into account, when you visit countries of an alliance, the feelings between certain countries, as well as rivalries and jealousies about the kind of events that you schedule. For example, on the Greek and Turkey one, I was keenly aware, because I had worked on that problem when I was Deputy Director of the Office of European Regional Affairs and had responsibility for backstopping NATO, at the end of 1949 and 1950, 'til I went with General Eisenhower in January to SHAPE, January of '51, I was aware that if you did anything in Greece, you had to have a comparable thing in Turkey, and vice versa.

Q: That is a rule that still holds like the Holy Writ.

MACARTHUR: It is Holy Writ. I scheduled very carefully, and I was quite satisfied with it. In Turkey, the President laid a wreath on Ataturk's tomb. In Greece, he laid a wreath on the equivalent of the Unknown Soldier. But the Greeks felt that there was a minor bit of fallout. Some of them felt that he should have visited the tomb of some great Grecian figure of the past, because he had laid a wreath on the tomb of Ataturk.

Q: Maybe Venezuelos or somebody like that. Really, it's a little hard to come up with a major figure.

MACARTHUR: It's very difficult to do certain things, particularly when you're dealing with countries with different religions and different social systems and different backgrounds and countries that have, as one looks back in history, been at each other's throats from time to time. So that was another aspect of my job at SHAPE.

Of course, with it all, I was always keeping an ear to the ground on the political situations as elections would come up in a country, what position the parties were taking with respect to defense and NATO and the like.

But the third and very interesting business was that when General Eisenhower was Supreme Allied Commander, he had a unique position, and very frequently when foreign ministers and defense ministers and prime ministers visited France from NATO countries, they would come out to SHAPE for a meeting with General Eisenhower, to see the headquarters, and then have a briefing if they wanted or a meeting with General Eisenhower. Included in the figures that used to come from time to time were people like Winston Churchill, and General Eisenhower was good enough to include me in these meetings and small luncheons with General Gruenther and a visiting dignitary with his ambassador or something like that. Then I would do a little what we call in the department a memorandum of conversation on the salient points--not the whole business, but just the salient points that they had raised that had a relationship directly or indirectly to NATO.

NATO was in a period of growth and development when I was at SHAPE, and as I mentioned earlier, Germany was not a member. I felt that it was important that the Germans have an appreciation of General Eisenhower's understanding of their problem. He felt so, too, and when we visited Germany, we usually made it a separate trip, since they were not a NATO country. We would not, for example, go from Germany to Norway or to Belgium or Holland. We would make these trips up where he would be briefed by our high commissioner and by the commanding general and so forth.

On one occasion, we were going to Germany, and there was a very attractive, nice, young first secretary in the German mission. They had a mission in Paris, not an embassy, because they were still an occupied power. They had not had their sovereignty restored and become a NATO member. That came later. He was named Franz Kraft, who later became a very distinguished ambassador and, I think, Under Secretary of the German Foreign Office. And since we were going to Germany, and I had developed a relationship with him and his mission to find out, to be aware of how they viewed what we were doing, and he appreciated that. He came out to say goodbye to me and as a mark of respect to General

Eisenhower, who was headed for Germany. As we got ready to board the plane, I presented him to General Eisenhower, and the general looked at him and said, "Would you like to ride up to Bonn and spend the night there?" [Laughter] Of course, Franz Kraft was absolutely thrilled with the idea, and he said, "Sure." So he hopped into the airplane and we had him aboard.

Well, it was through contacts such as this that later, before Germany was admitted to NATO, that I was able to arrange a private meeting for Generals Speidel and Hunsinger, German generals with distinguished war records, but known for their opposition to the Nazi system as such, before we had formal defense ties with Germany through their resumption of their sovereignty and being members of NATO.

Another area where I used to work with the general, he was very keen on keeping up support in America for NATO, and to have people visiting dignitaries from various fields of our national life. If they wanted to come out to NATO for a briefing, an American, I would set up the briefing, and he was very good about receiving these people for ten or 15 minutes when they were out there, giving them a special little meeting in his office.

He understood the need of labor support, and he knew that I had worked with George Meany and the AFL during the period I was in France in the early post-war years--that is, '44 to '48. That was before the merger of the AFL with the CIO. When the communists seized control of the French CGT, the general confederation of labor in France, which gave them a tremendous weapon to use against any French government, the general was familiar that I had worked with George Meany in helping to set up a rival non-communist, labor organization called Force Ouvriere. And I knew Irving Brown, who was with George Meany in the AFL and later the AFL-CIO, and still is, I think, its representative in Europe. I arranged for him to come out and have a long half-hour, 40-minute meeting with General Eisenhower, and later for Meany to come out, and also for Victor Reuther, who was the brother of Walter Reuther, the automobile labor guy, whom I knew, Vic Reuther. So I used to arrange things of that kind, visiting dignitaries, people from business or industry, so that there would be an understanding of what we were trying to accomplish at NATO.

Q: Eisenhower obviously considered this as much a political alliance as a military one.

MACARTHUR: Yes, but I'm sure he did, because he understood that support for the military depends on broad public support, and you must engage, if you can, every element that makes out the totality of a country in support of the military or what you're trying to do if you're to be successful. Otherwise, even if there's a strong minority, even if you have a majority, because a strong minority can be extremely disruptive and it can be particularly disruptive in terms of appropriations and things of that kind, on which the military depend to maintain adequate strength. I don't for one minute say that the General wasn't also--I just don't know--aware of the fact that it would do his image good should he ever go into politics to have people who appreciated very much the time that he spent with them at that time. In fact, as an amusing epilogue of the Irving Brown story, when General Eisenhower became a candidate for the presidency later and was running for the presidency, he addressed either an AFL or CIO convention, and as he walked in, one of the people that he

saw was Irving Brown, and he shouted, "Hi, Irv, how are you?" [Laughter] And of course, Irving Brown was delighted with this sign of recognition by the great man. I suspect that a lot of AFL people voted for Eisenhower for the presidency, despite the fact that he was a Republican and not a Democrat. [Laughter]

Q: Returning to your position, could we talk a little about the sort of support and the direction and your thought about the direction you got from the State Department and the Foreign Service? How were you informed? Did you have unofficial channels? Did they understand what you were doing, or were you pretty much left on your own?

MACARTHUR: Well, I was in the department, and our ambassadors in the field were extremely good about the department and sending the key telegrams or key information about policy decisions that were undergoing consideration. The people in the field were extremely cooperative and very helpful in repeating to me their basic think-piece telegrams that had any bearing on the country, if it was a NATO country, or on NATO itself and so forth. This material was sent to me through the embassy (I had the title of counselor of the embassy also at the embassy in Paris) through the embassy channels either by diplomatic pouch or by other things. But I wouldn't say that there was any direction. I reported to the assistant secretary. The material they sent me in itself enabled me, you know, to know what positions were and views were with respect to whatever the problem happened to be. So there was no need for any monitoring device to that office at that time.

Q: It was well integrated into the system then.

MACARTHUR: It was integrated into the system, and it was integrated on the other end, because after these meetings that I mentioned with distinguished foreign leaders, prime ministers and foreign ministers and defense ministers with General Eisenhower, or heads of political parties from NATO countries, I would dictate a summary telegram to the department on the points they had raised. At the beginning, I used to always take them into Al Gruenther to clear them with him.

Q: This is General Al Gruenther?

MACARTHUR: General Al Gruenther, who later became Supreme Allied Commander of NATO himself, after Ridgway. But I had done that for only about three weeks, and then Al called me in one morning, and he said, "Doug, there's no need to hold up your telegrams. With the time difference, you can get them on the desk the same day. Go ahead and send them and just send me a copy for the general and so forth." So I was integrated as a member of the SHAPE staff as much as any of the military were. I mean, there was none of this business "I want to see and approve and clear everything that you've written on this particular meeting and your impressions and so forth." I was told to go ahead and send the damn thing and let them have a copy.

Q: I think this probably was a reflection of the fact that all of you had been serving during wartime and had not succumbed to the bureaucratic problems that I think have clogged the arteries of the political and military establishments.

MACARTHUR: I think that the fact that I had worked very closely with the military, that I was on General Eisenhower's staff briefly in Normandy before we broke through, that after the liberation of Paris and most of Europe, I was in constant touch with the SHAEF--that's Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Forces--General Eisenhower's headquarters, either through their mission chief or directly with them. And then the fact that with that background, when in 1949-50 we set up the Office of European Regional Affairs to backstop NATO, and I had worked hours in the bowels of the five-sided building, the Pentagon, in the development of potential NATO force goals and other things. I think all these things contributed to a background where they accepted me as a team worker and not as a guy from a rival organization within our government.

Q: How was your information from the other side of the hill? In other words, from the Soviet Union and from our various embassies, and other information in Center Europe under the communist rule?

MACARTHUR: Well, as you know, we were then in the very depths of the Cold War, and NATO really came about because of Soviet expansionism and the growing threat to Western Europe, and the integrated forces, the openly hostile nature of the Soviet Union and its avowed expansionist policies that its system would triumph throughout the world, and that Europe was high on the priority list, the activities of the Communist Party, particularly the French Communist Party, which was probably at that time and since has been the most subservient Communist Party to the Soviet Union in the world. All these things led to the point where there was no prospect of detente, given the nature of Stalin's policies. I got copies of some of the think-pieces that came out of our embassy in the Soviet Union. EUR was very good about sending me appreciations of Soviet policy and things of that kind. But it was quite unlike a so-called period of detente, in which I think we lost some of our clothing. Indeed, it's unlike the present period today, where Mr. Gorbachev has been extremely skillful in creating the image of a very conciliatory person. So there was a view of the Soviet Union which the Soviet Union, by its actions and words, did nothing to dispel. And we really didn't have a problem of peaceniks and people who were clamoring for accommodation at any price with the Soviet Union at that time.

I might say that our view of the communist world at that time was not an accurate view. The general view, the view of the communist world at that point held pretty much by the department and by the people in government that counted was the view of a communist world, of a communist bloc of China and the Soviet Union. It was like a steel-hard sphere with no cracks, working together each to expand in its part of the world, but working closely together to do that. That image, of course, later started coming apart, because it was incorrect historically. The Chinese and the Soviet Union have had their periods of deep hostility long before Marx came to this world. But I refer, of course, to the period under Genghis Kahn and the Mongols, what the Russians refer to as the Chinese. They were the Mongols, swept over much of Russia, including European Russia, as they did over Iran, where I served later. And when they went through, say, a city of a couple of thousand people, they would blind or chop off the arms, an arm or a wrist or a foot of the younger able-bodied men, so they'd leave no fifth columns behind them.

I had, on one occasion, in a later period when we were meeting with the Russians after dinner in their place, when one of them was full of vodka, he said, almost with tears of rage in his eyes, "We will never forget what the Chinese have done to us in the past."

Similarly, I've had a Chinese of the communist world say to me that the Chinese will not forget that when Stalin sent his advisors to them in the late Twenties, that little advisory group that was with them when they were seeking to seize power in China, that every time they took the advice that the Russians gave them, they suffered a setback, and it was only when they acted on their own and in contradiction to Russian advice that they achieved power. So there were historic ethnic, political, and other reasons for suspicions between the two countries.

But to get back to the point I was making, at that time the view--and it was sustained in the beginning of the Eisenhower Administration by Mr. Dulles--that China and the Soviet Union, as I say, were a steel-hard sphere with no cracks that you could get a fingernail into.

Q: During the war, we had the OSS, which was pretty much dissolved by Truman, and then put back together. As a new organization, the CIA, which really for a peacetime situation was the first time in our history that we had any intelligence apparatus. I would suspect that you were not very well served by it as you would be later on because of its newness and learning the job. Was this your impression?

MACARTHUR: Well, I think at that time, we were a bit mesmerized by the support that the Russians were giving to the Chinese and by the bellicosity of the Chinese. I think also you must remember that we were at war with the Chinese in Korea, and the Russians were giving the Korean and Chinese armaments. There was a preponderance of Russian weaponry that they were being given by the Russians and support. So I think in the context of the times in which I'm speaking of, it was not completely without some basis that people had this feeling. There seemed to be no differences, and, of course, it was only later when--I guess it was the 20th Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956, I think it was, when they abolished the basic premise on which they had based their propaganda and their actions, the inevitability of war with the Western world, with the non-communist world, to non-inevitability of war and peaceful coexistence. That change on the part of the Russians, of course, was a direct consequence of the development of atomic weapons, which meant that if you had war, it could easily escalate to atomic war, and atomic war was self-destruction, even if you destroyed the other fellow. I was told later by a Chinese that that change in the Russians stance on the very fundamental issue had not gone down at all well with the leadership in China at that time, Mao and company.

Q: Before we turn to your return to Washington, how did General Eisenhower view the advent of Turkey and Greece into NATO? These were sort of odd bedfellows. They really were more interested--particularly the Greeks, more interested in fighting the Turks than the Soviets.

MACARTHUR: Well, I think General Eisenhower viewed it in the context of the vital

importance to Western Europe of the Mediterranean. If you had the Mediterranean divided in half, say, at the boot of Italy, where we had a supremacy in the Western Mediterranean, because of France and Britain, and the East was left to drift at a time when, you must remember, in that period of the early Fifties, late Forties and early Fifties, the Russians were making the most menacing noises to Turkey about frontier readjustments and other things, and there had been the Greek civil war, in which the communists had come very close to making a major breakthrough. I think that generally, all of us welcomed the idea of having in NATO two key countries in terms of control--I say all of us at SHAPE--in terms of the ability for the Eastern Mediterranean to be kept under the control of NATO, rather than having the Eastern Mediterranean become a Soviet zone from which action against NATO and the cutting of the trade routes on which Western Europe depended for energy and the like, and all the other aspects, political and economic, that go into it, there was no, despite the disparities which we were fully aware of, because the negotiations on the Greek-Turkey thing, you know, they started in '50 and went through '51, when they finally came, and I was mixed up with those when I was Deputy Director of the Office of European Regional Affairs in 1950. My God, the balancing act of trying to bring in both of them, one didn't want to go in, if one came in, the other wanted to come in, too, and if you wanted to do this for one, then you had to do that or this for the other. It was a very, very ticklish operation to handle this in a way where you didn't seem to be tilting from one to the other. I think our Near Eastern hands in the department handled it with a good deal of skill. I worked closely with them at that point, because I was responsible for the NATO backstopping. If they were going to come into NATO, you had to have the agreement of the other countries. They had some thoughts about all this, too.

So while it added to the complexity of NATO when you brought in two poor countries, which meant that one way or another, you were adding to economic burdens, probably, over the longer term, that from the military strategic point of view, there was no difference anywhere, I think, in our government, on the desirability of their being in, and the Mediterranean being ringed on the northern rim and Eastern rim, which is the rim from which Russian power was projected against. Nobody had any question that I can recall about that operation. Certainly not General Eisenhower.

Q: Could we then go to the time you were recalled? How did you end up going back to Washington?

MACARTHUR: Well, about the end of May 1952, I'd been there since January of '51, when I went over on the Queen Mary, I think it was, with President and Mrs. Eisenhower, my wife and myself, when we set up the first NATO-SHAPE headquarters in that hotel on the Champs-Élysées. [Laughter] While we were awaiting the construction of the NATO headquarters outside Paris at Rambouillet.

Well, in May 1952, a telegram came in, which I was not shown initially, personal for General Eisenhower from Secretary Acheson. And the telegram, in effect, said that because of the importance of Indochina and my deep background with France, and the fact that I'd worked with the French and the Resistance during two years of the Vichy period, and I knew virtually personally all the top leadership in France, and with that background

and everything, they wanted to send me to Indochina--to Vietnam, that is--as ambassador.

General Eisenhower and General Gruenther put their heads together, and they sent a telegram from General Eisenhower, which they did not show me 'til they had sent it, because they said they wanted the record to be absolutely clear that I had never seen the incoming or the outgoing message, and the outgoing message said, in effect--it is very complimentary; it said that "I unhesitatingly agree with your high opinion of Douglas MacArthur and his qualifications for the job, but I am returning to the United States." He was about to run for the presidency then; it had been announced. He wrote that General Ridgway, who will be his successor, has had virtually no experience in the European field. He'd been basically dealing with Korea, Japan. "There are many complexities, and I feel that there's nobody that knows the personalities in the top leadership of the NATO countries as well as MacArthur, and I think it would be doing a great disservice to NATO to take him away just when Ridgway comes there, because he will certainly need that background and understanding of the internal domestic problems, social, political, economic, defense, security, and the idiosyncrasies and the personalities of the people who are the leaders of these countries. So I would strongly recommend that you leave him for a period of about three months before you transfer him to a new assignment, so that Ridgway can have the benefit of traveling around with him and visiting these countries and so forth." And they showed me the telegram, and that was fine by me.

So General Ridgway came, and he was quite different from General Eisenhower. General Eisenhower was a distinguished military man, but who also had deep sensitivities to the political, economic . . . (end of tape).

General Ridgway, on the other hand, was what you might call a soldier's soldier, a military man, who saw things primarily in terms of military requirements, problems, and necessities. I enjoyed working with General Ridgway; it was totally different from General Eisenhower. I briefed General Ridgway every morning, but he liked also to read the telegrams, which was fine by me.

I had only problem within the whole time that I was there, and that was when his wife decided that she'd heard so much about Spain, and she wanted to take a vacation in Spain. That was at the height of the Franco regime, when a number of our NATO countries had socialist governments, and Franco was anathema to them. So I went in to General Ridgway, and I said, "General, you can't go to Spain on a vacation."

And he said, "What do you mean, I can't go to Spain on a vacation?"

I said, "If you do, you're going to subject yourself in the position of Supreme Allied Commander to very severe criticism from the opposition parties in countries that have non-socialist or non-labor governments, and to the governments themselves that do have that, because as you know, the center left has the strongest possible feelings of antagonism toward General Franco's extreme rightist dictatorship."

We didn't resolve the question that day. [Laughter] I guess he had to check with Mrs.

Ridgway, like all good husbands do. But he called me in about a day or two later, and he said, "Well, I agree with what you say, but what if we just went on a brief visit to those beautiful islands that are under Spanish control in the Mediterranean?"

Q: Majorca?

MACARTHUR: Exactly. Majorca and Minorca. "If we just went down to Majorca for a few days?" [Laughter]

So in the meantime, some of the people there like the other senior people of other nationalities who had heard about this thing were shocked and horrified. So I canvassed them, and they thought that a brief visit for a pure vacation in civilian clothes to Majorca would not raise any great outcry. So we solved the problem by General and Mrs. Ridgway going to Majorca.

But I respected General Ridgway's military record. He was an able combat man. He's the kind of a guy that you want to have when you're in combat. He was as tough and hard as nails in combat. I enjoyed working with him.

Well, to make a long story short, along toward the end of October, after checking with him and Al Gruenther, I said I'd like to get on back to Washington for this new assignment, and they all agreed. It was then October. Ridgway had come, I think, at the end of June.

Q: This was just prior to the 1952 election?

MACARTHUR: Yes. So my wife and I and our daughter embarked on one of the old liners that used to leave from Marseille.

Q: Either the Constitution or the Independence.

MACARTHUR: Yes. I think it was the Independence. We were on the high seas when the elections were held, when General Eisenhower was elected President.

When we got into New York, I had a message waiting for me that the President-elect wanted to see me in his temporary headquarters at the Hotel Commodore in New York. So I went up to the Hotel Commodore, went upstairs, and they had a whole floor that they had taken over. I got there and was ushered right in to President-elect Eisenhower's office. After asking me how Ridgway was doing and how things were going at NATO, and how the countries were evolving, he said, "You know, I've been thinking, and I don't know so many people at the senior working level in the department."

Q: This was the Department of State?

MACARTHUR: Department of State, yes. And he said, "I want to talk to you about this." But he said, "By the way, you know Foster Dulles, don't you?"

I said, "I've met Mr. Dulles. I met him when I was in Paris at the embassy there, and he came over on some sort of a mission. I was assigned to sort of help him any way that he needed."

So he picked up the telephone and said, "Ask Foster Dulles to come in, please."

Mr. Dulles came in, and the President said, "I've been talking to Doug, and I told him that you and I have discussed this, and that I would sort of like to have him around the department, at least for a while, because he's like an old shoe; he briefed me every morning and filled me in, and I know him well."

Then he turned to me, and he said, "I know this is asking a lot. It's like when you're a colonel, and suddenly you're being promoted to general rank, from Counselor of Embassy to an ambassador in charge. It's a big jump, but it would help me a lot (he was flattering enough to say) if you could be around, certainly during the transition period and immediately thereafter, and then we'll decide what the best place for you is."

So I said, "I'm delighted, General, if I can be of any help at all."

He said, "Fine." He said to Foster, "Call up David Bruce (who was then Under Secretary) and tell him that we've decided to void the Vietnam assignment and have Doug in the department for a while."

So I went down to the department. I don't remember the exact time frame. Perhaps a week, two weeks later, I got word that the President-elect wanted to see me. He was still residing at Columbia University, of which he was then president. He said he'd like to see me come out to his residence, and wanted to have a talk with me about various things. So I flew up to New York and went out to Columbia, and he was very warm and gracious, as he was indeed. Then he said, "I want you to talk with Secretary Dulles. I want you to organize and arrange two trips for him to be taken shortly after my inauguration as President." He said, "First, I want you to organize a trip before the end of January. I'll come in on the 20th of January." He said, "I want you to organize a trip for Mr. Dulles before the end of the month in which I am inaugurated, to visit all our NATO countries and let them know that the fact that I'm President hasn't changed a bit my strong feelings of the vital necessity of NATO and my support for it and so forth, and how I want to be helpful."

Then he said, "The second trip I want you to organize is a trip to the Middle East and Southeast Asia. This is a vital part of the world. It's a part of the world that will become increasingly important, and I want you to work with whoever you work with in the department, Mr. Dulles, of course, and lay out an itinerary, a program, to be responsible for getting all the position papers and all the things that have to be done before a trip of that kind for the Secretary, making all the arrangements that are necessary, that he's fully taken care of. I want you to get started on that."

So I went back, and the first thing was the NATO trip. I alerted the Near Eastern people that there would be a trip and it would be coming later, and they'd better get started on the

business of position papers and one thing or another. I went to work with the EUR people on the NATO visit, and then I went up again and met with the President and Mr. Dulles in New York, going over what I had, the schedule laid out.

Of course, in laying out schedules of that kind, sensibilities are extremely important. If you go to one country first, you know, in NATO some of the larger countries have traditional sort of rivalries or jealousies, one thing or another, and the smaller NATO countries sometimes feel that the bigger ones sort of look down their nose at them and sort of ignore them. So you try to strike a balance when you're laying out a schedule, that you don't go to one of the real big boys, the most vocal of the big boys, first or last. You sort of weave them in.

Q: You go to Luxembourg and work your way in a circle.

MACARTHUR: I think when I organized General Eisenhower's first trip as NATO commander, since he was in Paris, I think we went to Lisbon first and then over to Italy, and then up to Luxembourg, a small one, and then--I've forgotten. But in any event, you balance them off in such a way that this is one of the aspects.

Q: We're talking now about a President-elect who knew what he wanted to do in foreign policy, and he was talking to you as a professional to set this up, rather than, I think, so often is the case where the President comes in and he has the Secretary of State, and they sort of work together, but sort of blunder into it. But here's a President who is fine-tuning at a very early stage.

MACARTHUR: I think it's a difference, basically, in background. Normally, a President comes in, he's got a Secretary of State who has never been raised in foreign affairs. He's a politician, he brings in a lot of guys, and so forth. President Eisenhower was a product of military, where things are staffed. The professional staff bring the operation up with the options and so forth and so on. I think President Eisenhower liked to operate on that kind of a properly staffed business, where you use the best professional people you have in your organization to staff out the problem and produce something for you to look at and comment on or change or modify or do that. He did not look to a non-professional any more than a military man would look to a non-military guy to draw up a war plan. He looked to the professionals to draw up the plans, which then the civilians, if you will, at the top of the government could look at with the President.

He, not being--although I think he was by far the best prepared President on foreign affairs that we've had, with the possible exception of Nixon, who had the business of working with Eisenhower and was also very well versed in foreign affairs--but Eisenhower was well versed and he really understood the nature of the fact that the United States is not independent, that our security and our economic well being are dependent on other friendly nations, that interdependence, rather than independence, is the name of the game. Particularly when you're both an Atlantic and a Pacific power and to project your power to deter aggression, you must have foreign bases, you must have the support of a foreign public, governments and the public behind them. I think he understood these things

extremely well. As I say, he learned under three very difficult taskmasters who were individualists--De Gaulle, Roosevelt, and Churchill.

Q: He also understudied your uncle, too, at an earlier age.

MACARTHUR: Yes. You know, one thing that surprised some people, because my uncle, incidentally, I remember when I first met General Eisenhower, he was Major Eisenhower. My uncle was chief of staff. This was back in 1933, and I was a second lieutenant in the Reserves on active duty with the Sixth Field Artillery in Fort Hoyle, Maryland. I came in to Washington on some sort of a thing from Fort Hoyle to do something with the War Department and somebody at some level there. I went up to see if my uncle was free in the old State-War Navy Building, because in those days, what is now the Executive Offices Building had the Secretary of State, Secretary of War, Secretary of Navy, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, the CNO (Chief of Naval Operations) of the Navy. They were all in that building together, and the substantive part of the State Department, the policy part of the State Department, was there. The rest of it was scattered in all those other little buildings around town.

I went up, went in to see him, and then he said, "By the way." He walked with me to the door. He said, "This is Major Eisenhower." He introduced me, and then he told me later, "You know, Major Eisenhower is one of the brightest, brightest younger officers I've ever seen." General Eisenhower was a totally different--their personalities were not the kind of personalities that meshed very well, because my uncle was sort of, to a degree--and I say this in no criticism, because I admired him greatly--but he was rather austere and aloof and, in a sense, a bit imperious. General Eisenhower, in my experience with him, he was a very strong man and had the strength of his convictions and opinions, but he was a much more warm person as a human. As a person, he was less sort of aloof and removed from people. So a lot of people knew that there might have been a bit of feeling on Eisenhower's part about General MacArthur, and they were very surprised when he asked me to first go with him as his POLAD at SHAPE and then to come back and work with him and his people in the White House.

Well, to get on with the story, after we made a swing through the NATO countries, I went back. Then after I'd been back just a few days, I got word that the President wanted to see me in the White House. I went over there. He had Mr. Dulles with him, and they said, "We've decided that we want you to stay here for a full tour in the department, and we want you to be Counselor of the State Department."

Q: Prior to this, you had no real title?

MACARTHUR: No. [Laughter] I was just a Foreign Service officer, what you might call detached, what the Army would call detached service for the President-elect. That was the basis on which David Bruce said, "We know that you work with him, and we expect you to go ahead. You're at his disposal." So I was just working with him, with the department, of course, keeping them clued in on what he had in mind.

So Chip Bohlen was then counselor of the department, and Chip was under some criticism, and there were attacks on him in the Congress. The Secretary told him that he was going to be named ambassador to the Soviet Union. Chip was an old friend, going back to virtually--I think I first met him when I first came into the Foreign Service, into the department back in '35 or '36. So with this, the fact that there was going to be a fight on Capitol Hill about Chip's nomination as ambassador, I said to the Secretary I didn't want to have him sort of shoved out of the counselor's job. I would take over and act as counselor, but give me the title after we get Chip confirmed. So Chip, as ambassador designate to the Soviet Union, moved out. I moved into the counselor's office, but didn't take the title 'til Chip had been confirmed.

Q: After a rather bruising battle.

MACARTHUR: A bruising battle.

Q: Could you explain? That seems to be a floating title--the Counselor of the Department of State. What did it mean at the time you and Chip Bohlen were there?

MACARTHUR: It meant the same thing then that it means now. It means that you do whatever the job or you perform in whatever manner the Secretary of State at the time wants you to perform and thinks you can be the most help. Different Secretaries of State use counselors in different ways. Chip, of course, was close to Dean Acheson, who admired greatly his very considerable intellectual capabilities, his personality, his whole drive.

When I came in, Mr. Dulles didn't say, "I want you to do this or that." Before I came in and took over, as I say, I was already organizing trips for the Secretary, and then when I came in, one of the things he said, because of my background in the military, that they wanted me to be the senior working-level guy in the department, working with the National Security Council. Well, that was fine.

But then as we started getting prime ministers from the NATO countries and other things coming to Washington, the Secretary increasingly, because, I suppose, I had been responsible for the preparation of all the briefings books and the briefing material and briefed him on the airplane on those first two trips, the trip to the NATO countries at the end of January, beginning of February, and then the beginning of May, the trip to the Middle East and South Asia, he increasingly gave me the duty of preparing for bilateral and NATO and multilateral meetings. This led to a job description which is called Coordinator of Plans and Policies, and that was effectively the job that I fulfilled for most of the four years that I was counselor of the department. For almost all our major meetings, virtually all the meetings, including the summit in Geneva in '55, all the meetings with the Russians, the Berlin Conference, the foreign minister conferences, the meeting in San Francisco at the time of the tenth anniversary of the U.N., with Molotov on that occasion, I was Coordinator of Plans and Policies for the Secretary.

We set up an organizational arrangement where a committee of assistant secretaries of state

of interested departments and agencies was established. The basic membership on it was always State, Defense, and Treasury, because the Treasury is involved in anything that you get involved in. Then we had representation, as appropriate, from Congress or CIA, whatever it might be, on certain issues. I chaired the interdepartmental assistant secretaries' meetings.

The way policy papers were formulated in those days was that you first took the existing NSC document. Say it was on NATO. And then that document was referred to the bureau that had responsibility to NATO and the State Department, that is, the European bureau. Or if it was a case of something in the Middle East, it would be the Middle Eastern bureau. But just for the sake of an example, let's stick to NATO and follow it through. The European bureau would then go over that NSC Council paper. It might make some amendments in the light of events that had transpired since then or were desired to come about, like the admission of Germany to NATO or whatever it might be. They would make amendments to that paper, and then that paper would go to the assistant secretaries' meeting, which I chaired. They would get copies of that paper, and then their staffs would get it and go over it. Then they would come back and there would be suggestions for changes or modifications or one thing or another.

This, I think, stemmed in part from the President's view about proper staffing of papers, because I remember--and this is a very interesting thing I should have mentioned before about President Eisenhower--when it was established that I was going to be the basic coordinator for plans and policies for virtually all our major meetings at that time, the President called me over to the White House, and he said, "Look, Doug." He said, "You're going to be chairing this assistant secretaries meeting. I know all about you bureaucrats. I've been in the system myself. There's one thing I tell you that I will not have and do not want. I will not have your committee preparing bland position papers where you cover up the disagreement with some of that bureaucratic language, because if you do that, the minute that paper is adopted, each department is going to go in its own separate direction. When there are differences, I want those differences brought out and spelled out. Then if the cabinet cannot resolve them before they're brought to me, the President, for final approval or modification, I want them brought to me and we will resolve them in either the Security Council or in a meeting of the pertinent secretaries."

This, of course, was very, very, very sound advice, because anybody in the department that has ever worked on a working group knows the lengths to which different bureaus within the department, particularly during the period of decolonization, when the European bureau, you know, would be sort of thinking of the interest and impact on its people, and the people in the other geographic bureaus, will think about the impact of U.S. positions on a future independent country, you'd sometimes try to cover them over with obscure bureaucratic language which means everything to all people.

This, I think, we successfully avoided. I can remember only about three occasions when the thing had to go to the President. I don't mean that the policy didn't go to the National Security Council eventually. But on the assumption that the assistant secretaries finally reached agreement on a position paper, that paper first went to the Secretary of State. The

Secretary of State very frequently would suggest some modification or some change or some amplification or something. It would then go back to the assistant secretaries. It would be worked over again to take account of these comments, and brought back to him.

If the Secretary was then satisfied with it, it would go to the President for review and comment. And if he agreed with it, fine. Very frequently, I was present at almost all the meetings when the Secretary presented the paper to the President in those days. I used to go over to the White House with him alone, and the President would invite one of his staff in, and we would sit there. Then the President would go over the paper and make comments, which I would note, one thing and another, frequently offering very useful suggestions that would make it more appealing to some of our friends. He had a knack for that, and sometimes suggesting a modification for fear or concern that it would ruffle some sensibilities which could then create problems for the paper as a whole, the objective we were trying to achieve.

If the President were satisfied with it, the paper went to either--he'd get all the interested cabinet secretaries in, or he'd have a National Security Council meeting with interested people, and it would be adopted formally as policy.

The other part of the aspect of the job was the preparation for the Secretary himself of the multitudinous position papers that you have whenever there's an important meeting with the country that you're dealing with. There are position papers that deal with the position that the United States takes on subjects that it is going to raise or it knows the other people are going to raise. Then there are a myriad of contingency papers based on nothing that we want to raise, nothing that the other people have said they're going to raise, but because of their interest in a particular area or field or event or policy, that they may very well raise. So you have the contingency paper so that if you're in a meeting and you're prepared against every contingency that you can imagine, or you try to be prepared, let me put it that way, against every contingency that the other side might bring up.

If I could go on, we moved rapidly into a new area, which was negotiations with the Russians during the Eisenhower first term. You will recall that there had been no meeting between the foreign ministers of the Western powers--that is, the U.S., France, and Great Britain--and the Soviet foreign ministers since the late 1940s. Relations were very chilled as the Russians had started expanding in Eastern Europe and putting their iron-fisted grip on Eastern Europe and taken over Czechoslovakia and done all the rest.

Then I think it was about 1953, the first year of the Eisenhower Administration, Winston Churchill, in a speech he made, dropped a word about--put forth the word about the four-power meeting with the Russians. I don't remember the occasion or the event, but I think he was . . .

Q: Churchill was prime minister at that time.

MACARTHUR: Yes. People sort of shied away from the idea. Anthony Eden, who was his foreign secretary, wasn't enthusiastic at all about it. People weren't enthusiastic generally

about it, but as the President and the Secretary thought about it, we had some things that we wanted to talk about to the Russians, where we felt that we would not hurt ourselves at all by having a meeting. The Secretary certainly wasn't afraid that he'd be taken to the cleaners, meeting with the Russians. And so over a period of time, and there were certain evidences on the Soviet side that they, too, might be interested in putting the idea to business. Well, to make a long story short, we eventually reached the conclusion that there would be a four-power meeting in Berlin. We wanted to reach an agreement with the Soviets on Germany and Austria and some other subjects, where we felt we couldn't lose. I say we couldn't lose, because Germany was divided in half by the Russians, who had brought down the Iron Curtain, and Austria was occupied. Half of Austria, the eastern half, was occupied by the Soviet Union.

So we went through the business then of a four-power meeting with the Russians--the U.S., U.K., France, and the Soviet Union. This added one additional complication to the preparation of position papers. We followed the same general formula in preparation of our papers, but we also had to set up working groups, international working groups with the British and the French and ourselves. The impetus to the meeting with the Russians was given added strength by the decision of the NATO Council to restore German sovereignty and to eventually make Germany a member of NATO. The decision had not been made then, but it was in the cards.

We went to Berlin and spent four weeks there, and got absolutely nowhere. In the first place, before you have a meeting, there are all sorts of procedural arrangements. It is a hideous nightmare when you have these four-power meetings. Indeed, two-power meetings are sometimes consumed by procedural problems. But in a four-power meeting, how are the principals going to be seated? In what order will they talk? Will there be limitations on the length of time, so that you can't filibuster forever? Where will you meet? Will you meet on your side? Where will you meet physically--what city? Will you meet in a neutral country? Will you meet in an occupied country? Will you meet in the Soviet Union or one of the Western countries? There are all these many, many procedural things that all are a part and which are an important part, because procedures, including whether you have simultaneous or consecutive translations, all these things, which language will be used, all of these things come into play.

But we met in Germany, to make a long story short, for four weeks. We had proposed to the Russians originally items on the unification of Germany. We got nowhere with them. We had an item on European security. The original item had been unification of Germany and European security, and it was broken down into two, as I recall, one on the German problem and one on European security.

And we left Berlin after four bloody weeks, absolutely having gotten nowhere substantively. However, we did come out of that meeting with, I think, a substantial propaganda, if you want to put it that way, or public image improvement that we were the ones that wanted to seek the liberation of Austria from all occupation forces, because it had been taken over by the Nazis under the Anschluss, and it had been agreed that it would be treated as a liberated country.

We came out on a plus, basically, on the German business, that we didn't want to have a proud people remain divided forever, that they should be unified under proper safeguards and the like. And so on the propaganda side, we didn't hurt a bit. In fact, I think we benefitted worldwide. But substantively, we got nowhere.

Q: How did Secretary of State Dulles do? Did he enjoy this type of thing?

MACARTHUR: Secretary Dulles, as you know, was a distinguished lawyer with Sullivan & Cromwell, that great New York law firm. He was like all good lawyers, very skillful and thoughtful in his choice of words. He wasn't ad-libbing. I don't mean that he read from text, because he didn't. He could improvise and improvise very well indeed. But Mr. Dulles weighed his words, as all excellent lawyers do, very, very carefully. I mean, he was not in the slightest intimidated by Molotov and his henchmen, Gromyko and the Russians.

I remember a couple of incidents involving Mr. Molotov. During these four weeks, we agreed with the Russians to have a five-on-a-side dinner once every five days, to see outside the forum of the four-power formal conference, which degenerated, basically, into a propaganda contest at Berlin. In the relaxed atmosphere of a dinner, you could put probes out to find out if there was any give or any possibility of making progress in any of the fields. So we agreed with the Russians to meet five-on-a-side. They'd have dinner as the guest of Mr. Dulles, and we would have dinner with them at our place, and we would have dinner with them in their place with Mr. Molotov. The participants were the Secretary, Livy Merchant, who was head of the EUR, Bob Bowie, myself, generally the five substantive people.

Q: You were discussing the informal dinners you were having with the Soviets.

MACARTHUR: So we would have the dinners, the five-on-a-side, to see if there was a prospect of a breakthrough, but from none of them came any real indication of any give at all on Germany or Austria.

At one of the dinners, when Secretary Dulles was host, Mr. Dulles was afraid of gaining weight, and he always served what the French called crudites, raw carrots and celery and other things. I was having an aperitif with Mr. Molotov, with Livy Merchant, when a waiter came up. We were holding our drinks, and he came up with this platter of raw vegetables, as it were. And the dinner had followed an evening when Mr. Dulles had gotten very angry with Mr. Molotov, because Molotov had adopted a procedure in the preceding ten days, where about every third or fourth night after a long day starting at 10:00 in the morning to around 7:30, Mr. Molotov, as the conference was about to adjourn, would raise a hand and say, "I have a new proposal to offer." Then he would distribute the proposal in the Russian language, read in Russian for about 20 or 25 minutes. In the meantime, his henchmen would distribute text of the statement that he was making in English, French, and the other languages, to waiting correspondents outside. And by the time he finished, it would be after 8:00 o'clock, and we had no time to evaluate his proposal, to see an English translation of it, and all you could do is listen to the translation as it was given by the

translator who followed him. So the result was that every morning after one of these procedures, the Western press, because of the time difference, would have headlines "Russians (or Soviets) Make New Proposal." Well, when you looked at the proposal and saw the full text of it, it was not a new proposal at all; it was the same old business that they'd been presenting for two or three weeks, but with a new introductory paragraph and perhaps a slight rearrangement, but the same old story.

Mr. Dulles finally got extremely irked, and it was the night before this dinner which I referred to. After Mr. Molotov had finished, Mr. Dulles raised his hand and said, "I think we're tired of having Mr. Molotov every three or four nights reach into his briefcase and pull out a new rabbit and put it on the conference table for us to view."

Well, I was having a drink with Livy Merchant and Molotov at the dinner which followed this outburst of Mr. Dulles'. The fellow came by with the tray of raw carrots and celery and stuff, and Mr. Molotov said, no, he would like some caviar. So we ordered some caviar, which we had. I said to Mr. Molotov, "Mr. Minister, if you don't want any of these fine carrots and crudites for yourself, perhaps I can arrange to have a little package made, and you can take some home for your rabbits."

Mr. Molotov looked at me, and this lovely, frosty pane of icy cold humor came into his eyes, and he shook his head with mock sadness, and he said, "I always thought Dulles was a very intelligent man, but now I'm really, really beginning to doubt it very seriously."

And playing the straight man, I said, "Well, why, Mr. Minister?"

He said, "Because Mr. Dulles tonight referred to my reaching into my briefcase and pulling out new rabbits every few nights." He said, "If Mr. Dulles were intelligent, he would see that I always use the same old rabbit." [Laughter] It's an amusing story which showed this icy humor that Molotov had.

Q: Had we had any hopes for this Berlin Conference to get anywhere?

MACARTHUR: Well, we hadn't had any hopes, but with the Russians, at that stage of the game, we never knew whether there would be some give to the point where they might agree to set up a working group or do something. Then we went back with absolutely no indication that there was any change from the rigid stand they had taken until some weeks later, when it became clear that they were considering an agreement on Austria, which would evolve. Some of us thought that perhaps, in part, this was because their rigid, absolutely formal stand, that there would be no agreement on Austria, no withdrawal of forces until after there was a German settlement, had hurt them a bit. We don't know if that was a factor or not. As a practical matter, withdrawal of their forces from Eastern Europe strategically changed not one damn thing, because with forces in Czechoslovakia and Hungary, they could be back in Vienna in two hours. So that their military certainly couldn't have had any serious objection to it from the military point of view, because there was no way that we could have gotten any effective assistance to Austria if they had moved back in. In any event, the whole idea of the thrust of the business was that Austria was to be

neutralized, was to be a neutral nation and not subject to reoccupation or to alliances and so forth, which we accepted as a necessary price for the liberation of the eastern half of Austria and the withdrawal of occupation forces.

Q: Had we considered doing this for Germany, as such?

MACARTHUR: The German problem was quite different. If you neutralized Germany, you put your defense lines on the Rhine, on France's frontiers. If you do that, where do you station adequate forces? So in effect, if you say, "All right, we'll neutralize all of Germany," that means that the Soviet Union is poised in Poland with overwhelming preponderance in conventional forces. The NATO line of resistance is on the French border, and there's no possible way that you could accommodate anything like the required forces in France and fight a successful war if the other side had the initiative in making a lightning sweep across a neutralized country that couldn't raise a finger.

Q: So this was never on our agenda.

MACARTHUR: It was never on our agenda because not only did our NATO allies not want it to be on our agenda, but the East Germans did not for one minute want to have a neutralized Germany, where the Soviet Union would obviously be able to impose its will by intimidation or threat and so forth. There was no disagreement among the Western NATO allies or Germany, which at that time was going to be admitted to NATO, but had not had its sovereignty fully restored.

I guess we might end on that note. We might make a note that we ended on that note.

Q: Yes, I am going to.

MACARTHUR: That we ended on the note of the Berlin Conference.

Continuation of interview, January 20, 1988.

Q: Mr. Ambassador, in our last discussion, we were talking about the Berlin meeting in January of 1954. But I would like to turn back to when the Eisenhower Administration took over the administration in January of 1953. This was a period of some travail with many people, but especially the Foreign Service, because it was under attack by particularly the right wing of the Republican Party, often called the Primitives. I'm thinking of Senators McCarthy, Wherry, Bridges, and Knowland, especially, but there were others.

When Dulles came in, he made a call to the Foreign Service to sort of get on the team, and he asked for a phrase that became sort of overly used: "positive loyalty." How did you deal with this at that particular time?

MACARTHUR: Well, I think there were two aspects to the change that occurred when the

Eisenhower Administration came in. First, we had had many, many years of Democratic administration, with Democratic Secretaries of State, Democratic Presidents Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman. And obviously, with a change in administration, and particularly as dramatic a change as that one after so many years in the Great Depression, the Democrats after the war and so forth, but the new President would bring in people at the top that shared his views. He brought in Dulles, whom he did not know particularly well personally; he didn't know him on an intimate basis, but he greatly respected him. Of course, John Foster Dulles had spent much of his life studying foreign affairs, even though he was a very distinguished lawyer at Sullivan & Cromwell, but studying of foreign affairs because he had always had the ambition to succeed his grandfather, I guess it was, [Robert] Lansing, who had been Secretary of State. When I say "succeed," I mean hold the same high post. So at the top there were changes.

I think because of the rhetoric of the campaign and the natural desire of any party to win, a great deal of attention was paid to the right wing of the Republican Party, which was certainly, in the campaign as I recall it, was among the noisiest of the campaigners for a Republican presidency. I have a great deal of admiration and respect for Mr. Dulles. I worked very closely with him. But I think in the early days, at the beginning of his term as Secretary of State, he did not really understand the degree of hostility which certain of the key Republican senators of the extreme right that you mentioned, led by McCarthy, the animosity which they held for the Foreign Service on the basis that the Foreign Service consisted of wimps who would give in to stronger adversaries who shouted louder and so forth and so on. That changed. He ended up, if you look at the people who surrounded him for most of his career, they were career people or very distinguished people from the outside. But nonetheless, when you have a change with top people from the Secretary to the Under Secretary, it was then, to the Deputy Under Secretary for Political Affairs, the top three posts, the counselor, the policy planning staff, and the geographic bureaus, when you have a clean sweep after years of continuity, even if individuals at the top change, the same people had been working with the same people who moved into other higher slots, generally speaking. There was a bit of turmoil and a bit of unhappiness.

But this period, I think, was a relatively short one, because Dulles surrounded himself, had an early-morning staff meeting with a very small group of people, and they were people he picked who would challenge his views. There was Herman Phleger, a very distinguished lawyer from California, And I remember at some of these meetings when Dulles would put forward his thinking about how we should do something. I can hear Herman Phleger now saying, "Mr. Secretary, you can't do that. It ain't legal."

And Dulles replying, "Well, Herman, if it isn't legal, show me or tell me the way to do it so that it is legal."

I can hear Bob Bowie, who replaced Paul Nitze as chief of the policy planning staff, picking up the cudgels on various aspects. This is when you're talking about the beginnings of the formulation of policy and arguing very persuasively with the Secretary. Livy Merchant, a man of great wisdom and balance and judgment and admiral character and a charming personality, Livy, with a smile, never hesitated to let his reservations be known

about things. And myself, I frequently had what the French call a *prise de bec* with the Secretary over some aspect of something where I thought the viewpoint that he expressed would not be one that would carry in an international context--that is, with friends and allies, for reasons which were quite clear, and that we could achieve the same result in it by a slightly different approach.

So I mention this only because when I was in the midst of negotiating the U.S.-Japan treaty some years later, I came home for a consultation with the President and Secretary Dulles about the treaty. And while I was home, Mr. Dulles said to me, "Doug, would you consider coming back and being Deputy Under Secretary for Political Affairs?" That's the present Under Secretary for Political Affairs.

And I said, "Well, Mr. Secretary, I'm in the midst of this negotiation."

Q: This is when you were Ambassador to Japan.

MACARTHUR: To Japan, yes. But I'm telling this story only because I said, "There are many capable people, and I've developed first a relationship with the Japanese I'm in negotiation with. It is not an easy thing to do. We've got some very ticklish problems, and I'm hesitant to leave this thing up in the air just to have a new person come in." But I said, "Why do you want me to come back? I thought you'd had enough of my wrangling with you in those four years."

And he looked at me and said, "Well, Livy's going off. Livy Merchant's going off to Canada as ambassador, Bob Bowie's gone back to Harvard." He said, "I haven't got anybody around me now that will strongly challenge me when they think I'm not on the right track." So Mr. Dulles did have in him the knowledge that he needed--every person in a very high position is bound to be influenced to an extent by his own experiences and feelings about an issue, and that those should not predominate, that they needed to be challenged and examined very, very carefully and, if necessary, modified in terms of the logic of another or slightly varying or different approach.

Q: Going away from policy but to the personnel side, within the Foreign Service, Dulles came in with a reputation of not being very supportive of those in the Foreign Service who were under fire by the Senate. You were at that time the top-ranking Foreign Service officer and close to Mr. Dulles. How did you find him? How did you deal with him on these things? Because he must have been concerned with this.

MACARTHUR: Well, I think with Mr. Dulles, if he said that he wanted somebody else in a job because he felt the other person--I think his feeling was that the other person--I think the feeling that Mr. Dulles brought into the Department--and it's sort of an instinctive feeling, I guess, that people have when you have a change of administration--that if people have been working for another administration, maybe they wouldn't be quite loyal or supportive if the policies were different from the policies that they were used to under another administration. I think there was a bit of that.

I encountered the same thing with Dean Rusk, although Dean Rusk was a Democrat and appointed by a Democratic President. When President Johnson asked me to come back and be Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Affairs, I came back and found that they were giving me less than I could read in the Washington Post or The New York Times in the morning in the distribution of telegrams. I was kept completely in the dark. So I went to Mr. Rusk, Secretary Rusk, and I said, "Mr. Secretary, I didn't come back here just to sit around and go over and spend my time on Capitol Hill. I can mislead people over there if I don't know how your mind is working and in what direction you and the President are thinking." I said, "I've got to know, and if you don't want to distribute the secret telegrams to me or have me in your small meeting, then my resignation will be on the President's desk tomorrow." I said, "He asked me to take this job." It's not one that I really wanted. "It's not connected directly with the formulation and execution of foreign policy; it's a lobbying job."

And he said, "Well, how can I be sure that you won't tell, let some of the things out of the bag to people on Capitol Hill that we're trying to hold close?"

And I said, "Well, if you don't trust me, then get rid of me. My resignation will be on the President's desk in one hour. I'll go down and write it out."

He said, "No, no, no." He said, "I'm not doing that." He said, "But that was the concern that kept me from authorizing you to have the distribution of telegrams that you should." And I had the distribution of telegrams that I should in the future, and I was invited into his very small little 9:15 meeting every morning with just a few key people.

But I mention this. When people come in from a different--I had never worked for Dean Rusk, but Dean Rusk worked for the Truman Administration, and he was replaced by Dulles. I was very close to Dulles, and obviously he considered me a die-hard Dulles man, Republican, although three of my six presidential appointments were under Democratic Presidents and three were under Republican Presidents. But there was that feeling he had. It was not a logical feeling. I think that Mr. Dulles coming in probably had the same kind of a feeling about people that had been there before, working for another administration--were they completely loyal to them? And I would agree with you. I do not think, at the beginning, he stood up hard enough for them, but I remind you also that there are other aspects of this problem that should be brought out.

We've seen recently a senator who does what I call hostage taking. You know.

Q: Senator Helms.

MACARTHUR: Senator Helms. He holds up whole lists and everything else because he doesn't like one or two people on it.

Q: These are lists of ambassadors waiting for presidential appointments.

MACARTHUR: Presidential appointments that have to go through the business. They can

be for a bureau chief--anything that's a presidential appointment. But Bill Fulbright started that. He held up a list on which I and several other people were on. He held it up for a year because he didn't like Tom Mann and disagreed with him, and he held up a whole list. So when you get into this business of hostage taking, Bill Fulbright was a hostage taker, just like Jesse Helms is a hostage taker. This is one of the unfortunate things that we run into.

Q: Did you find yourself being there with Dulles and with, obviously, the approval of the President? Because you'd worked with him, acting as an interpreter for the Foreign Service, saying, "Mr. Secretary, after all, this is a professional job. Don't think of these people as being disloyal."

MACARTHUR: No. When you start out in a job and you're told, first, "Organize a trip to all the NATO countries. Get all the papers together, get all the briefing books for a new Secretary of State," and that trip's over, and then from that come things that you're asked to coordinate, policy changes and things, and then to go on for another trip to the Middle East, totally different area, totally different personalities, totally different problems, I used to arrive at my office at about 7:45 to 8:00 o'clock every morning, and I got home about 8:00 to 8:30 every night. The day wasn't long enough. I was not a spokesman for the Foreign Service. We had a very eloquent one in Loy Henderson, whom the Secretary respected, who I supported time after time.

But my primary job was not the personnel job; my job was a job for the President, to coordinate plans and policies, first within his administration and then with our Allies. That did not give me the time to delve into every aspect of every personnel problem that arose. It wasn't my job, and I think it would have been resented by the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration.

Q: This was Loy Henderson, who really carried this.

MACARTHUR: Loy Henderson. And Loy Henderson did a wonderful job. I think Loy Henderson, more than anybody else, was responsible, together with the Secretary's perception that professional career people were doing a hell of a job for him in the preparation for all these meetings that he was holding in various parts of the world under the new administration, but Loy was fantastic. I unhesitatingly gave Loy support in the small meetings that we had in the morning with Mr. Dulles when a personnel matter came up.

But the point I wanted to make was I didn't take the lead in doing this. This was not my job. I didn't know enough about it to take the job. I didn't know enough about the person's qualifications, whether he was effective or not effective as an individual to do what Loy did. And he was tremendous.

Q: Let's turn to another aspect of the Washington experience before we move abroad.

MACARTHUR: Yes.

Q: There is a course now being taught at the Foreign Service Institute called "statecraft," which is designed for officers who've never served in Washington, or have served in Washington at a fairly low level, about how to work in the Washington environment. You obviously were quite experienced in that. I'm speaking about the time you were the Counselor of the State Department. How did you operate with other agencies and also within the Department of State?

MACARTHUR: Well, let me correct what is perhaps a slight misconception. The first 14 years of my life, I never had an assignment in Washington. When I came to Washington to head up the Western European Bureau in 1949, having entered in '35, I was appalled at how little I knew about how the decision-making process operated within the Department, and I was also appalled about how little I knew about the relationships of the Department, the Executive Branch, with the Congress, all of which go to make up a mix that you've got to have some knowledge and understand about if you're going to be effective, if you're going to be effective in the Department in the job you get, and if you're going to be effective when you're serving abroad, knowing what buttons to punch in Washington to try to move forward something--that is, policy--that is trying to be moved forward.

So I made a recommendation that was never followed. I made it to successive administrations each time I was in Washington with an executive appointment, a presidential appointment. In the first three assignments of an officer's career, on the basis of three- or four-year assignments, one of those first three assignments should be in the Department, even if it were only a two-year assignment, so that the individual would not come in as cold as I came in in '49 to the mechanics and the realities and the problems of working in the Department and in Washington, and an understanding of how it worked.

So I'm all for the idea of statecraft. I still think that no officer should go 12 or 14 years with no service in the Department. I think it's all wrong.

Q: I think they do try within the first three assignments to get officers there, but sometimes they're in positions that really have nothing to do, even at the lower level, with policy formulation.

MACARTHUR: Yes. Of course, when I came into the Foreign Service, it was a much smaller organization. What did we have--750?

Q: Something like that, if I recall, yes.

MACARTHUR: And it had not proliferated. I think one of the worst things that happened to the Department is the proliferation of the administrative side of the Department, and that happened, to a large extent, under Bill Crockett. When you looked at the expansion of the number of deputy assistant secretaries, they were just multiplying.

Q: This was in the 1960s.

MACARTHUR: They were just multiplying. And when you looked in embassies abroad,

which before had been run on a fairly austere basis, when you looked at the numbers of people that you had that were assigned there from the administrative side of the business, in terms of the British, of the French, or any other embassy, what they had in terms of administrative personnel, it was an absurdity. I think we went absolutely overboard on the administrative side. I'm not knocking administration; it's a basic underpinning and support you must have for effective policy. I'm talking about exaggerating.

Q: Coming back as the counselor, you say we did have a discussion about how Eisenhower wanted things staffed out, to have clear recommendations or clear disputes laid out. But how did you work with other agencies?

MACARTHUR: Let me just explain the process. The first process was to get the State Department's ducks lined up in a row, and given a certain problem. Then I chaired meetings of the representatives, the Assistant Secretary or his representative, of meetings, where we hammered out the policy or the recommendations for a policy. Where there were differences, we took them to Mr. Dulles within 24 hours for a full discussion, where the differences lay, and his decision was made. He frequently checked with the President. And we moved ahead. Finally, we had a State Department position. I say "finally." The process sounds like a cumbersome one. It is, but it's the only way you can get the input that you need from interested areas of the Department that can be important, that other areas don't think much about because everybody concentrates on the importance of their own particular field and their own particular job.

Then when we had a U.S. position, at the time that we started developing the U.S. position, from the very beginning, I let the Assistant Secretary of the other departments know who was handling international affairs or did the international part of their work, that we were starting on a business, and as soon as we had a position ready, we would be in touch with them to start a series of interdepartmental meetings at the Assistant Secretary level. And we would go in with our position, and Defense would come in with its position, and Treasury would come in with its decision, and if Commerce should be involved for one reason or another, it would come in, and it would be represented at the meeting that dealt with the aspect that had to do with the commercial aspects of any particular problem.

We would sit down, and we would put forward the Secretary's view--that is, the State Department position--and then they would discuss it, put forward their views, where they differed and so forth. And we would discuss it and then go back to our principals, they to their principals, me with whoever might be involved in the particular issue involved to the Secretary, and we would explain why this other department disagreed or wanted this changed for this reason or that reason or the other reason. And we would then get from the Secretary either a business, "Well, that we can modify to this extent or opposition to meet that business," or, "No, on this one, this is a fundamental matter of principle we must stand on." And they would come back in the same business.

Eventually, we would hammer out this process, which took, with meetings sometimes virtually every day during the week, and always meetings on Saturday and Sundays, Saturdays in the Department, and Sundays in the Secretary's house out on Woodland

Drive, I think it was, meetings that went on four or five hours. We frequently had people like Frank Nash, who was the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs (ISA), or somebody from Treasury, and the like. Through this process we then came up, finally, with either an agreed position to go to the President and present to the President, or we came up with differences, and before we had reached the final decision on the overall policy, those decisions would go to the President. I recall only one that had to go to the President directly. Several were mentioned in Cabinet meetings, which I did not attend, and the President made a decision there. But there was one between "Engine" Charlie Wilson and Mr. Dulles.

Q: Do you remember which one? He was the Secretary of Defense.

MACARTHUR: He was the Secretary of Defense.

Q: Would you remember that one which you couldn't reach any accord on?

MACARTHUR: That was one where we couldn't reach any agreement. The Defense Department was absolutely immovable, and we were immovable on what they wanted.

Q: Do you remember what the issue was?

MACARTHUR: I don't remember offhand, but it was one which put all the emphasis on the military aspect of a particular issue, which we knew we could never--and it was in preparation for a meeting with the Russians, which we knew we could never get the British or the French--we could never get any agreement on. The President decided it on the basis which, in his judgment, and he knew a great deal more about our security requirements than many people in the Pentagon.

Q: Especially Mr. Wilson.

MACARTHUR: Yes. I think Mr. Wilson was just sort of a mouthpiece for the hard-liners in the Defense Department, and there are always hard-liners in every department, in the State Department and in the Defense Department, people who want to hang on to their view willy-nilly, whether it will wash or not.

And then comes the final business where we would then schedule meetings. They might be in Paris, they might be here in Washington, where the British and the French, because in those days, our meetings with the Russians were basically quadripartite meetings--the Russians, the British, French, and ourselves. They were not bilateral. There were three trilaterals during the war, but the meetings in the period of the Eisenhower Administration, then the four years--that is, '53 to '57--were basically quadrilateral meetings.

And we would then set up meetings which would go on a week or ten days with the British and the French, because they had their national positions, too. And before we went into a meeting with the Russians, we would want to have a solid position that we could all agree to and all support, so there wouldn't be differences that the Russians would drive a wedge

right into and the whole business of Allied unity would break down. So it was a complicated process of, first, the Department, and sometimes there were very, very keen differences.

I remember at that period, because it was during the period of decolonization between the European Bureau, the EUR, on the one hand, having in mind the possibilities of getting British or French support, both being colonial powers who were just in the beginnings of the decolonization period, and, say, the African Bureau or Middle East or Southeast Asia, where the British had important former colonies or still some colonies or client states. So these things took time.

Q: But did you have trouble keeping control over your discipline, say, in the State Department or later when you went to the British, of having people who had been overruled try to subvert the process?

MACARTHUR: I don't recall. I don't recall a single case of that.

Q: How about with Congress? Were domestic political considerations taken into account, or did you go ahead and then somebody else put in the making it palatable for the . . .

MACARTHUR: No, no. On frequent occasions, that's how I got to know a number of congressmen. I would go over and brief the Foreign Relations Committee or the Foreign Affairs Committee, and in that period we always tried, before we went into an international conference, the Secretary met with the thing, but in the meantime, I would meet with the chairmen of these committees, four or five people on each side of the aisle in the committees, Republicans and Democrats, the senior members of the committee, explain the things. And in some cases, like the SEATO treaty, we picked a senior man from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mike Mansfield and Alexander Smith on the Republican side, and took them out as members of the delegation.

The President was quite insistent that we not go moving off into the wild blue yonder without the knowledge that we had congressional support and understanding.

Q: This was a lesson learned from the League of Nations, would you say?

MACARTHUR: Well, it was from the League of Nations and from his own experience in government, I guess. I know when the Japanese asked to have the old treaty that was negotiated during the occupation period, when they didn't have anybody of their own, to be replaced by a treaty based on equality, because all our other treaties, the SEATO treaty, the NATO treaty, Korea, were based on equality, and theirs was the only one that was based on a different concept because it was negotiated during the occupation period and was a price they had to pay for their restoration of sovereignty. I don't mean it wasn't in Japan's interest, because they didn't have a single man under arms, and we undertook the obligation of defending them. It involved heavy responsibilities on our part, and we felt that gave us the right to, in effect, put them into thermonuclear war without even consulting them if that was our decision.

But I mention it only because when I came back, I knew the President, who once said to me--I think I mentioned in one of our other interviews--"I don't care how solemn a treaty is or how important the people that sign it. The moment that one party to that treaty does not believe that it serves its national interest or that it does a disservice to its national interest, it is unenforceable unless you're ready to land the Marines." That's what the President said.

When I went back to the President with this thing, Mr. Dulles, who had negotiated the original treaty, had a little pride of authorship in that treaty negotiated in 1950-51, had some reticence, as did Mr. Yoshida, the gentleman who negotiated it for the Japanese, for the same basis--pride of authorship.

The first thing the President said to me, "I agree." He said, "But we can't move until you go on over and have seen the top three or four people in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, both of the majority, the Democrat majority, and the minorities." He said, "I want the approval of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to the concept that you've outlined before we make a step, and if they won't approve, we cannot move."

So the President was keenly aware of the need to carry the Congress along with you every step of the way--not after the fact or at the last minute, but every step of the way. And when I went over on the Japan treaty and explained the concept, that it had to be in keeping with our other treaties, it could not be inconsistent with our other treaties, but that there would be one exception, Article IX of the Japanese constitution, the so-called No War Article, we would have to observe that, which would make it a bit different, but that would be the only difference.

I remember Senator Fulbright, who was most cooperative, Senator Mansfield, and several of the others saying, "Well, we can't approve in advance any treaty that you're going to negotiate, but we can give you full approval to go ahead and start a negotiation on the basis of which you outlined, that it is fully consistent with our other treaties." I had made a rough draft of what I thought the treaty might look like, which I'd shown them. Of course, they couldn't approve a treaty until they saw the final text, but they approved the concept, they approved the reason behind it, and that was all we needed to go ahead.

Q: This was a process that, in other ways, was formed before you went out on these various meetings with the Soviet Union.

MACARTHUR: Absolutely.

Q: This was coming from the President.

MACARTHUR: Absolutely. It was the President's knowledge and understanding that the worst disaster that could happen--or it would be a disaster in foreign policy, let me put it that way, to go out and negotiate something and then have it come back and have the Senate reject it because they weren't aboard.

Q: Coming to policy recommendations, I ran across a reference to what was known as the MAMBO group. Have you ever heard this expression?

MACARTHUR: I've heard the MacMerBo group.

Q: This one, it's all the same, but MAMBO apparently stood for MacArthur, Livingston Merchant, Bowie, and Roderic O'Connor.

MACARTHUR: Well, O'Connor was not in it. He was the Secretary's, in effect, private secretary. He sat at all the meetings, made notes, and would put in his piece. The people that you're referring to was known commonly in EUR, and they even developed a poem about it, known as MacMerBo--MacArthur, Merchant, and Bowie. The three of us, Bowie was head of the policy planning staff, Livy Merchant was head of EUR, I was counselor of the Department. And Bob Bowie brought the broad overall aspect of policies in the policy planning staff, which has to cover every quarter of the globe; Livy brought specifically the European aspect, which is very touchy and difficult.

Q: And also, really, the center of our focus.

MACARTHUR: The center of our focus, but was particularly touchy and difficult because of the decolonization period that Europe was going through, with all the emotionalism and political hoop-de-doop that generated among the European countries who were losing their colonies and so forth. Mr. Churchill, 'til the very end, you know, opposed the idea of independence for India, and indeed, when he came over when I was at SHAPE, he used to come over for lunch occasionally with General Eisenhower--I'm speaking of '51, '52. I remember once at lunchtime he spoke for about five minutes about what a terrible, the greatest mistake the British had made was to grant independence and sovereignty to India. So there were strong feelings on the part of important people in those days.

You also remember that the abortive British-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt . . .

Q: The Suez crisis.

MACARTHUR: The Suez crisis was a direct result of what I'm talking about. Now the concerns of decolonization and the canal and the whole business all fitted into one ball of wax that suited the views of certain people in all three governments.

Q: How did the three of you--Merchant, Bowie, and yourself--really view the--let's take the decolonization period. What was America's role in this?

MACARTHUR: You must interview Bob Bowie, who's here, you know. He's here. He's a very, very special person, a professor at Harvard for many years, distinguished person in government, different administrations. But I think we all viewed decolonization as inevitable. At the end of the war, how were you going to stop them without Britain and France, Belgium and other people raising massive forces and trying to hold them by force, which never would have worked? France and Vietnam, the same thing.

Down the line in EUR, I remember I came back from a trip around the world, and I was considered an EUR boy because I'd been in EUR in Italy, Portugal, France, during the war, during the occupation, and then back after the war, and in Belgium. I was considered an EUR alumnus. I remember when I came back from a trip around the world I made with Mr. Dulles and had been in South Asia and Southeast Asia, and I recall that I went in and talked about the inevitability of not only decolonization, but the nationalism and so forth and so on. And I remember some of the junior members. It was at an EUR staff meeting. Livy asked me to come in and give this expose. I remember some of them sort of put their fingers to the side of their eyes and made slant eyes at me, as if I'd suddenly changed my nationality and I'd committed a heresy by talking this way. So that within the departments, as you know--and I don't know how true it is now--but if you're the British desk or the French desk or the Belgian desk or the Italian desk or the Spanish desk, you have sort of (end of tape)

I was saying if it was recommended in the Department deliberations that the U.S. take a position that was going to ruffle a lot of feathers and create a lot of bilateral problems between ourselves and a country which the desk officer represented, there was a reluctance on some occasions to agree to that because of the inevitability that there would be some fallout. Well, I think that Bob Bowie certainly understood it; Livy understood it; and I think I understood it. I remember Bob Bowie and myself having, on one occasion, a long discussion--I wouldn't call it an argument, although we were obviously differing with the Secretary--where the question of military aid and military alliances was discussed.

And the Secretary took the position that military aid, indeed, substantial economic aid, should be reserved for our friends and allies. If people were unwilling to side with us and wanted to float between our position and the Russians', frequently voting with the Russians, why should we give them any support? And Bob Bowie and I took the position--I remember the discussion centered on India, that the important thing was not that India become an ally of the United States, because it would never be a dependable ally, given its background and its political orientation. It would not wish to be an ally. The important thing was that India, which was then a country of about 230 or 240 million. Now it's about double that. But India should remain an independent entity and not fall under Soviet domination as either a client state or as surrogate. That was why, in our judgment, economic aid to ease the burdens of the hardship and suffering of the Indian people that were going through a very difficult period then was important in itself, because if they were left in misery and despair and there was no hope from any other source in the West for assistance to help them get back on their feet, then in despair and desperation, they might turn the wrong way and turn toward the Soviets, which could have ultimately the most tremendous--if the Soviets succeeded in making them virtually a client state or some such thing by aid and by doing things for them and by supplying them with certain things, then strategically the whole situation of the Middle East, Persian Gulf, and all the rest of it would be upset.

So there was no hesitancy on the part, when we're talking about a thorny question like decolonization, I think there was realization about that. Mr. Dulles, I think, agreed with us

in the end about that. Certainly at that period, as you pointed out, most of our orientation was toward NATO Europe at that time. There was no desire to deliberately take steps that would alienate and offend and make more difficult cooperation with our NATO allies. But at the same time, there was, I think, a realization that the world was moving on. Like other eras in the past, we were going on into a new phase where colonies were going to resume their independent status.

Q: Mr. Ambassador, I would like to turn now to some of the major international conferences and negotiations you were concerned with. Could we talk a bit about the Manila Conference, which established SEATO? What was your role in that?

MACARTHUR: Well, I got back from an absence from the Department. I was away. I've forgotten if I'd been away for a couple of weeks' holiday or what. I got back to the Department and was told that I was to be Coordinator of Plans and Policies for a conference that would bring together the United States, Britain, France, and representatives of three Southeast Asian countries.

I was familiar with the problem, because earlier I had been involved, because of my background with the French and talks with the French about Indochina, and there was great concern at that time that the Communist Viet Cong, as it was then called, would triumph in Indochina, and this would set up a domino effect.

Q: I think it was the Viet Minh, wasn't it?

MACARTHUR: Viet Minh, yes. It was Viet Minh in those days, Viet Cong now. And this would start the domino theory operating, and that when it went, you'd have Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Burma, and the like going. And the Philippines, which represented strategically our key military position in the Southwest Pacific, balanced off in the north by our bases in Japan, that it would be, with all its problems, under lots of pressure, and the Philippine situation had been acute very recently because of the Huk rebellion, the Hakbalahap rebellion, which had been supported by the Communists.

So we started off with a meeting of the ambassadors of the interested countries, France, Britain, the Philippines, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and then the British, we started having talks here. We met every three or four days here. This was the locus for the international side of the business. We had developed a U.S. position.

The British then said that they could not really go ahead with the SEATO pact unless they could invite members of the Commonwealth, former colonial dependencies that were in the general area. Well, you could make a case, perhaps, for Burma, that we knew because of its leadership would refuse, but Anthony Eden insisted that Britain invite--and went ahead and invited India and Pakistan to join. We knew that India, in view of its position, would not join. But Pakistan immediately jumped at the chance, and it jumped to join for the wrong reason. It really was not at all interested in Southeast Asia; it wanted to get firm allies in its continuing confrontation with India.

So we started off on the SEATO treaty on the wrong track. We started off on the wrong track first because we had former colonial powers and ourselves as the inspiration for this agreement and not the local people coming to us, although they all agreed to the concept. And when you have outside colonial powers, former colonial powers involved, one of which France was still fighting an act of war in that part of the world, it made it a difficult concept.

Now, I'd like to go back. I should have mentioned it first. The first time I ever heard the idea of something like SEATO suggested was when, November 1952, I returned to this country from my duties as political advisor to SHAPE, and I was asked to meet with President Eisenhower in the Hotel Commodore in New York. After we talked about NATO and how General Ridgway was getting along and how things were going in NATO, the President said that he was deeply concerned about the situation in Southeast Asia, because whatever happened there would have an inevitable and very significant impact on France, and France was where our NATO headquarters was. That was before De Gaulle had pulled France out of the military machinery of NATO. And he said to me, "Is there any possibility that there might be some sort of form of a pact, like the NATO pact, that those countries, the non-Communist countries in that area, getting together to form a treaty so that there would be some coalescence and there would be something, mutual support and other things that would enable them to stand if the Communists went in Vietnam and then take over Laos, Cambodia, and start expanding outward with Moscow's help?"

And I told him that I thought that was a non-starter, because the countries in that area were so geographically diverse. I mean, you've got Australia and New Zealand that have an obvious interest in what happens in that whole area, particularly in terms of seaborne commerce and their lines of communication. You've got the Philippines, you've got Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam, you've got Thailand, you've got Burma. And when you look at all this business and the differences, I frankly didn't think that it would wash.

Q: Are we talking about Indonesia also at the time?

MACARTHUR: We're talking about Indonesia, too. He didn't advance it as a proposal; he just threw it out as a thought. "What do you think? Is there any chance?" I gave him my answer that I didn't think it would work.

Well, as time progressed and the French thing got more and more acute, and the specter of the Communists taking over Vietnam and then start expanding, and we had understandings with Thailand, the magnitude of what would happen in that area suddenly, over a period of time, became client states of China and the Soviet Union, which we then viewed as a single, hard, monolithic bloc looking to expand the Communist system in Asia as well as in South Asia, Southeast Asia, Middle East, Africa, throughout the world. But we got off to--the concept was flawed, and it was flawed from the beginning by, as I say, the participation of Britain, France, Pakistan, which had no interest in it other than India.

But eventually we reached an agreement here in Washington on the general lines of a treaty, and then I was sent out with Herman Phleger, the legal advisor, a brilliant man who

made a splendid contribution, balanced, good judgment. We were sent out to meet with higher ranking principals and ambassadors in Manila to hammer out the final treaty. That meeting was presided over by--it was during Magsaysay's time, and that meeting was presided over at that level, there was the foreign minister, but the man that ran it was Raul Manglapus, who is today foreign minister of the Philippines. He was exiled under Marcos and so forth. And Felino Neri was also a key player. He was one of President Magsaysay's right-hand men, a wonderful man.

We finally hammered out a treaty that had only about three parenthetical or four parenthetical clauses that were to be decided by the foreign ministers. Then Mr. Dulles came out with his delegation, and the delegation included Senator Mansfield and Senator Smith from the Foreign Relations Committee so there would be support for that committee for whatever was decided. And we briefed them. I was staying with Admiral Spruance, who was our ambassador. So was Mr. Dulles. They arrived in the afternoon, and we briefed them that evening. Then the telephone rang, and President Magsaysay was on the telephone speaking to Mr. Dulles, and Mr. Dulles came in and said, "President Magsaysay is having trouble with the Philippine Senate on the treaty, and he wants you to appear and brief the Philippine Senate tomorrow morning at 8:00 o'clock, the Philippine Senate Foreign Relations Committee."

I said to the Secretary, "I really don't want to do that. Filipinos are extremely touchy about American tutelage and one thing and another, and I think it would be a grave mistake to have a senior member of the American State Department in telling the Philippine Senate Foreign Relations Committee how they should vote in connection with the SEATO treaty."

He said, "Well, the President has insisted that you do it." Well, I knew Magsaysay well and I'd seen him. He was a remarkable man. The tragedy of the Philippines was that he was killed. He was a man of the people, who understood the people. Thanks to him, the Huk rebellion was put down.

So I slept very badly that night and went the next morning, arrived at a quarter to 8:00 to the Philippine Senate, went into the Senate Foreign Relations Committee room, met the chairman. They were all quite formal. They knew something about the name, my grandfather having been the first military governor general, or one of the first military governor generals of the Philippines, and Uncle Doug, General MacArthur, having been the liberator. But they were rather cool.

I thought about how I should present the matter, so I opened my presentation to the senators saying, "I come here with the greatest reluctance I'm appearing before you. I did not wish to. Why? For the simple reason that I feared that anything I said would be taken by your gentlemen as an indication that the United States was trying to pressure you to vote for something that it wanted, but about which you had grave doubts." So I said, "The decision, I'm not going to brief you in the sense of trying to persuade you to do anything." I said, "I'm going to explain to you the reasons why the United States supports this concept, but then it's up to you, weighing first and foremost and only what you consider the overriding national interest of your own country, to vote the way you think it serves your

country's best interest." And I said, "I can assure you if you vote against the treaty, it will not affect our relations at all. That is your prerogative; that is your duty to defend your own national interest." And I ended up by saying, "Although I'm a foreigner, my family has had connections with the Philippines for three generations, and perhaps you will consider me as a distant cousin." [Laughter]

With this, in a burst of emotion, they all jumped up and sort of embraced me and said, "All MacArthurs are brothers."

Q: How nice.

MACARTHUR: And they voted for the treaty. But we ran into a snag at the very end, because Mr. Dulles was quite aware from our briefing of him that the Pakistanis were in it only to get allies against India, so he made clear in the formal meeting before the signature that the United States would enter a reservation in signing the treaty, which said that insofar as the United States was concerned, the word "aggression" used in the treaty referred to Communist aggression only. And with this, (inaudible), the Pakistan foreign minister, walked out of the room, came back later and signed.

But the SEATO treaty was basically doomed because it had its origins--its concept was an American-European concept which was sold to them by the United States, Britain, and France, mostly the United States, because of fear of what was happening in Vietnam. And it was not a spontaneous thing where they felt in their own interest--"they," the countries of the area should come together and form what they later formed, which was ASEAN. So our concept was flawed on that one, and I think also because we had done so much of the original drafting and the work and so forth, and the United States had played such a prominent role in it. Although I got along well with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I think there was an underlying feeling that basically this was primarily designed to be an instrument of American foreign policy rather than an instrument which served, first and foremost, the interests of the Philippines.

Q: At the time, looking back on it, you can see it was flawed. Did those of you who were working on this see that this was probably not going to be a very efficient treaty at the time?

MACARTHUR: Well, we knew it wouldn't be very efficient, but we hoped it would have a strong deterrent effect. I say we knew it wouldn't be very efficient because there is no way that you could have any integrated military integration with everything, you know, scattered all around thousands of miles apart and so forth.

Q: Thousands of islands, too.

MACARTHUR: The Philippines themselves, as you point out, are thousands of islands. But the thought was that it would be sufficient to deter. The Viet Minh had not yet gone into Laos and Cambodia; they were still independent. We mentioned they were not included as members because, I think, they didn't want to be. It was considered that that

might be provocative, but there was a reference. I've forgotten how the reference read to them, which, if there was an attack on them, it would . . .

Q: "Them" being Laos and Cambodia.

MACARTHUR: Laos and Cambodia. You're right. But at the time, we thought it was the best sort of deterrent that we could arrange, and if things deteriorated very, very badly and we got involved there, it might have some utility. In other words, nobody in the Department that I know of, or that I can recall, was opposed to the idea. Everybody thought, "Well, you know, it's going to be sort of an unwieldy animal, but it's better than nothing. At least it will show that there is some solidarity and there's support for the free nations of Europe."

They were rather anxious. Let me add that the Southeast Asian nations participating were rather anxious to have this firm declaration of support for them from particularly the United States, but also from Britain and France as, again, a deterrent. So none of us saw the nature of the flaws that were inevitable and built into the business.

Q: Moving from here both to the other side of our concern, I'm speaking of the Austrian treaty, also here was one that really was a success.

MACARTHUR: Yes.

Q: Again, what was your role with the Austrian treaty?

MACARTHUR: I was a member of the delegation, but the primary role in the Austrian treaty, the negotiating role, was performed by a remarkable career Foreign Service officer, Ambassador Tommy Thompson, Llewellyn Thompson. He was Ambassador to Austria, and he carried the burden of the negotiations with his opposite numbers in Austria.

Q: With Austria and the Soviets, too?

MACARTHUR: Yes. Those were where the working-group meetings were, and Tommy was on them. But you can't talk about the Austrian treaty without going back to the Berlin Conference of January and February 1954.

At that foreign ministers' conference, you will remember that in addition to Germany and European security, Austria was also an agenda item. At that time, in the 1954 conference, the Russians were brutally adamant that there would be no settlement and withdrawal of any kind from Austria until there had been a German settlement. And on the German settlement, they were absolutely frozen in concrete, and we got nowhere in that almost four-week period of January and February at the Berlin Conference.

Q: 1954.

MACARTHUR: '54. So our hopes weren't very high in '54, but by the spring time of '55,

there had been some very significant changes. One of the most significant changes was that it was quite clear by the spring--and we started getting little feelers from the Soviets--it was quite clear by the spring of 1955 that West Germany was going to be taken into the Western European union and into NATO. From Austria in the deep freeze--we won't talk about Austria, except the possibility of withdrawing our troops from the center of Vienna out to our zone on the outskirts.

Q: Austria at this time was divided.

MACARTHUR: Divided into two zones of occupation, an Allied zone of occupation in the west, and a Soviet zone of occupation in the east, with Vienna in the center. And forces of all four nations had elements stationed in Vienna. That was the only thing the Russians were willing to talk about, pulling them out of the principle centers of Vienna and having them in their zone right in the suburbs, as it were. But with this development of the relationship of Germany moving steadily toward becoming a part of a European fabric of agreements, the Russians started indicating change in give.

Why did they do this? I think the basic reason was quite clear to us then, and I think it's as valid today as it was then. At the Berlin Conference, they were so brutally, brutally opposed to anything on Austria and to anything on Germany that meant less than an agreement which would guarantee Soviet dominance over all of Germany, that there was a very substantial public opinion backlash in Europe, a very substantial backlash in Europe. And the failure of the Berlin Conference in '54 was placed, basically, at the Russians' doorstep.

So when it became inevitable that Germany was moving toward membership in NATO, which occurred just before the NATO meeting in Paris in May of '55, before we went on to Vienna to sign, the Russians, obviously wanting to recoup a propaganda position, began to make noises about how an agreement on Austria was possible. And then Tommy Thompson was the one that did the negotiating.

Now, why, in addition to the propaganda advantage of saying, "We're the ones that are going to make possible withdrawal of foreign forces from Austria and a re-integration of Austria into a single sovereign state," what were the additional reasons that they were willing to go for the Austrian settlement? There were two. First, strategically, they weren't giving up a damn thing. They had very substantial forces stationed along the borders of neighboring Czechoslovakia and Hungary that could be back, if they withdrew and we withdrew, they could be back in Vienna within a matter of several hours. There would be nothing to stop them. So strategically, they weren't abandoning anything we could move into before they couldn't take over.

Q: There was no frontier or mountain frontier, river, or open plain.

MACARTHUR: Nothing to hold them up, and no Austrian forces of any significance whatsoever.

The second material reason was the condition on which Austria was reunited; it would be neutral, and that there would be no foreign forces stationed there. And this also sent a signal to the German people from the Soviet Union, that if Germany wanted to be reunited, all it had to do was to declare its neutrality, throw out all the Allied forces in Germany, and that was the way which would leave it totally defenseless, with the Russians poised and able to move through at lightning speed, that the reunification of Germany depended on its withdrawal from NATO, its neutrality, and its entity as a neutral, disarmed state between the Russian forces in Poland and Czechoslovakia and the like and Western Europe, which would have been a death knell to any hope of defending Western Europe. Because back up to the Rhine there just isn't space for any adequate defense.

So propaganda-wise, to overcome the setback that they took as a result of the hard-line position they took in Berlin, the '54 conference, because they gave up nothing strategically, there was no way the U.S. or Allied forces could be back in Austria in any reasonable time, and the Russians could be there, and to set an example for Germany: "Germany, if you want to be reunited, get out of NATO, become neutral, disarm, and you've got it made."

So we got the word that the final agreement had been overcome, and we flew on. I won't ever forget that day, a beautiful day, May 13, 1955. We flew to Austria, and it was a very emotional scene. There must have been three-quarters of a million Austrians on all the little hamlets and cross-roads coming in from the airport, hundreds of farmers and people at the rooftops, crowded with people in the streets. And we drove into this marvelous thing.

Then the next day, the treaty was signed in the beautiful Belvedere Palace, and there must have been half a million people gathered on the great sloping lawns, treed lawns that go down under the palace.

The signing ceremonies and what immediately followed were not without interest. The Austrian Foreign Minister Figl, who had conducted himself with courage and resolution at the Berlin Conference in '54, when Molotov had just treated him like a dog, dirt, of course, for him it was a very emotional day. And after the signing, Figl went out on the balcony, and there were thunderous cheers and applause of half a million people who shouted and cheered. Then Mr. Figl went back in and motioned to Mr. Dulles and Mr. Eden and the French foreign minister that they should each go out alone and take a bow on the porch, the great stone porch that looked down over the gardens and the sloping hill.

Molotov saw what was happening as Eden started toward the door, and immediately went out and joined him and appeared arm-in-arm with him. [Laughter] Then when they came in, Dulles went out. Molotov grabbed Dulles by the arm, and he did the same with the Frenchman. [Laughter]

Q: He didn't want to be faced with whatever there would be for himself alone.

MACARTHUR: He certainly did not want to be faced with what--so he did not appear by himself. The treaty was signed and came into being. But as I say, while I was a member of the delegation, at the treaty signing, the hero of the treaty was Tommy Thompson, who

worked 16, 18, 20 hours a day. Indeed, we didn't get the final word that the final hurdle had been cleared by a Soviet concession until the night before we left.

Q: You're moving to relations not with Austria, but with Britain. I was reading a British account saying that Dulles and Eden always seemed to be talking past each other. I wonder if you could see how--Eden, of course, was either foreign minister or prime minister during almost the entire period you're talking about.

MACARTHUR: Yes.

Q: How did you and the State Department view Eden, and particularly Secretary Dulles view Eden?

MACARTHUR: Mr. Dulles and Mr. Eden did not get along--period. Mr. Eden, I think, had, for some reason, a personal feeling of dislike about Dulles. Why, I don't know. Whether he felt that it was in part due to the leadership role that Dulles frequently played at these conferences with the Russians and elsewhere, where the Russians would turn to him because he was the representative of the only other super power and represented the most important country there, but they did not get along. It was known by the British delegation that Mr. Eden cordially disliked Dulles. This did not happen at the very beginning, but it was a thing that developed. Mr. Dulles never talked about it to me or to anybody else that I know of. He gave the impression that Eden was sometimes very difficult with him, and he couldn't care less. I mean, I don't think he was fazed by Eden's dislike of him, but there was a personal thing there, and there was an antipathy. It was something all of us on both delegations recognized that it was there. We didn't talk to each other about it.

Q: But it didn't rub off on the delegations, particularly?

MACARTHUR: No, no. We had excellent--we had really excellent relations at the senior working level, you know, the equipment of the Assistant Secretary and Under Secretary level and down the line. (Inaudible) might take positions with which we differed, which they skillfully defended, but the personal relationships between us were not affected by it.

Continuation of interview, February 3, 1988.

Q: We are now in the 1950s period when you were Counselor of the Department of State. Mr. Ambassador, we want to talk a little about the lead-up to the first major post-war summit.

MACARTHUR: Yes. You will recall that in January and February 1954, the foreign ministers of the United States, France, Britain, and the Soviet Union met in what I could only describe as a totally inconclusive and unproductive session in Berlin, the Berlin Conference, that lasted for almost four weeks, and where we got nowhere, absolutely nowhere, on the principle subjects which we were interested in and which were on the

agenda. One was Germany. For us that meant the reunification of Germany and freedom. The Soviet Union refused to have an agenda item under the phrase "reunification." They said, "It can be either Germany or the German problem."

We were also interested in Austria, and the Austrian Chancellor Figl came to the Berlin Conference, and we got nowhere on Austria, nor did he, although he put up a very courageous performance, because the Germans said there would be no settlement of the Austrian problem and withdrawal of Soviet forces from Austria until the German problem had been solved to their satisfaction.

We touched on European security also at that conference, including the question of armaments or disarmament or production of armaments, if you will, and really, we got nowhere at all.

By the spring of 1955, however, certain events had taken place that had caused a major shift in the Soviet position. In the first place, the Soviets were so obdurate on Austria and Germany at the Berlin Conference that they had suffered a rather major setback in terms of European opinion and Free World opinion, generally speaking. Second, and much more important, by the spring of 1955, West Germany, which the Soviet Union had been trying to isolate and intimidate into a form of neutrality and acquiescence, to Soviet control of all of Eastern Germany and primary influence over Western Germany.

By the spring of 1955, Germany had been taken into WEU, the Western European Union, and was also taken into NATO. I mention this because it has relevance to something that's happened very recently. All during the period preceding Germany's being taken into NATO, the Soviets put on a major, major propaganda campaign in Western Europe to counter any such possibility, because they recognized that if West Germany became a part of NATO, their ability to control all of Germany would be very substantially reduced. Let me say the campaign they put on was very similar to the campaign they put on to balance the Soviet SS-20 missiles that were deployed a few years back.

Q: This was during the late Seventies, early Eighties period.

MACARTHUR: Yes. The Soviets put on the a tremendous propaganda campaign against the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe to counter the Soviet SS-20s. However, once that was a fait accompli and their campaign of propaganda against such deployment failed, the Soviets immediately modified their position and we went on to negotiations which led recently in Washington to the Gorbachev-Reagan summit and the signing of an IMF treaty.

Similarly, once Germany was accepted into NATO, the Soviet position, which had been totally intransigent on Germany and on Austria, the Austrian position was then modified. In as early as March of 1955, we began to get signals that an agreement on the withdrawal of all forces from Austria was a possibility with the neutralization of Austria so that it could not be used as a springboard for the forces from either East or West in any kind of an eventual confrontation. So as I say, the situation had changed very radically from

January-February in Berlin 1954 to the spring time of '55.

Then the proposition, which had been made in a public speech by Winston Churchill two years earlier in '53, the proposition that there should be a meeting at the summit--he coined the phrase--to ease tensions and try to deal with problems came to the fore. The United States' position initially was one of some hesitancy of going into a summit for a couple of basic reasons. One, if you held a summit and the summit resulted in an absolute rigid iron deadlock and that was evident, it could increase tensions and certainly increase a feeling of despondency and inevitability that eventually there was going to be some kind of a clash between the democratic forces of Western Europe and the Soviet Union.

On the other hand, if you had a summit that really accomplished nothing substantively, but you covered up that lack of accomplishment with a generally worded, rather optimistic communique that said nothing in terms of substance but gave an impression that all was well and sweetness and light, then the result might be a let-down and a relaxation on the part of the Western democracies in terms of maintaining the necessary armed forces for a balance of power, which was the essential ingredient to the maintenance of peace, the balance of military power.

There was also one third consideration, which, in our own little American group, as we discussed it with Secretary Dulles and the White House, was a reserve, a hesitancy to commit the President to a summit meeting if it was going to end with absolutely no accomplishment whatsoever because of Soviet obduracy, and where there would inevitably have to be, as there always are at summits, a bit of socializing, which would give the impression to many people in many parts of the world that we respected the Soviet Union as a country that was equal in all respects, including democracy and the like.

Q: Excuse me, Mr. Ambassador, but since we're focusing on your role and also the role of the State Department, these were obvious concerns, but were these concerns being brought out by the State Department? Were they coming from the President? Or were they just sort of accepted? How was this working within the State Department?

MACARTHUR: Within the State Department, we had a working group which I chaired, and then we had also an interdepartmental group. The State Department had a position that we would go, when we met with Defense or whoever the interested parties were, Defense, sometimes Treasury, I believe the CIA was represented as an observer at all the interdepartmental meetings. But the concerns that I'm talking about came out inside the State Department and were discussed and thrashed out with the Secretary of State. The State Department working group would bring these concerns to the State Department, the pros and cons of all the issues that were involved to the Secretary, and then we would have these long meetings with the Secretary, thrashing them out, frequently on Saturdays and Sundays at his home. Sometimes he'd be in the office Saturday morning, and we would adjourn to his house after lunch in the afternoon and work Saturday afternoon, and Sunday we would meet again. So that there was time without the interruption of the normal things. The Secretary is interrupted, his schedule in the office. So we could sit down and reach conclusions.

So the concerns, as I say, came out of the discussions in the working group, but they were obviously concerns that were also not unique to the working group, but the Secretary of State had them very much in mind, too.

Then, of course, when we reached a position in the Department, we put it to the other interested departments, which were basically the Defense Department, although Treasury was in on some of these things. As I say, the CIA, a by-member, always had a senior representative or deputy director or something of that kind there to be of assistance, if necessary, on the intelligence side, and also to be fully familiar with the way the thinking was moving.

The procedure then, I mentioned in an earlier interview that the President was quite adamant that when there were differences, they should be brought clearly to him. He wanted no bureaucratic language that meant everything to all people, because if you had that general bureaucratic language that, as he described it, each department would march in a different direction because it was so vague and not specific. So when there were differences, he wanted them brought directly to him. And on several occasions, there were differences which were resolved by meetings between the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense.

Q: This is on the summit.

MACARTHUR: On the summit, yes. I say it was on the summit; it was on the summit, but no matter what the occasion was, the President was really quite rightly immovable on the idea that he wanted a clear-cut decision where people in the different departments would know what the marching orders were and would march in unison.

I remember one occasion when the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State were unable to reach agreement, and they went to the White House, and a decision was taken there. I don't frankly remember whether it was taken by the National Security Council, but I do remember that it was fully laid out, both sides of the question, to the President, and he made his decision on that issue, and that was the end of that.

Then, of course, when you had a U.S. position, these were four-power meetings, not bilateral meetings such as we have today. The British and the French were also participants on the Western side. And we would then have meetings with the British and French, trilateral meetings, where we would put out our position and they would put out theirs.

Q: This was at what level?

MACARTHUR: At the level of the equivalent of Assistant Secretary, and they were not always in the United States. I remember one of them was in Paris, and another one was in London, and there were a couple of Washington, where they had obviously gone through the same sort of procedures that we had gone through and produced a national position, a British position or a French position, on the specific agenda item or problem under

consideration. And because there was cross-fertilization through their embassy, I saw a great deal of the British and French ambassadors as we were developing the U.S. position.

Q: And we were feeding somewhat of the same.

MACARTHUR: We were feeding feelings on these things, and when we reached conclusions about certain things, we fed that to the British and the French so there wouldn't be any sudden surprise when the international, as we called it, the international working group got together. Although there were differences of presentation or one thing or another, when you got down to hard substance, the positions of the three powers were parallel. As I say, there were on occasions things on presentation or order or one thing or another that the meetings were useful, because when we came out of them, we came out with an agreement of all three parties that this would be the position that we would stand by when we got into the meeting with the Russians, because the Russians always tried to drive wedges between the three Allies powers--the British and the French and the Americans. They always tried to pick out something where they could find some difference and then exploit that difference to divide the three powers.

Q: But you say when you wanted to get together with the other two Western powers, you didn't want them to be surprised at your points, and they didn't want to be surprised at what we were interested in. What about with the Soviets? Since this is going to be a meeting, were you keeping them somewhat apprised of the thinking, so that at least they would know what to think about?

MACARTHUR: I don't recall any meetings that I had during that period other than at social occasions with the Soviets on substance, where we dealt with them in the same way that we dealt with the British and the French. The Soviets were quite familiar with our basic position. They were familiar with it from the Berlin Conference the year before; they were familiar with it from very frequent statements and speeches made by the Secretary or even by the President.

But I want to qualify what I've said. I never met, as coordinator of plans and policies, with the Soviets as such in this, because usually it would have been quite out of line to do so until we had a common position with the British and the French. It would have been exploited by the Soviets. However, before the summit, we started having talks with the Soviets as they gave indications of changes in position, Tommy Thompson in Vienna, with his opposite number on the Austrian question, and Livy Merchant with the Soviet ambassador here.

And then before the summit, we met in New York, as I recall. That was in June of 1955. We had extended the official invitation to the Soviets for the summit at the Austrian peace treaty business, and then 1955 coincided with the tenth anniversary of the United Nations, and the foreign ministers of the four countries--the Soviet Union, France, Britain, the United States--all went to San Francisco for the celebration of that tenth anniversary of the United Nations. And before we went there, we had worked out first, in full cooperation with the British and the French, the idea that we would have a meeting or meetings with

Mr. Molotov there.

Q: He was the foreign minister.

MACARTHUR: He was the foreign minister. On the summit and various--both the substantive and operative arrangements, the protocol businesses and all the things, the order of speaking and one thing or another, which was not very difficult, because we had worked out a system in Berlin that, although we got nowhere in Berlin, a system of speaking and so forth and locating chairmanships and so forth worked all right.

I remember that the Secretary met, I think, with the British and the French, and I think Chancellor Adenauer had been over here at that time in a period of a week or ten days in New York before going to San Francisco, and then we went to San Francisco, and there the Secretary had talks with Molotov. Then the Russians gave a luncheon at the place they had in the country outside of San Francisco. It was a meeting where it was a luncheon, but it was a business luncheon and extended on into the afternoon, where we ironed out the final modalities of the summit and reached the agreements on the final details.

Q: What were you doing during the New York meeting, the San Francisco meeting, you personally?

MACARTHUR: I was with the Secretary, and as coordinator, I accompanied him to most of the meetings, because we also met in San Francisco with Mr. Pinay, who was the French Foreign Minister, whom I had known well in the period when I served in France just after the liberation. And I accompanied, I remember, Secretary Dulles to a meeting when we were in Paris before going on to Austria in May. I went along with the Secretary to call on Chancellor Adenauer, because we wanted to discuss with him before the formal invitation that we had worked out or were working out at the time of the NATO meeting in May, before the Austrian state treaty, I accompanied the Secretary to that meeting. We met with Adenauer for about an hour, a very, very satisfactory meeting. I knew most of Adenauer's people, because although West Germany was not included in any of these conferences--the Russians wouldn't have heard of it--we kept the West Germans fully informed of the Western position. At Berlin and at the Geneva summit and at the post-Geneva foreign ministers' meeting in Geneva also the following October, the Germans had high-level representation there, with whom we met and briefed every evening after the sessions were over, so that they would be fully up to date on what had transpired and where we stood. So the briefings with the Germans, if I remember correctly, we did it trilaterally. Three of us went, the British, French, and Americans, the senior participants in the meeting, met with the Adenauer's representatives. They were kept fully, fully in the picture, which they much appreciated.

Q: Now, on this work leading up to the summit, what was your impression of John Foster Dulles' feeling towards the summit? Was he basically for it to begin with? Did he come around reluctantly?

MACARTHUR: Well, I mentioned the concerns we had. Those were concerns that weren't

just Mr. Dulles' concerns; they were concerns that all of us shared. But on balance, we felt that these concerns were more than balanced, and we felt confident the President would be able fully to hold his own in any meeting with the Russians. He had a lot of experience as a military man meeting with Cheka, the Russian military, and other people, and he had had a lot of international experience because, as I also mentioned, he's the first President we ever had that really had had international experience, and he learned under the three most difficult teachers as possible that I can imagine to learn under--Franklin Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Charles de Gaulle. So we were not concerned about the President not being fully up to date.

I should say that the President kept close tabs as we were developing the U.S. position. Mr. Dulles was meticulous in keeping the President informed. And before signing off on anything at all going to the President to the White House, and I very, very frequently went with Mr. Dulles to these meetings in the Oval Room with the President, because I had been General Eisenhower's POLAD, advisor in international affairs at SHAPE and was used to briefing him, and I very frequently went with Mr. Dulles, and we would lay out the issues and the conclusions we had reached. And the President would sign off on them or sometimes he would make very useful suggestions about presentation that would make it more appealing to a broader spectrum of the Free World than the presentation that we had in mind. These were not basically major decisions of substance, but it showed his sensitivity to the importance of presenting the thing in a way that would ring the most friendly bells throughout the world and with our friends and allies and with others as well.

So there was a constant keeping of the President informed, and when Mr. Dulles went on any trip--and I went on a great many trips with him around the world, Middle East, Southeast Asia, Europe--every night after the day's meetings, Mr. Dulles personally sat down and dictated a telegram to the President so the President would know exactly what he had done and the position he had taken. He was extraordinarily meticulous about that, and rightly so. And, of course, he had a President who understood the issues.

Q: I was just going to say that some Presidents would be overwhelmed by this.

MACARTHUR: I think that's true, because we've had Presidents, particularly recently, who never have the slightest experience of any kind in foreign affairs, and that has been, I think, one of our problems.

Q: With this summit, from San Francisco had you developed an agenda at that time?

MACARTHUR: I think we had the agenda, and I think that was one of the subjects that was discussed. You could never leave an agenda. An agenda is an endless business when you're talking with the Russians. They'll talk until 5:00 o'clock in the morning. Frankly, I don't remember when we had completed the agenda, but my vague recollection is that at San Francisco, by that time the Russians had accepted the meeting, which had been extended in May, as I say, about the time of the Austrian state treaty, and Molotov had said that he couldn't answer. But it sounded like a good idea to him, which meant to us that the answer was going to be affirmative. From the point when we got the reply back, we then

had to meet with the Russians on agenda points, meet with them, communicate with them on agenda points. As I remember, I don't remember in detail; I'd have to go back and look at the record. But by the time we met in San Francisco, we were pretty much down the track on all arrangements, including agenda. I don't remember if there were any last-minute slight things or there was not agreement on the agenda, but we were on track.

Q: Then what preparations did you make before the summit? What were your particular concerns?

MACARTHUR: Well, I had my particular concerns with the whole damn business. As coordinator, I was responsible for the coordination of the development not just of the substantive issues, on which we spent many, many hours. I've described weekends and other times. But the procedural issues--procedures are tremendously important in meetings with the Russians, the place in the agenda of a certain item. At the Berlin Conference in '54, the Russians insisted on having Germany at the very end of the agenda, and time finally ran out about three-and-a-half weeks later, when we were there, as I said, almost four weeks, accomplishing nothing. So first, in developing our own position on all the procedures--order of speaking, chairmanship, agenda order, very, very important and the like, as well as the substantive issue of what you were going to do substantively with respect to the particular problem was my responsibility.

I had tremendous and magnificent support from the State Department Secretariat, who assigned one of their senior people.

Q: Who was that, do you remember?

MACARTHUR: Well, in different meetings they're different ones, and I'd have to check.

Q: I'll just turn this [tape recorder] off for a second.

MACARTHUR: I don't want to leave out people.

Q: Let me ask this. Were there any divisions within the Department of State? I'm thinking particularly of bureaus, Eastern Europe versus Western Europe, or maybe East Asia or something, where there were major disagreements that you had to deal with as far as the summit and what we were aiming for there.

MACARTHUR: No, I don't recall any major disagreements, because the summit really--we did have a meeting with the Russians on Far Eastern matters one time in Geneva, but that was not a meeting at the summit; it was at the foreign ministers' meeting. But in this respect, in respect to the summit meeting, when we were dealing with questions on disarmament, originally Austria, the reunification of Germany in freedom, measures to reduce tensions, the sort of things that were on the agendas of the summit were not things that would raise the kind of issues that you mentioned.

Leaving quite aside relationships with the Soviet Union, during the period of

decolonization, that is, the period following the war basically from the Fifties on, as France, Britain, Belgium, Holland lost their colonies in Africa, the Middle East, Southeast Asia, and the like, and became independent states, there were tensions and differences between the bureaus at that time, with the European bureau usually wanting to move much more slowly as the British and the French, who were reluctantly decolonizing, wanted to move, than the people in the bureaus that had the former or present colonies that were being decolonized, who wanted to move as rapidly as possible and show that we were in the forefront of those that believed in what our Constitution stood for, that is, the rights of individuals to live under governments of their own choosing and civil rights, and all the rest of it and so forth.

So while there were differences in a totally different area, talking of summitry or our meetings with the Russians, I don't recall a single difference.

Q: At the Geneva summit, again, did you sort of sit at Secretary Dulles' elbow and keep him apprised of where we were?

MACARTHUR: The President sat in the center. Mr. Dulles sat on his right, and I sat on his left in case there were procedural or other things that he wanted not to bother with Mr. Dulles about. Since I'd been Coordinator of Plans and Policies with Mr. Dulles and had briefed him on it and the preparatory work, I also think there was another motive, although this is supposition on my part, to be seated on the President's left, which, of course, was a great honor. I don't think the President wanted a lot of conflicting people talking in each ear. In other words, if you put a senior fellow from Defense or something like that, and you have Mr. Dulles on one side and somebody else on the other, I don't think the President wanted, at a meeting, to be buzzed from both sides. This, however, is supposition on my part. I know that when the procedures were laid out, if there were questions or things, they came through Mr. Dulles. They'd scribble on the paper and if it was on my side of the table, I'd reach around and give it to Dulles to deal with. The President, in other words, wanted us to speak with one voice, and he wanted to concentrate on the business. Now, nobody ever told me this, but from my knowledge of the way the President operated and the way he liked to operate, I think that was the reason I was seated on his left.

I did have more overall mileage on all aspects from having been coordinator, and if there was any point that came up about this, that, or the other thing, he could turn to me and ask me about it, which he did on a couple of occasions.

Q: Were there pressures from the Department of Defense to put a Department of Defense person equivalent to your rank near the President, because there were military issues that were coming up.

MACARTHUR: Oh, sure. Let me just read you the delegation of the Soviet Union. This is the U.S. delegation: President of the United States; John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State; Dillon Anderson, Special Assistant to the President; Charles E. Bohlen, Ambassador to the Soviet Union; Robert Bowie, Director of the Policy Planning Staff; James Hagerty, Press Secretary of the President; Douglas MacArthur, Counselor of the Department of State;

Livingston Merchant, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs; Herman Phleger, Legal Advisor; Llewellyn Thompson, Ambassador to Austria. Now, that was the delegation, but then we always had the Assistant Secretary of ISA [International Security Affairs] of the Department of Defense, who sat right behind, usually behind where he could be behind the Secretary of State one seat, one way or another. At that time, if I recall, it was perhaps Frank Nash.

ISA is International Security Affairs. It's the Department of Defense's Department of State, if you will. We always had them, and we had them on the working group, and we always had a senior person from ISA at every conference, not just with the Russians, but when I went out to negotiate the SEATO treaty, we had an ISA fellow who was one of my principle advisors. The only place where we didn't have one was when I negotiated the Japan treaty in that period of 1957, '58, to 1960, the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security with Japan. But that was a running process, where sometimes it would stall for six weeks while the Japanese, with their decision-making process of consensus, it would take them six or eight weeks to reach an answer to a problem that was before us, and it was impractical to have a senior person out there all the time, although they got copies automatically of my telegrams, which were in a special series with a special indicator, went to Defense, so they knew exactly what was happening. I had also, as an advisor, I could always call on CinCPac [Commander in Chief Pacific Fleet] in Honolulu if I wished.

Q: But when you got to the summit, were there any problems in your coordinating the work of the British and the French with us?

MACARTHUR: We did have a problem, but I didn't mention one preliminary step. I mentioned the meeting in San Francisco between the foreign ministers of France, Britain, and the United States, and the Soviet Union, Mr. Molotov, at which certain agreements were reached. That was in June. Then before the summit, which was in the latter part of July, an international working group was set up in Paris for the three Western powers, with German participation on matters that related to Germany. That was the hammering out of the final hard positions that we would take and stick with when the summit began and we were in negotiations with the Russians, so that there would not be wedges driven between apparent differences in the positions of the powers.

I do recall that Prime Minister Faure of France, when we got to Geneva the day before the summit, suddenly informed us that he had decided that he wanted to modify his presentation to include or to change a bit one of the agreed points that we had met. We were not particularly happy about that, because we felt that we had reached firm agreement. In fact, firm agreement had been reached in the senior level preliminary conference in Paris, where Ambassador Jake Beam did a great job. It made actually no material difference to the outcome of the conference, and there was no wedge driven, but that is the only case where I recall of having reached agreement prior to a conference with the Russians with our British and French friends. There was a deviation of modest dimensions before the conference actually began.

During the conferences, however, as the Soviets made various proposals, many of them we

were prepared for, because they were not so vastly different from what we had heard before from them in preliminary meetings and at Berlin in 1954. We met, as I think I mentioned, the British and the French and ourselves would meet after the conference broke up, after the ministers left, and work out the recommendations for the line to be taken the following day.

Now, the Geneva summit was a summit that was different in some respects than other summits, because in the morning the foreign ministers met.

Q: The foreign ministers at this point were whom? Dulles, Molotov?

MACARTHUR: Molotov, Pinay, and I think it was Harold MacMillan. Eden, who had been foreign minister, was running for prime ministership at that time. They had elections that were coming along. And although he had not originally been very enthusiastic for the summit in the months preceding the final decision to hold one, he decided, in light of his electoral aspirations, it would be a good thing to support it. So he was uncertain about summitry and not terribly enthusiastic when Winston Churchill proposed it in '53, but he became an ardent supporter of the summit.

But the foreign ministers met in the morning, and then the chiefs of government met in the afternoon. After the foreign ministers' meetings, there would be get-togethers by the top people or their representatives of the three Western powers to agree on the briefings and things of their guy and the procedures that would be followed in the afternoon by the chiefs of state and so forth.

On substance, little came out of that first summit, except one item which we had been struggling for from the Berlin Conference of January-February of '54 and before, and it came about in a very dramatic way. After the conference had gone on for a couple of days--I don't remember whether it was two or three days--it related to the German question. And the President had been very insistent that in his speeches that Germany be reunited through free elections so the German people could have a government of their own choice. And the Russians had vigorously resisted this at Berlin. They'd absolutely slammed the door on the idea.

At this conference, Bulganin was the chief of state for the Soviet Union, but Khrushchev was the guy that was running the show, and that was very evident. After the President got up and made a very powerful speech about this thing, Khrushchev replied, accepting that Germany would be reunited, reunified through free elections, in keeping with the interests of the German people. Well, we had been struggling for well over a year-and-a-half to get the Russians to agree to this formulation, and in the final communique, it was agreed that this was written into the final communique, which took the form of a directive to the foreign ministers, who were then instructed to meet in a short period of time, a couple of months, in Geneva, to work out the details of this agreement.

Our euphoria and pleasure of having this included in the communique was dimmed very considerably when Molotov got up at the subsequent foreign ministers' meeting in Geneva

and made an opening speech which made it quite clear that the only circumstances under which Germany would be reunited were ones in which Germany would be unified, but under the influence of the Soviet Union, and that the Communist Party would play an important role in reunified Germany. So once again, we suffered a disappointment from what we thought was an agreement, which was reneged on by the Soviet Union.

I say "once again," because if you go back, the first summits were wartime summits, tripartite summits. There was the 1943 summit in Tehran, and out of that came an agreement that Iran would be treated as a liberated area. There were then occupation forces of the three powers in Iran. The northern half was occupied by the Russians; the southern, by the British. We had about 15,000 men on an line of communication from the Gulf up to the Russian zone. We were not allowed beyond the northern half of Russian-occupied, and this was the route through which our lend-lease supplies for Russia had passed, or a considerable part of them.

It was also agreed that six months after the end of the war in Europe, the forces of the three occupying powers would be withdrawn. We and the British withdrew our forces in those six months. The Russians kept their entire force there, and not only kept them there, but tried to tear off the whole northwest corner of Iran, setting up the People's Republic of Azerbaijan. That move would cut through the Turkish-Iran barrier to the Persian Gulf. That move was frustrated by a very strong position that President Truman took in '46. We then had the monopoly of the weapon, and the Russians finally withdrew.

The next summit was the 1945 summit at Yalta, and there the Russians agreed that the peoples of Eastern Europe would have governments that were the result of free elections, genuinely free elections held by their people to choose a government. And that, of course, was also honored in the breach by the Russians, who, with the Soviet Red Army in possession, set up the Communist Party and ran the elections with only one candidate from the Communist Party that people could vote for. I taxed Mr. Molotov at an after-dinner meeting at Berlin about this, and he said, "But we did have free elections." He said, "People could vote yes or not."

I said, "Yes, but they could only vote for the Communist candidate that you selected. That's not a free election."

He said, "Of course it's a free election. People were free to vote. They could vote yes or no if they wanted."

The next summit, of course, was the Potsdam Summit just at the end of the war, where the principal decision was the decision that the Soviet Union would move into the war against Japan, a decision which, I think, we have great cause to regret. But at the time, it seemed like a good thing.

Q: And probably they would have done it anyway.

MACARTHUR: Exactly. They would have done it anyway. When Japan started going,

they would have done it anyway. I happened to be present at the Potsdam Conference, too. The French were excluded. I was head of the political section in Paris, but they were excluded from that conference, and it made De Gaulle furious, of course. I went there as an observer so that when we got back to Paris, we could report to the French. The only dramatic thing about that conference that I clearly remember was that an election was going on in Britain about that time, and Churchill was still prime minister. In the midst of the conference, about the second or third day, the results were in. The Socialist labor party won, and Attlee, whom he had brought along as an advisor, then moved up to the table and Churchill took the back seat that Attlee had had before. That was, to me, the only dramatic thing that I recall with any clarity about the Potsdam Conference. [Laughter]

Q: Back to the Geneva Summit of 1955. Did you have much contact yourself with your Soviet counterpart or not? Were we pretty well isolated? Was there the iron curtain between our delegations?

MACARTHUR: Well, we had contacts. We saw the Soviets. Somebody had a dinner. One of the chiefs of government or state had dinners, and you would run into your Soviet contacts and talk with them. In the Berlin Conference, as I mentioned earlier, and in the Geneva Conference, too, the subsequent foreign ministers' Geneva Conference, we used to have these little dinners where I went aside to see if there was any--where you got them away from the hype and propaganda aspects of the conference table to explore privately whether there was any give or movement.

But the thing that we got away from about the drama of the Russians agreeing to President Eisenhower's speech calling for the reunification of Germany through free elections was--and this I will never forget--when Khrushchev got up and said that and made the reply, Molotov and Gromyko turned absolutely white and immediately, when Khrushchev sat down, huddled around him and were obviously protesting very, very vigorously. And they were extremely unhappy with what he had done. As a practical matter, it made no difference, because, as I say, some two-and-a-half months later when we met in October with the foreign ministers to implement that decision, in Mr. Molotov's opening speech, there it was.

So I mention these points only because with summitry now having become a media hype thing, it isn't what the Russians subscribe to at the summit that is important; it is the carrying out of any commitments they make that are important. And in seeing that they carry them out, where we were much too slack and loose at Yalta and elsewhere, has been a looseness of language. If you reach an agreement with the Russians, it must be specific in every single detail, because otherwise, you will have Mr. Molotov saying, "They are free elections. They don't have to vote. They can vote yes, no, whatever they want," when they aren't free at all when the candidate is imposed by the Red Army.

Q: After our summit, in the Geneva Summit, were we aware that we had better spell everything out very carefully?

MACARTHUR: Absolutely. As an amusing business, there were rooms at the Palais des

Nations in Geneva, where the conference was held, for the different delegations. We were always extremely careful about not talking in those, for fear of rooms being tapped by somebody during the night. We had some experience with this at the Berlin Conference, which went on, as I said, almost four weeks. We met one week at the western sector and the next week at the eastern sector and the next week in the western sector, and alternated. The first meetings were in the western sector, and then we went to the eastern sector. Before we went, we had a meeting, and every member of the delegation that went to the meeting was given a little pad and a pen, if he didn't have one. Most everybody had a pen. The instructions were that when we went into this room that was the U.S. delegation room, we should not say a word. Any communication, any discussion, anything should be written, given to the Secretary, and he would write a response. We were convinced that it was bugged. We took along with us a debugging specialist, and he pulled out his equipment. There was this very nice room with a long table. At the end of the wall behind the table was an armchair, where, obviously, the Secretary would sit. There was a big portrait of Lenin. He passed his discovery apparatus across the portrait, and sure enough, under Lenin's vest pocket was a listening device. We found one built into the table, underneath the table, at the head of the table, and another one at the far end of the room. So the need for extraordinary precautions for confidentiality in terms of debugging any place that you were going to be, including your own headquarters, your own meeting places, having them debugged in case some mole slipped in and planted something during the night that you're not aware of is of great importance, because the last thing you want to do is to send the signals to your Soviet across the table of exactly what your position is before you go in.

Q: After the summit, then there was a foreign ministers' meeting.

MACARTHUR: Yes. The foreign ministers met in October, if I recall.

Q: 1955.

MACARTHUR: 1955, in Geneva. There our principal hope had been that we would find some formula which would allow a free and independent Germany to be reunited, the two sectors to be reunited. As I mentioned, it was blasted from the beginning by Molotov's first speech, and we really came out of that summit with nothing very sensational.

Q: After Khrushchev had made this statement that perhaps there would be free elections in Germany and all . . .

MACARTHUR: He didn't say perhaps. He committed it.

Q: But once he said that, were you getting advice? You had Llewellyn Thompson and Chip Bohlen there, who were Soviet experts. Were they saying, "This will never fly in the Politburo"?

MACARTHUR: No. Nobody said it wouldn't fly. We waited with some hope that there had been some modification in the Soviet position, just as there had been a major modification in the position with respect to Austria. Of course, the two countries are quite different in

terms of strategic importance. A neutral Austria is of no strategic danger to the Soviet Union, because, as I mentioned, they could be in Vienna in a matter of three hours with their forces that they have in both Hungary and Czechoslovakia, whereas there's no way the West, if you withdraw, could get back in there. Eastern Germany is the pivot on which the whole Soviet position in Eastern Europe depends. If Germany is reunited, and chooses to be a part of the Free World and not a satellite, then the whole strategic picture and what happens domestically and internally in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania--I don't mention Bulgaria, because they've always been known as the "little Russians"--but throughout Soviet-dominated Eastern Europe, a united Germany would be a formidable force. The implications that you can have--free and democratic societies--would be very difficult, would place the Soviets in a very difficult position in maintaining control, if you will, over countries that they've occupied and imposed their system on.

Q: After the foreign ministers' meeting, which, as you said, proved abortive, you were still in the Department of State as counselor during, I guess, the greatest crisis of the Eisenhower Administration. The foreign crisis was the fall of 1956, both with Suez and with the Hungarian revolt. Did you have a role in this, giving advice or working with the Secretary?

MACARTHUR: Well, only basically in the Secretary's morning meetings with the people that I mentioned who were generally there, the head of the planning staff, Bob Bowie, whom you ought to see, Livy Merchant, Herman Phleger, the legal advisor, the Near Eastern fellow, whom I think--I don't remember if he was Hank Byroade then or not.

Q: Was it Lloyd Henderson?

MACARTHUR: No.

Q: He was administration.

MACARTHUR: Under Secretary, Deputy Under for Administration, although he was frequently there because he was one of our greatest things. But I had no particular special role. The Secretary had warned the British very clearly that when we got word from intelligence that they were getting ready with the French to do something with the Israelis, that if this happened, there would be opposition on the part of the United States, and indeed there was. We opposed that business, and I think that increased or may have been the principal part of the antipathy that was manifested by Mr. Eden toward Mr. Dulles.

Q: Looking at the Suez Crisis, you were there when the information was coming from the State Department. Were there varying views within his small council that used to meet about what we should do about this?

MACARTHUR: No. I don't remember anybody supporting the idea that we should sit back and simply accept a military intervention by the British and the French and the Israelis into Egypt. I can't remember if it was the President or the Secretary, because these matters were, of course, discussed with him, but one or the other of them said, "You can't have one law

for the Medes and one for the Persians. We can't say that we are opposed to overt aggression across recognized international boundaries on the one hand, when it's people we don't like, or injuring our interest, but on the other hand say that it's fine and quite the thing to do and quite all right if it's your friends who do it." If people are going to resort to the use of force to settle issues, then we're in a hell of a fix. And that was generally the position, I think, that was taken.

The Israeli lobby, of course, did not have nearly the power that it has now on Capitol Hill. It wasn't organized to the extent it is now, didn't have the money, and couldn't produce the votes that it can now to intimidate congressmen and senators, particularly when election-time nears. And I don't recall any divergence on this. I just don't remember whether the European bureau was a little bit unhappy about it or not because, of course, Britain and France were both clients, in the sense that the European bureau supervises our relationships with them. But to my knowledge, Livy Merchant was not opposed to it at all, and I think there was a general consensus in the small group that we couldn't, as one of the top people said, say that aggression is fine when your friends do it--that is, the use of military force across recognized international boundaries in the absence of provocation. And, of course, to the British, it was a way of keeping open the canal; to Israel, it was a way of dealing a major blow to the strongest Arab country, Egypt; and to the French, it was an indication that they were also going to hang on. They joined because they weren't going to give up their colonies very easily either.

Q: The other crisis that came almost at the same time was with the Hungarian revolt. We had been making noises. Secretary Dulles was talking about rolling back Eastern Europe at one time, liberating Eastern Europe. Here was a case where this might happen. But how did we face this at that time within the councils, where you were?

MACARTHUR: Well, Mr. Dulles had one weakness or strength--depends on how you look at it--from a media point of view. He loved to coin phrases that would make headlines. I remember when the French vetoed the idea of the EDC, the European Defense Community, which was a way of trying to bring Germany into some collective form of security agreement with West Germany, Mr. Dulles talked about an "agonizing reappraisal." And then there was another famous word that he used, which became commonplace.

Q: Brinkmanship, maybe?

MACARTHUR: Brinkmanship. He said, "We will go right to the brink." And "rolling back the curtain" was another one of those phrases. But as a practical matter, all that would have happened--I mean, there weren't the material or physical resources, and if we had tried to use force to counter that business, we would have been in a war with the Soviet Union, when we would have been, by that time, in a not-too-advantageous position, because they had overwhelming superiority in conventional forces then. And by that time, they also had nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them on this country. We could not have thrown them out of Hungary by the use of conventional forces; we would have gotten our backsides kicked hard if we had even tried it. So it was fine to talk about these things, and it

was certainly a tragedy, but there it is.

We faced another tragedy when I was in B(inaudible), Austria. I sat there and watched the Russian troops roll in and crush the Prague Spring in '68. There are situations where unless you are perfectly willing to risk global thermonuclear war and self-destruction, even though you can destroy the other guy, too, in the process, destruction of the world, if you will, where the material military capabilities of the present era in which we live make it not a rational decision nor a feasible decision.

Q: Was there any push, maybe, to move, to do something within the councils of the Secretary? Or were those of you who were advising the Secretary well aware of what the situation was?

MACARTHUR: We were all aware, I think, including the Secretary, and particularly the President, who was a former military man, about the military capabilities we could marshal. Another side of this is who would have gone along with us if we had had such a thing? Do you think the British and the French, given the disparity of forces, would have been prepared to join with us? What could we do alone? Nothing.

Q: I'm not sure which came first, but already they were committed in the Suez area with what little they had.

MACARTHUR: Yes, that was a very feeble attempt. What they allocated to it and the way they set it up was totally--it was not a very sound operation.

Q: Mr. Ambassador, before ending this interview--and then we'll pick up Japan next time--I wonder if you could discuss briefly a little of the role of Walter Robertson in the East Asian bureau. I've heard he was a very strong person. With what you were able to see, how important was he?

MACARTHUR: Well, Walter was one of what you might call the China Lobby, a strong supporter of Chiang Kai-shek, a very strong adversary of Chinese Communist control of the Chinese mainland. I liked Walter personally very much, and I've traveled a lot with him. I got mixed up in trips with him and the Secretary to Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, in the early days of the Eisenhower Administration, and I was mixed up in the business when the French asked us to use our naval air force to bomb around Dien Bien Phu to relieve the pressures, which President Eisenhower wisely refused. I remember very well in that connection he said at a very small breakfast meeting of about six or eight of us, "Never as long as I'm President will we get involved in a land war in Vietnam." And he said, "If we go in with bombers and do a strike around Dien Bien Phu, they'll simply pull back into the jungle and we won't be able to do any material damage, but we will have committed America's prestige to that war. And then we have one of two choices: to withdraw with our tails between our legs because the aerial strike really didn't accomplish anything, or go in with land forces." And he said, "I will not ever go in with land forces into Indochina." And he was 200% right and saw the picture very clearly. Unfortunately, his successor, President Kennedy, had no military or strategic experience comparable in any way, except as

commander of a small torpedo boat, whom I liked also and had known since he was a junior at Harvard, when he visited me when I was a third secretary in Paris. I liked him personally, but his most fatal error has been made in recent presidencies, is his error in committing 16,000 combat troops to Vietnam and get us started down that path. He's the fellow that started us down the Vietnam path.

But I saw Walter. I have one comment. The general feeling was that Walter accepted the Secretary's decision. He might argue his point.

Q: On supporting Dien Bien Phu.

MACARTHUR: But he accepted the Secretary's decision, but many people felt that Walter had been brought in to sort of nullify the right wing, the China Lobby wing, as it used to be called, of the Republican Party.

Q: This was led by Senator Knowland of California.

MACARTHUR: Yes, that's right. And that Walter Robertson, as long as you had somebody that was strongly of their persuasion, in viewing the general picture in there as Assistant Secretary of State, that the administration would not stray too far off line. In other words, some people felt--and I'm not saying that there's any truth in it--that Walter had been selected for this job precisely because he came from that group that felt very strongly about it.

Q: This is not unique in the government.

MACARTHUR: No, we do that. Frequently we pick somebody from a group that feels that way to sort of balance off the business and nullify criticisms or to reduce criticisms from a particular interest group, a special interest group.

Q: Did you find that Secretary Dulles treated Robertson in a somewhat different manner than he would, say, with Livingston Merchant, who was in charge of European affairs?

MACARTHUR: I don't think he treated him differently. I think he was much closer to Livy. Livy was a unique person. He was a very engaging man with a tremendous intellect and a great sense of humor and a great human being. He was one of the finest, nicest men I've ever known anywhere in my life. Walter was also a very decent, very gentlemanly, very nice, fine guy, and I don't think that the President or the Secretary treated them any differently. I think Walter respected the Secretary, and if he argued a point that went against him, he respected the reasoning that the Secretary gave for the particular position he took. He never publicly, to my knowledge, ever opposed any of the Secretary's positions on the Far East, China, Formosa, and so forth and so on. Of course, at that time, we were much concerned about the future of Taiwan--I called it Formosa--because we are the only power that is basically a huge Atlantic power and, at the same time, a Pacific power. The Soviet Union is a Pacific power, but it doesn't front directly on the Atlantic, except way up in the Arctic Circle. And in the Pacific, strategically, our position is basically based on

naval and air position there, with Japan anchoring the northern end of our position and the Philippines, the southern end. And in between sits the island of Formosa--Taiwan. If Taiwan ever fell into unfriendly hands, then there would be the capacity of those unfriendly hands to interdict communication between the north and the south, our positions based on our bases in the Philippines and in Japan, and we would, in effect, have to have two Seventh Fleets. We would have to double our strength, and it would be an intolerable position. If you could operate submarines and air force off Taiwan, it would make our position intolerable.

So I think there were no differences on the strategic importance of Taiwan and so forth, but I think there was a great deal of realism at the chances of Chiang Kai-shek going back to the mainland were zero. Now, a lot of people wanted him to. Senator Knowland and other people kept beating the drums on that, but for any realist, with what?

So I think that Walter did a good job and was supportive of the Secretary, although he was much more a one-China-under-Chiang-Kai-shek fan than anybody else.

Continuation of interview, March 3, 1988.

Q: Mr. Ambassador, we have now reached the point where I've been calling you Mr. Ambassador, but for the first time you actually were appointed to an ambassadorship and to a very major post, Japan. You were as Europeanist as anyone could be. Your entire career overseas was in Western Europe, and although you had worldwide responsibilities as Counselor of the State Department, yet Japan seemed to be out of your field. How did that appointment come about?

MACARTHUR: It came about because during the period that I was Counselor, I spent a great deal of time traveling with the Secretary of State, usually, but not always, in the Middle East, in Southeast Asia, in Japan. And indeed, I was named and designated the negotiator for the SEATO Treaty, which was an abortive operation, although the treaty was signed, which tried to bring together the free nations of Southeast Asia into a relationship where they could work together to prevent an expansion of Communist power, which was taking place on the mainland through the Viet Minh operations after the Chinese Communist Party had seized the mainland.

The Viet Minh, the insurgent Communist-supported rebels in then French Indochina were expanding rapidly. Laos and Cambodia were threatened, as indeed was Thailand. So I spent a considerable amount of time in Southeast Asia. And since, in the whole Asian rim of the Pacific Basin, Japan obviously was on its way back to being a very important power and perhaps by far the most important industrial power, because in those days, there were no NICs. The NICs hadn't emerged--the newly industrialized countries like Taiwan and South Korea and Singapore and the like.

Q: The date when you went to Japan was when?

MACARTHUR: I was sworn in as Ambassador to Japan in December of 1956, around Christmastime, and I went to Japan in 1957. I'd been back in the Department working as Counselor, in the Counselor's seat after President Eisenhower took office in January of '53. I was coordinator of all Mr. Dulles' trips to South Asia, Southeast Asia, Middle East, and the like.

So although my practical experience as a diplomat, until I became Counselor, had been Western Europe, with an initial post in Canada, the next few years as Counselor, almost four years, I had to wrestle and coordinate plans and policies with the Geographic Assistant Secretary of State and the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs in many parts of the world. Of course, not the least bit was the fact that I was Coordinator of Plans and Policy for all our meetings with the Russians during that period when I was Counselor, including the Geneva Summit in '55 and the various foreign ministers' conferences.

So I did have an exposure to Japan and the Far East. That exposure, before I became Counselor, was enhanced by the two years I spent as General Eisenhower's political advisor at SHAPE, because General Eisenhower realized better than most people that in a period of decolonization, which was creating great problems for our NATO Allies, that what happened in every part of the world was of critical importance to them that could affect the resources they had available or could use in support of NATO and its objectives, while at the same time trying to protect their interests in widespread areas of the world in which they had colonies. In fact, I recall--and I think I mentioned it in an earlier interview--that in one of my daily morning briefings alone with General Eisenhower at SHAPE, he asked me when the last time an American Secretary of State had visited the Middle East, and I said no Secretary of State had ever visited the Middle East or South Asia. And he so organized life with Mr. Dulles, his Secretary of State when he became President, and I was present when he gave the instructions that Mr. Dulles was first to visit the NATO countries, and then he was to visit Southeast Asia.

Now, the final part of the decision was that in terms of American strategy--I'm using the word "strategy" in its broadest terms--it had become evident by 1956-57 that Japan was not only re-emerging as an important nation, but that with Communist expansion rife everywhere and with the developments on mainline China with the Communists taking power there, that American basic defensive strategy must be based on a tripod concept. The tripod, North America--that's Canada and the U.S., NATO, Europe, and Japan, where we had bases, and where we had a relationship, a special relationship as a result of the period of our occupation and then the 1951 treaty negotiated by Mr. Dulles, that was the so-called peace treaty. I'll come to that a bit later.

So after four years as Counselor, I think--and I've always felt--that four years is enough for any person in a senior advisory position to hold such a position in the Department of State, or for that matter in other agencies and departments. Why? Because after four years, you become so much of a part of every past decision of the past four years that you're sort of in your subconscious wedded to those positions. And we live in a changing world where you have to look at things slightly differently. I think it's much harder for somebody that has

been a part of a series of successive decisions over a period of years to take a new look at the nature of the problems that we face, an entirely new look with a different perspective, than it is for somebody who has participated and been active in making those decisions. It's just more difficult.

So in late '56, I saw the President and the Secretary, and said that I felt it was time for me to get out of the Department, back into the field in an operational capacity, and have a new person in the Counselor's job with perhaps a slightly different perspective. The suggestion was then made about three weeks later by the President and Mr. Dulles that I go to Japan, which obviously was coming along very rapidly.

Q: Had you expressed any preference at the time?

MACARTHUR: No, I just said I wanted to go out. Japan came as a sort of surprise to me. I thought they might send me someplace in Europe in view of my NATO background. But the President and the Secretary felt that Japan was moving very, very rapidly toward an increasingly important position, and as it became increasingly important as a nation, it would become increasingly assertive, and with the experience I'd had in various parts of the world and some understanding of the importance of Japan and our broad strategic thinking, as well as the nature of the feelings of the other countries on the Asian rim about Japan because of the Japanese militarist expansionist policies, which were called the Greater Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere before Pearl Harbor, that although I'd never served in Japan, I could fill that role. So I went there. But that is how it happened.

Q: What were your marching orders when you went there? I'd like to know two things. One, what were your marching orders? Secondly, what were your internal ideas of what you wanted to do? First let's go to your official instructions.

MACARTHUR: I knew a little bit about Japan--very little. I didn't speak the language, although I took three hours a day for about three months before I went there, which helped only modestly. And indeed, I took lessons after I got there. But I first visited Japan in 1921 with my father, who was in the Navy. He was in the Navy, a captain in the Navy, and when the Secretary of the United States Navy and the Annapolis class of 1881 were invited to Japan as official guests of the Japanese Imperial Navy, which sounds very strange in light of Pearl Harbor, my father was selected to command the warship that took the Secretary of the Navy abroad. The Secretary had a son of about my age, and so being a good politician, he didn't want to be accused of taking his boy along all by himself for the ride, so he said, "Captain MacArthur, you have two boys that are friends of my son. Let's take all three boys along together, and nobody will say anything." So we went.

My first contact with Japan was the night that it was so arranged that we would arrive on July Fourth in Yokohama, our national Independence Day, for a very warm welcome from the Japanese. In July, when you're doing the Great Circle Route into Japan, it gets light very early, and I woke up at about 4:00 o'clock in the morning. Dawn was breaking, and I asked permission to go to the bridge, and I went to the bridge after permission was given. The Marine at the foot of the bridge got permission. My father said I could take a seat on

the wing, that slot that runs along that the officer of the watch or the skipper sits on, and there I saw, as I looked from one side to the other, on each side there were two small, low, twin-funneled destroyers coasting along beside us as an escort, flying the Imperial Japanese Navy flag. That's the one with the stripes coming out from the rising sun.

I looked at these destroyers, and after a few minutes, when my father was not engaged, I said to him, "Isn't it too bad that the Japanese are so behind the times that they have these destroyers with only two funnels, whereas we have those marvelous ones with all four funnels?"

And my father looked at me and said, "Sonny, never underestimate the Japanese." He said, "They're about eight years ahead of us." He said, "We're still trying to get four boilers to go off on two funnels properly and with a low silhouette such as they have, so just never underestimate these people." And I never forgot that, because it was so true, how many people underestimated Japan before and during the war.

Q: And even after the war.

MACARTHUR: And after the war. I'd like to say, if I may, just a word about Japan before we get into the details of what I did while I was there.

Q: Certainly.

MACARTHUR: Japan is a unique country in one sense. There is no other country like it. It is the only nation that has never been subjected to the leavening and melding influence of other societies, civilizations, and points of view, which have come about either through massive waves of migration or by conquest. The Japanese have sat in their islands from the beginning of time, never having been conquered or invaded. Indeed, according to legend, they have been there since the Sun Goddess came down and gave birth to the first Japanese. The word "kamikaze" that was used for suicide airplanes in the last war goes back to the 13th Century, when the Chinese, under Kubla Khan, tried twice to invade Japan in 1274 and 1281. And each time the Chinese were successful in landing their armies on the beach, but then Japan was saved by the kamikazes, "the divine breeze," which was a typhoon, which came along and broke up the Chinese ships, and the samurai's polished off the men left on the beach with their two swords and that indomitable spirit that the Japanese fighting man has always shown.

So their civilization grew up in very much a unique way. They're an inward-looking people. There is a togetherness and a Japaneseness about them that they feel toward each other and their people, with other people being foreigners. And this is a direct result of the history of the nation, as I say, unlike any other country in the world, any other nation in the world, never exposed to other cultures, civilizations, ways of looking at things, and so forth. They've developed their own unique and in many respects, very, very, very high-grade and beautiful civilization.

I would say, among other things, that in all the countries I've known and visited and served

in, I've never known a people with a greater appreciation of duty. This is one of the characteristics that the Japanese have, and you notice it in everything from the way the food is served, the presentation of the food when you're in a Japanese restaurant is as important, the beauty of that presentation, as the cook who prepared it and the preparation of the food.

It's produced, as I say, a remarkable people that have their own very special way of looking at the rest of the world, at themselves. I think this is changing. It is changing, as Japan has become more exposed through the fact that it has come from a defeated, wrecked, destroyed country to become an economic and financial superpower, with its young people going through one of the finest educational systems--I wish ours was half as good--that is imaginable, and many, many, many of the young people being sent abroad to learn and study in foreign universities, so that they understand the outside world, and also that they acquire almost a bilingual ability to express themselves in other languages. They are an extraordinary people. I mention all this because it has a background on the years I spent in Japan.

When I went there in February, I arrived on February 3, 1957, I arranged to fly from Washington to Honolulu by American carrier, and then I thought that because of all that had happened during the war and so forth, that it would be a useful thing to arrive in a Japanese carrier, showing confidence in Japan and what it had accomplished. So I took a JAL, Japanese Airline flight from Tokyo to Haneda. In those days, that was long before they had the volume of air travel that is there now and which obliged them to build that huge new airport at Narita, almost an hour outside Tokyo. Haneda was right on the edge of Yokohama in those days. This gesture was very much appreciated, and in my opening statement, as my arrival statement, which was a very short statement, I said that I had come to listen and learn more about Japan, which I'd visited only once as a boy, and not to preach to them or tell them what to do. In effect, that was the thrust of the statement I made.

So I got off to a fairly good start with the Japanese, but I was immediately apprized, after I'd been there a few weeks, that the United States had over 8,000 basic research contracts being conducted by young Japanese, Japanese who had doctorates or master's degrees in the sciences, and that roughly half of these were basic research contracts financed by the Pentagon. This came as quite a blow to me--a shock. I would say not a blow, but a shock. So I inquired why, and the answer was a very simple one. The majority of bright young Americans seemed to think the quick way to the top and the money, the dough, was by going down the law school route or by going to a business school, like a Harvard Business School, or going into medicine, and we had very, very few coming out with higher degrees in the sciences, mathematics and the sciences. And we had so few that we had to put them basically on development of improvement of existing things, whereas the big and flashing experience is when you make a breakthrough in basic research. That's where the big glue comes. So I started visiting some of these Japanese plants, and I went to the Sony plant, founded by my friends Mr. Morita and Mr. Ibuka in about 1947 or '48. They then employed something over 700 people. I was amazed to find out that 20% of their human resources and 20% of their financial resources were going into basic research, and the motto of Sony was, "Research makes the difference."

Then I flew down to Nagoya to visit the Toyota passenger car line, and when I went there in '57, Toyota was the only Japanese automobile company turning out passenger cars. In the immediate post-war period when Nissan and Toyota were building motor vehicles, they were building four-wheelers, usually, but they were van-type things which in the period of reconstruction were all-purpose vehicles for families or whoever had them. You could do anything with them. You could use them for any purpose, and that was the purpose they needed, for reconstruction and rebuilding. And Toyota was turning out 20,000 cars a year. I visited the line, and they were, indeed, very kind, and they were most appreciative. They said that Mr. Ford had invited them to come to America before they built the line, that Mr. Ford had not only permitted them to take pictures, but to make diagrams of the Ford assembly line in Dearborn, I guess it is, and that they had come back. But then they said, with some pride, "We have eliminated two full stations on the line, and we're eliminating the third."

And I said, "Well, how did you do that?"

And they said, "Well, we discovered that Mr. Ford, in putting together automobiles, they sometimes have three or four parts, you have to put two together and then the third you screw on and you put the fourth. We found that we could design a part which encompassed all four parts, and you just eliminated the labor of putting these pieces together, and you had a stronger part which functioned better and had less chance of problems later."

Q: Mr. Ambassador, before you get more into the economics of Japan, could we talk a little about when you were sent out? Did you have any instructions?

MACARTHUR: I had no instructions at all, other than that Japan was on the comeback trail, it would again resume a place as an important nation in the world, and particularly in what we referred to as the Far East--one of my successors or predecessors referred to as the "Near West"--and that my job was to strengthen the ties of understanding and friendship between our two countries. And that is why I took a Japanese plane in as a practical example of what I might do and to let the Japanese people know from the beginning that I had confidence in them and in what they were doing, and that is why, also, I designed my arrival statement to say that I had come to listen and learn, and not to tell them what to do.

Q: On this economic side that you were mentioning, at the time you came out there . . .

MACARTHUR: The only problem we had at the time I came out there was the beginning of the problem of textiles. This was before the NICs--Korea, Singapore, and so forth had reached the capacity that Japan did. One of the things that I did while I was there was to negotiate a so-called voluntary quota for Japanese textiles. It was about as voluntary as your doing something if you've got a pistol pointed at your head, economically, because Japan depended even then, not to the extent that it did now, but it depended on access to the American market.

Japan's balance of payments on trade and commerce were just under a billion dollars in

deficit. That billion dollars in deficit was made up for by American military spending on the troops and forces and supplies and things that we procured in Japan for our forces in Japan, our naval base and the air base and so forth. We still had a few thousand troops there. So their balance of payments, overall, was in equilibrium, but the export market was very important to them, and they were obviously targeting it.

Now, I want to make just one point about that. The Japanese honored that agreement, and what happened, Hong Kong immediately stepped up its textile industries and started shipping more than they had been than the total Japanese shipment, and we accepted that from Hong Kong but not from Japan. And why was that? That was simply because we didn't want to offend the British, who said they would be very, very offended if we put voluntary quotas on Hong Kong. So we accommodated the British, we didn't help our textile people with the voluntary protective quotas one damn bit, because it was immediately filled by Hong Kong, and then as Korea came along, by Korea. So the Japanese said, with some reason, "We reduced our shipments and accepted a quota, but you immediately let it be filled by other people. What good does that do you, and why should we be penalized?" It was one of the injustices that Americans sometimes don't understand unless they've been a part of one of these so-called voluntary quota negotiations.

Q: Did this happen while you were in Japan?

MACARTHUR: This happened while I was in Japan.

Q: Did the embassy--you, as ambassador--try to protest?

MACARTHUR: Well, you don't protest, but you report their protests and say it obviously is not an equitable thing to do, but that had no effect on Washington, which felt that its special relationships with Britain, born during the war or drawn ever closer by World War II and in NATO and one thing and another, we were not going to offend the British. I mean, back here--I've been ambassador in many places, and they said, "Well, that's fine. We understand the point you're making, but we've got other considerations that we consider important." And very frequently they're right, because if you're an ambassador stationed abroad, you can't also understand always some of the domestic political implications of things that are not necessarily the best foreign policy in the world, but you have to face up to political realities of who controls the Congress and what they can do, and the extent to which you must cooperate with the Congress if our system of government, the Executive Branch, that is, is to function successfully.

Q: Looking at it from today's point of view, but at the time was the idea of opening up Japan to American goods very high on our agenda, or was it not really considered a very important item?

MACARTHUR: I'm delighted that you asked that question, because it brings out the reason for the tremendous adverse imbalance in our trade. When the war ended, our two great potential industrial competitors, Western Europe and Japan, had had their industries bombed out, burned out, used up by the war, and exhausted. We had no competition

roughly for 15 years. We had no competition. You could sell any American product almost that we turned out if the money was available. We could sell anything if the people had the money to buy it. And when you have no competition, the first thing that suffers is quality of product. When you have no competition, there's no incentive for quality; there's no incentive for better industrial designing which will make your product cheaper and better.

Let me emphasize this by a personal story. After I left Japan in '61 and was appointed to Belgium as ambassador, I decided that I wanted to take a medium-size American car, a personal automobile, to Belgium that I could use weekends or for personal use when the official car should not be used. So I called up a friend, who was the vice president international, one of the two greatest American manufacturers, got him on the telephone, and explained what I wanted, and asked what they had. He said, "I'll call you back in about half an hour."

He called me back in 40 minutes. I'd worked with him before and helped his company a bit here and there. He said, "Doug, we've got just exactly the car that you want. Of course, you'll get the usual 10% Foreign Service discount, and we'll ship it whenever you want." And he said, "Best of all, it's a Wednesday car."

I said, "Joe, what the heck is a Wednesday car?"

"Well," he said, "you know, a lot of our people don't show up on Friday on the production lines. They want a longer weekend, and sometimes a lot don't show up on Mondays because they want to extend their weekend or they've celebrated too much. So we have to put people on the production lines on Friday and Monday that don't do the job every day." So he said, "All our people in the company get Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday cars, but the top executives get Wednesday cars, because that's the time when you will get a car with the maximum chance of it being put together properly in every respect." So much for quality. And it was quality which, as much as anything else, started us down the slippery slope.

In textiles, we had already become or were rapidly becoming not very competitive with quality textiles because of the higher wages in this country as contrasted with Japan and Hong Kong and, subsequently, Korea and Taiwan. But I make the point that the period when we had no competition was to a very, very considerable extent responsible for the falling-off quality in American products and the emergence of foreign products which people bought, not because they were foreign, but because they were of better quality and they lasted better.

Now, I do not want in any sense to excuse the Japanese for their protectionist policies of that period, because they had protectionist policies, too. We could sell stuff for a period of time in Japan, but take automobiles, which they targeted for eventual export. And when I was in Japan, as I say, there were only 20,000 passenger cars a year being turned out. Honda turned out only motorcycles. Nissan turned out a small open sports car with a collapsible top, two-passenger car. Those are the only passenger cars that were being turned out when I arrived in Japan--20,000 Toyotas and that was it. But they targeted; they

had automobile markets targeted.

I had a very serious argument with Mr. Ikeda when he succeeded Mr. Kishi as prime minister on the very subject of automotive imports, because I suddenly discovered that members of the American Chamber of Commerce in Japan, of which I was a member, could not import an American car unless they had owned that car for 30 months before they imported it, and these were businessmen who lived in Japan. How could they have owned abroad a car for 30 months before they imported it? So I went to him and said, "Mr. Ikeda, it's as simple as this. Either you remove that provision of the 30 months and so forth, or I will recommend in the strongest fashion possible that we put quotas and take retaliatory steps on some of your products that are important to your exports to the United States." And that particular provision was removed. This was several months before I left Japan.

Q: But this was, of course, for the personal car of Americans there.

MACARTHUR: It was any Japanese; it was the same thing. A Japanese had to own it; it wasn't just American. It was a rule: foreign cars cannot be imported unless they've been owned for 30 months.

Q: Were we getting any other pressure from American businessmen and from the Treasury and Department of Commerce and elsewhere?

MACARTHUR: Not in the early period that I was there, because the Japanese competition, there were some things. Sony was doing extremely well at that time. I remember the General Electric senior vice president came out there, and when I told him that Sony was devoting 20% of their resources, human and financial, to research and development, and they were coming out with some very, very interesting new things, he was astonished. He said, "My God, of course, we have a much larger budget, but it's less than 1% that we devote to research and the kind that you're talking about with Sony." But the big push had not come. The big push in automobiles and textiles, we'd solved it by the voluntary quotas, which the Japanese observed, but as I recall now--it was a good many years ago--but that was the only one where there were strong pressures from America. There was no question about other Japanese products that were coming in--just textiles.

Q: I'm skipping around a bit, but moving from the economics to internal workings, how did you find our embassy at the time? You had been in the Foreign Service a long time, but this was your first time being charged with an embassy. How did you find it as an operation, an effective or non-effective operation?

MACARTHUR: I found that we had some extremely capable and good people. I found it an excellent embassy. I had been chargé d'affaires for a while in Belgium, in '49, during Admiral Kirk's incumbency as ambassador when he was away, even though I was ill, and I had served in another big embassy in Paris as head of the political section, so I was somewhat familiar with embassy operations. But I found that we had excellent people, first-class people. I found the younger officers who had gone through language training extremely able and contributive to general thinking. Then I had the very good luck, as

attrition took place, as it does when an assignment is up and they go, to be able to get very good people to replace the people that had left.

When I came there, Ben Thibodeaux was Minister for Economic Affairs, and when he left for another assignment, I got Phil Trezise, who is still down here with Brookings Institute, an absolutely first-class economic minister and person, with political as well as economic sense and judgment. I got Bill Leonhart from the policy planning staff as my DCM.

Q: For the record, how did this work? Did you say, "I want so and so?" Did you give names of people?

MACARTHUR: I recommended them. Bill had served in Japan, he helped work with me and talked with me when he was on the policy planning staff on my initial assignment there, which I mentioned earlier. He is a man of remarkable judgment, and he is still a member of one of the senior government intelligence boards here in Washington. He's a man of admirable intelligence and judgment, which is what you want as much as anything else, in addition to his knowledge and other skills. I would recommend them, and when somebody's time was coming up, you don't wait until the replacement is done. If it's somebody's time coming up and you've got what you think is an important mission, you let the Department know, unofficially, if you will. You let the assistant secretary of the geographic division know the guy that you think is most qualified. That's the way it should work. It shouldn't work with some cabal of people who are 1,000 miles away in personnel doing it; it ought to come from people that know something about the man's qualifications in the post that he goes. I'm all against the idea of having a personnel section that looks at a computer or numbers and picks people out for key positions. Further down the line, as you move along, that's one thing.

The world has become too complex, and international problems are too complicated now to think that one man, an ambassador, can mastermind everything. Every ambassador, like every President, needs the best and most capable advisors that he can get, because an ambassador, some of his time, like a President's time, is taken up in time-consuming protocol things that cannot be avoided. There are many things that he must do, and no single person has the wisdom or ability to know everything about everything. You've got the economic side, you've got the strategic side, you've got the domestic political side, you have the domestic political side on our side of the water as well as theirs. You have all these factors that have to fit in and be fitted in together when you make a recommendation to the Department on a given subject, on a serious subject, and you need the best you can get for that.

Q: Did you find that we were developing a solid and large enough corps of Japanese experts as officers?

MACARTHUR: I can't really answer that question. Certainly you can't take an officer and chain him to Japan for his whole life. I mean, that isn't what the Foreign Service is all about; you won't get the experience. We went through the business of old China hands, and we went through the business of old Middle Eastern hands, who couldn't see anything. We

went through the business of old European hands, who didn't understand a thing about the inevitability of decolonization and the like. So we were certainly turning out capable young officers, they were extremely good, and they made a very valuable contribution.

We also had several Japanese nationals who were extraordinary. One of them was Kishiyama, who was my interpreter. He had grown up in this country, gone to school in this country, although he was of Japanese origin and Japanese nationality. He spoke flawless American. He had a memory like a tape recorder in translating, but also he translated the spirit of what you were saying, even sometimes the facial gestures and things. He was an extraordinary man. After he retired, guess who snapped him up very swiftly? Mr. Morita of Sony.

Q: Looking at the other side, who did you deal with in Japan, and how would you describe the Japanese Government and its structure and personalities at that time?

MACARTHUR: I would like to, if I may, get into the negotiation of the Japanese treaty, which brings out those very points of your question.

Q: Excellent.

MACARTHUR: And I think it brings them out more tellingly than just a descriptive business.

Q: Yes.

MACARTHUR: After I'd been in Japan six or eight months, I was able to develop a rather warm and friendly relationship with the Prime Minister, Mr. Kishi, and also with some of the senior people in the foreign ministry. The foreign ministry was staffed by some very able people. They were entirely Japanese, but they were also understanding to an extent that was not true with the other ministries, particular MITI, Ministry of International Trade and Industry, which often tried to block the recommendations of the Japanese foreign ministry to be more liberal and open in the acceptance of foreign products.

I don't exactly remember when, but late in '57, Mr. Kishi asked to see me privately, and I think there were only two other people present on his side, and I went with--I can't remember. I had a couple of people on my side. I think one was the interpreter. Mr. Kishi said that he thought the time--it came as quite a surprise to me--had come to renegotiate the U.S.-Japan treaty of 1951. The U.S.-Japan treaty of 1951 was negotiated by John Foster Dulles, and Mr. Yoshida, Prime Minister Yoshida, an extraordinary gentleman who was five times Prime Minister of Japan, a man who spoke flawless English, he'd been ambassador to a couple of countries, a man of courage, a man of great ability. That treaty was negotiated in '50-'51, when Japan was still under occupation. That treaty was the price for the restoration of sovereignty. Until that peace treaty was signed, Japan's sovereignty could not be restored and the occupation ended.

The treaty was, in a sense, one-sided in favor of the United States, because it had to be, for

this reason. At the time that treaty was negotiated, Japan did not have one single man under arms, and we took on the heavy obligation of assuring the defense of Japan. When you take on an obligation with a country that doesn't have a single soldier, sailor, or airman, you've got to be able to deploy your troops and forces to meet possible threats if a contingency arises for which the commitment is made. So we were, in a sense, able to do whatever we wanted in terms of moving forces here, there, or anyplace, without consultation. We had a status-of-forces agreement regarding the status of our forces that enabled us to do whatever we wanted, insofar as they were concerned; the Japanese had no voice in it. Generally speaking, the treaty was not in keeping with our other treaties, because it had been negotiated under entirely different circumstances, our other treaties of alliance.

Mr. Kishi pointed out that since that treaty had been negotiated, with the Korean War, Japan had developed its own self-defense forces--Army, Navy, Air Force. They were small, but they would be increased and assume greater responsibilities, and that at the same time, we had treaties, we had negotiated the SEATO Treaty, the NATO Treaty, had a treaty with Korea, that were based on equality, whereas Japan, which now had its armed forces, still needed and absolutely had to have the protective umbrella of American military power, but Japan was being treated as a very second-rate citizen. This did not worry Mr. Kishi at that particular time, because our relationships were good and we had a close personal relationship, but he said, "You have only to listen to the broadcasts in Japanese from Peking and Moscow now that there is a great effort being made by the Communist world and by the Japanese Left to upset this treaty." And he said, "If the treaty ever becomes an issue of Japanese sovereignty, and the question of whether Japan is being treated on a basis of equality, it will be much easier for these people to get demonstrations going in the streets, and it will be much easier for them, if a majority of the Japanese so decide, to make your bases useless simply by cutting the communications that you have to get in and out of your bases--rail, road, all the rest that they can divide. So now, when relationships are extremely good, is the time to renegotiate this treaty and put it on the same basis of equality as your other treaties, so that it is not attackable by the left, that above all wants to see Japan first neutralized and then dominated by the Communist world, our two great Communist neighbors," because they're neighbors of both China and Russia. "And the great potential of Japanese industry used to their advantage."

Q: I just want to make one thing clear. The initiative came completely from the Japanese?

MACARTHUR: It came from the Japanese side.

Q: Had this subject even been raised when you left Washington, about renegotiating the treaty at some point?

MACARTHUR: Never. They'd never raised it with (Inaudible).

Q: And in Washington?

MACARTHUR: No, it had not been raised before. Our relationships with Japan were on a stable, even keel, and there it was. Kishi was looking ahead.

So I said I would reflect on this and we would meet again in a week or so. I thought back to a comment that President Eisenhower had once made to me when I was his political advisor at SHAPE and briefing him one morning, and we were discussing a treaty. He said to me, "I don't care how important a treaty is or how important the occasion on which it's signed is, or how important the personality of who signs it is. Once one party to a treaty feels that that treaty is not only not serving its own self-interest, but is against its own self-interest, then that treaty is unenforceable if we're a party to it, unless we're willing to land the Marines."

And I thought about this, and I thought about the future, and I thought about Japan's rapidly emerging status as a very important nation, so I went back and had a further talk with Mr. Kishi, and I said one thing, and I'll tell it to you now. He had said to me, "Of course, any treaty we have with you will have to recognize Article IX of the Japanese Constitution." This is the no-war article in the Japanese Constitution that was put in largely by American insistence in the aftermath of the war, only to be regretted in the Korean War, when Japan was encouraged to raise its own self-defense forces on the basis of the U.N. Charter, which gives every country the inalienable right of individual and collective self-defense.

So I said that I would recommend this to the President, but that in other respects, I would have to see him. I didn't know what his view on this would be, and I would have to consult in Washington. I sent an eyes-only telegram to the President and Secretary, laying out the whole thing and the reasoning, and why I felt that this was the time, when relations were so stable and good, to go ahead with the renegotiation on the basis that we'd have to recognize Article IX, but that it should be consistent, and that with our other engagements, we couldn't make it a special thing with a whole bunch of special things for Japan only, when we had allies in Asia, as well as in Europe.

Then I got word to return to Washington, so I returned and talked to the Secretary and the President.

Q: I assume this was kept very much under wraps between you and Kishi.

MACARTHUR: As I said, eyes-only for the President.

Q: Nothing was coming out of the Japanese side about this thinking either?

MACARTHUR: No, not at that time, because I told them that I couldn't in any way, shape, or form say whether Washington would go along with it. I'd be willing to recommend it; that was as far as I could go.

Q: The Japanese wasn't mounting any campaign.

MACARTHUR: Oh, sure, there was the constant campaign of the left, but it was under control. It was propaganda; it was not an issue. There was nothing that was an issue. The issue only came up after the treaty was negotiated.

Q: I'm sorry to have interrupted. You went back to Washington.

MACARTHUR: We're talking about two years before the demonstrations. So I got back to Washington and got word that the Secretary wanted to see me, and then we'd go over together to the White House to talk about it. I tell this as an amusing episode of the treaty. I knew the Secretary extremely well. I'd traveled many hundreds of thousands of miles with him all over the world, I'd organized trips for him, I'd been Coordinator of Plans and Policies for him, I'd done a lot of things. When I walked into his office that morning, when we were to see the President the day after I got back, he looked at me, and he said to me, his first words were, "Doug, what's wrong with that treaty I negotiated?"

And I said, "Well, Mr. Secretary, you're a great lawyer from Sullivan & Cromwell, and you got 90% for your client, and it won't stand up over a bit of time, I fear."

Then we went over to see the President, and the President saw the point immediately and virtually repeated this business, "Well, if once ever a country feels that a treaty is working to its disadvantage, it's inoperable unless you are willing to land the Marines. You can't enforce it. It's unenforceable unless you're willing to land the Marines. That we're certainly never going to do." So he said to me, "Doug, this is all right with me, but first you must go and clear it with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I want you to see these top three people on each side of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats. I want you to see the Majority Leader of the Senate, and I want you to see the Speaker of the House, those people."

Q: This shows his thinking on how to deal with the Congress.

MACARTHUR: He said, "If they say no, there's no point in going ahead. We're not going to get into a battle which we can't win with this. If they give the green light for a negotiation, okay. Now it's up to you."

So I spent about four days and saw all these people, and I had brought back with me a draft treaty which differed from the old treaty, because I wanted to get away from the idea that this was just a military treaty. That's why the name we chose, Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security, would start the economic cooperation, cooperation non-military, in the earlier stages of the articles of the treaty. They didn't want to look at any text, but in effect, all of them said, "Well, the point you make is a very good point, that if it is one-sided, if it's been overtaken by events, we will recognize Article IX, although that will put the Japanese in a more privileged position than any of our other treaty partners, who, engaged in attack, is on us. This engages us to come to their defense only on an attack against Japanese territory or Japanese-controlled territory under the authority of Japan." Our other treaties are more general; an attack anywhere can do it.

So I went back to Japan, saw Mr. Kishi. I got back in the evening and saw him the next morning, thinking he would be very happy. I told him that I'd seen the President, and that the parameters within which I could negotiate with the following, which I thought were imminently satisfactory to the Japanese, first we would recognize Article IX of the

Japanese Constitution. We would not try to void that by treaty language, that would stand and be left alone, untouched or unmentioned by the treaty, and it would stand.

Secondly, in every other respect, this treaty had to be fully consistent with our other security engagements in other parts of the world, including NATO, SEATO, the U.S.-Philippine Treaty, and the other ones. And he smiled and said that that was fine, but then he said to me, put his head to one side, sort of shook his head and he said, "I have a problem with Mr. Yoshida."

And I said, "What's your problem?"

He said, "He's not enthusiastic." Yoshida, two of his boys controlled two of the largest factions--I'm coming to the Japanese Government structure later--that made up the Liberal Democratic Party, Ikeda and Sato, that successively succeeded Kishi.

So I said, "Well, all right."

So I called up Mr. Yoshida and said I was back from America, and I wanted to come down and talk to him about the treaty. He had a little house at Oiso, behind the dunes down on Segami Bay. So I got an Army chopper. He said, "Come on down for lunch." So I choppered down for lunch, and we landed on a little pad there.

Q: I might say for the record that "chopper" means a helicopter.

MACARTHUR: A helicopter. He was waiting to greet me at the little gate and fence around his property, and after greeting me and asking me how I was, his first words--I give you my word of honor--were identical to the words of Mr. Dulles, with whom he had negotiated the treaty, "What's wrong with that treaty I negotiated?" [Laughter] I mention it only to show that pride of authorship sometimes . . .

Q: Did you tell him that Mr. Dulles . . .

MACARTHUR: I told him that Mr. Dulles had said exactly the same thing, and he laughed. We had lunched and talked about it, and I explained the reasons why, to make less vulnerable our relationship to the left, which he was concerned about, too, because part of the problem with Japan at that time, and part of his problem with the students that later emerged, was the fact that during the time when the militarists took over in Japan and did Pearl Harbor and did all the expansion, many of the Japanese professors in the universities didn't raise a single voice. They were quiet as mice; they never raised a voice of protest or suggested it might not be a good thing. And after the war, those professors, or some of them, a number of them felt--and this comes to me from two very distinguished Japanese university presidents, among other people--they felt that they had to be more liberal and more to the left than anybody else to re-establish their credibility, and so they were, to a considerable extent, behind the students and pushing the students on later, which I will come to.

In any event, the negotiations started, and the negotiators were basically myself, Bill Leonhart, who was my DCM, who made a remarkable contribution, Dick Sneider, in the political section, who was later ambassador to Korea, a wonderful fellow, and he was in the political section. He was the fellow I drafted or tapped to do a lot of the basic work and be responsible in the political section for the treaty part of the negotiation. And on the Japanese side, it was Mr. Kishi, who headed the thing; Foreign Minister Fujiyama, who was a politico and had no international background, he was simply a voice; Kisimara Yamada, the vice minister, who died only six months ago, I only heard about it two days ago; Mr. Togo, who was later ambassador to the United States, who was chief of the American section of the foreign ministry at that time, and who, I think, on the Japanese side bore the brunt of most of the drafting.

Q: He and Sneider were sort of counterparts?

MACARTHUR: Yes, they were sort of counterparts in it, in a sense. And the chief of the Japanese legal division of the foreign ministry. We negotiated along.

This brings me to the structure of the Japanese Government, the political party that's run the country since the war, and how it functions. Why did it take two-years-plus to negotiate a treaty that Japan wanted and we were acceptable to? First, I would have to mention a fundamental and most basic difference in the decision-making process of Japan and most other countries. In our country and many other countries, except dictatorships, the decision-making process is by majority vote in democratic countries, and Japan is a democracy. But in Japan, the decision-making process is a process of consensus. That means that in a cabinet of, say, 24, headed by the prime minister, if one or two people say no, they won't move until those gentlemen withdraw their objection or agree. So we would go along with the easier articles, and then there would be a pause, maybe five or six weeks, where we wouldn't meet. And why was that? That was simply because within the inner workings of the cabinet, one or two or three people would say no. They couldn't move until those people removed their objection. Why couldn't they move?

This leads me to the structure of Japanese Government. The political party that has run Japan since its sovereignty was restored, the Liberal Democratic Party, is not a political party in any sense that we understand it in the West. It is uniquely Japanese, and it has certain feudal aspects. The Liberal Democratic Party is a grouping of coalitions who generally believe in the same philosophy, but each coalition is headed by a very ambitious leader whose ambition is to become prime minister of Japan. The coalition leaders are the ones that shake down big business for the contribution, and then dish out the money they get from the big companies for the campaign expenses, for members of the Diet who support them. So in a sense, it's like feudal Japan, who you had the shogun who had to have the support of a majority of important daimyos, feudal lords. And the feudal lords were, in turn, supported by their samurai swordsmen whose loyalty they kept by giving them so many kokus of rice every year. Today, in the Liberal Democratic Party, you have the factional leader, who is the political daimyo, you have the prime minister, who is the shogun, you have the factional leader, who is the political overlord, you have his samurai Diet swordsmen, who are the members who support him in the Diet, and you have the

political overlord giving to his political samurais in the Diet not kokus of rice, but so much money because running a political campaign in Japan is very expensive, of the money that he's collected from big industry.

So the prime minister's position as prime minister depends on keeping the support of a majority of these people, but under the consensus decision-making process which is fundamental to Japan. A majority isn't enough; you've got to have the consensus.

Now, let me give you an example. After we'd been negotiating for about 11 months, ten or 11 months, maybe it was a little longer, and we negotiated to keep it out of the public press, because the press, Asahi Shimbun, I was told by a senior member, had 154 card-carrying members of the Communist Party in its editorial and reportorial staff. We used to meet privately, without any announcement. I went into a meeting one day with Bill Leonhart, I guess, and Dick Sneider, probably. We had been going along and agreed on three or four of the simpler articles. And the prime minister, Fujiyama, looked at me, and he said, "We've been thinking a lot about the treaty lately, and we think we have a better formulation than the one we've been working on, better for you and better for us, better for both sides."

And he handed me a piece of paper, two sheets, to read. I started reading, and as I read it, the adrenalin of anger started making my heart pound so loud, I thought that they would probably hear it. But I remained quite impassive until I had read it through. Why did my heart pound? Because this had nothing to do with what we'd been talking about. It was a treaty that gave every single advantage to Japan with not a single responsibility. It was quite contrary to anything that was dreamable. So I looked very coldly at the foreign minister and said, "I suppose this is your Japanese way of breaking off the negotiations. I accept it as such. I think we've got nothing more to talk about. Good day," and got up to leave.

He grabbed me, and he said, "Why do you say that?"

And I said, "Because you know, your prime minister knows, your government knows, the vice minister who's sitting here next to you knows exactly the limits within which the President and the United States Senate will ratify the treaty, and this has absolutely no bearing. There is not one measure or reciprocity in any sense. It has nothing to do with what we've been talking about. So obviously, there it is."

Then he said to me, "Please give me back that piece of paper." I gave it to him. He tore it up into small pieces, put it in his briefcase, pulled out the treaty we'd been working on, and said, "Let's go back to the other treaty then."

And I said, "No, Mr. Minister. You've raised a very important question in my mind, the question of Japan's sincerity." Sincerity in Japan is a word that translates itself. It is much stronger than in English. It's a combination of "bushido," honor, and sincerity.

Q: It's a certain amount of face.

MACARTHUR: Well, it's more than face. It's a question of honor and one thing and another.

I said, "I must think very seriously about whether this proposal that you made originally was a serious proposal or not, and whether we're dealing with sincere people."

And he said, "Next week."

I said, "I'm not prepared to set a date. I may want to communicate with the President and find out what his views are." So I left. I got back. I knew Mr. Yamato, the vice minister, he was a close friend. He called me Mac-san, and I called him Yamato-san. And I sent work to him.

Q: He was the vice foreign minister?

MACARTHUR: Yes. I'd done a lot of work with him and Togo-san, the ambassador, later Ambassador Togo, also a remarkable man. And I sent word that I felt that he owed me an explanation about what had taken place. As soon as I got back to the embassy, I got one of my Japanese-speaking Americans to call up his secretary and say that I felt he owed me an explanation about what had happened that afternoon.

I got word back immediately to come and see him the next morning about 9:30 at his little house, the house that was maintained by the Japanese Foreign Ministry for entertainment and geisha parties and things of that kind. I went there the next morning, and Yamada-san greeted me with a drink in his hand, and said, "Mac-san, come have a drink with me."

I said, "No, Yamada-san, I didn't come to have a drink with you. I came to find out what happened yesterday."

He said, "Please have a drink with me."

I said, "No."

He said, "I'm embarrassed. I can't explain unless you have a drink of friendship with me."

So he poured me a drink, and I touched it to my lips. Then I said, "What the hell happened yesterday?"

He said, "You know, in the cabinet there are 24 people, including the prime minister." He said, "Twenty-one people agree completely with what we are doing, but three gentlemen in the cabinet have different ideas. They don't agree. They say what they think we ought to be asking of America, which was in our paper." He said, "The prime minister explained about your talks with the President and the Foreign Relations Committee. The prime minister explains, I explain that it won't work, that there's no way that such a treaty could ever be ratified." But he said, "Then these three gentlemen look at the prime minister and say, 'Well, why are you afraid at least to try?'" So he said, "We tried." And then he giggled that

nervous giggle they give when they're very, very embarrassed.

Now, I mention this because it brings together both the decision-making process and the fact that the three people were important factional leaders or representatives of important different factions, and if the prime minister had overridden those three gentlemen, he would have alienated and had the permanent enmity of the factional leader and the faction they represented. Either they were the factional leader in the cabinet, or they were the factional leaders represented in the cabinet, and there would have been problems further down the road.

So we continued on and eventually completed the treaty. We had a difficult time--not a difficult time, but for the Japanese, the nuclear problem was a very acute problem.

Q: Could you explain what the nuclear problem was?

MACARTHUR: Well, the nuclear bomb having been used only twice in the world, in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and never anywhere else, and several hundred thousand people having perished as a result of either the bomb or the great widespread fires that resulted from it, the Japanese were extremely sensitive to this issue. This was an issue that in the daily broadcasts from Moscow and Peking, was always hit upon during the period of the negotiation of the treaty, you know, the nuclear business and so forth and so on, and Japan would be a nuclear base, one thing and another. So the problem of devising a treaty that met our requirements and our procedures, with respect to our armed forces was one which was not insoluble for us, but was very emotional for the Japanese.

We settled it by a formula which I would give Bill Leonhart the basic credit for devising, which is that we undertook not to introduce nuclear weapons into Japan. Of course, the problem of vessels with nuclear weapons is one which we had always taken a consistent position on. That position is that a vessel and its armaments are inseparable entity, and that we do not, for national security reasons, advertise the particular types of weapons that we carry on any vessel, nor will we ever make them public. But we undertook not to introduce nuclear weapons into Japan.

Q: So you are really talking about a twofold thing. One was that we would not put ground-based nuclear weapons in Japan. On the other, we just left it open.

MACARTHUR: In effect, we said just what the language says: we would not introduce nuclear weapons into Japan. There are two aspects, one of basing land-based weapons there; the other is the question of whether a ship that happens to have a nuclear armament of some kind on a casual visit or passing through Japanese territorial waters, we do not respond to that and never have and will not.

The treaty was signed in the White House with general acclaim, except for the left in Japan, and a number of university professors and the Asahi Shimbun, which, as I mentioned, one of its senior people told me they had 154 card-carrying members of the Communist Party. And then the treaty was signed in the White House in January 1960.

Before it was signed, the President wanted and I wanted a commitment from Mr. Kishi that they would go ahead and get on with the ratification, which they wanted to do. The reason this point came to a head was that Mr. Kishi extended an invitation to the President, when he came over to sign the treaty, to visit Japan. I advised the President that the acceptance should be conditioned on the fact that sufficient time had been guaranteed for the treaty to get over and the demonstrations which we knew the left would mount against it, and that there should be a commitment from the Japanese Government, which had a majority in the Parliament, on a date by which time they would have the treaty ratified. We would then set a date roughly three months after that for things to quiet down.

So the Japanese Prime Minister Kishi gave an assurance that the treaty would be ratified probably in late March, but no later than early or mid-April, and the visit could take place about the middle of June.

When we got back to Japan, the Japanese Government introduced the treaty into the Diet, but the opposition kept, through various delaying procedures and tactics, delaying and delaying and delaying it. In the meantime, the propaganda from Moscow and Peking about the remilitarization of Japan by the Americans and so forth was growing, but no demonstrations started. There was simply propaganda in Asahi Shimbun and speeches by left-wing university professors, and the like.

Finally, March came and went, and in April, Mr. Kishi felt that he had no choice but to go ahead and vote the treaty through the Parliament with the majority that he had.

Q: We've come to April.

MACARTHUR: By April, Mr. Kishi realized that he had no choice but to go ahead and ratify it, even though it was contrary to Japanese practice, because the opposition socialist party, led by Mr. Asanuma, had threatened to walk out or block a vote on the treaty, and it was contrary to the general sort of consensus decision-making process that was sort of ingrained in Japan, although it does not operate in a modern Diet in domestic or matters of budgetary or other concern.

So finally, Mr. Kishi talked to me twice in April, I guess it was, and I said, "If the treaty isn't ratified, I don't see how it's possible for the President to come out here."

Q: Had the President's visit been announced?

MACARTHUR: Oh, yes. It was announced in January that he would visit, that at the White House he had accepted an invitation to visit Japan sometime in June. It was to be in the middle of June, but I don't think the exact date in June had been fixed. Mr. Kishi realized this, and I didn't even know it was happening. He then decided to go ahead and force a vote in the Japanese Diet, gave the orders to the Liberal Democratic Party, and his cabinet backed him, forced the vote through the Diet.

Well, the minute the socialists heard he had given the order, they grabbed the speaker of the Parliament, the presiding officer, the speaker, because a vote cannot take place unless the speaker is in the chamber. And they locked him up in a broom closet in the bottom of the Diet to prevent a vote from being legally possible. And when the Liberal Democratic Party members heard about this, they went down to the basement, and there was a pitched scuffle, and then they started dragging the poor old speaker up the stairs into the room to vote. Finally, in a tug of war, in which the poor old gentleman's knee was dislocated, if I recall correctly, he was pulled into the chamber, and at that point, the socialists all simply marched out and refused to vote. And the vote was held, and it was a unanimous vote of those present, which was a substantial majority of the Liberal Democratic Party.

But the socialists immediately went out, and with the collaboration of the Asahi Shimbun, published stories and got on the radio that the Japanese Government had brought police and military in, had dispelled the socialist members of the Diet, reverted to militarism, and passed this treaty, which was a total false lie. They had walked out when they saw that they would lose the vote in the chamber. But the story was broadcast by at least one or two of the radios, and Asahi Simbun headlined it. This immediately was picked up in the universities, and demonstrations started. As one young man explained to me later, which is a different story, which was among the students and later became an executive at NHK, their national television company, broadcasting, the students were all told by their professors and by the newspapers that it wasn't a question of the treaty, that democracy had been violated in the most flagrant way by the Japanese Government, that had used military and police force to physically eject democratically elected members of the Parliament from the building, and that this was all part of a plot to remilitarize Japan and so forth, and that the treaty was involved in it, and so forth.

Q: Had we had any observers around to see any of this? Were we getting a straight account of what happened?

MACARTHUR: Well, nothing had happened yet. You mean in the Diet building?

Q: Yes.

MACARTHUR: No. We didn't even know they were going to call the vote in the Diet building. We didn't even know they were going to call the vote. But once the word got out the next day, the demonstrations started.

Then James Hagerty, who came over, he was the press secretary, with Tommy Stevens, who was special assistant to the President, they came over in early May, if I recall correctly, when the demonstrations had started, street demonstrations with students dancing and things, in a city which was then a city of 6 million, and with Greater Yokohama, which is all one great accumulation of 11 million, there were probably 15,000 to 25,000 people demonstrating, basically around the Diet. Down at the ginza and everything else, it was business as usual at this period.

When Hagerty, who was coming over to make, as always before a presidential visit, the

preliminary arrangements and to survey the schedule and all that, when he sent me word he was coming, I suggested he come in at a military airfield. I said, "There are going to be demonstrations, and the Communist left is capable of mounting a demonstrations of 10,000 or 15,000 people if you come in at the airport. So I think the thing to do, you're coming in a government military plane anyway, is to land at a military airport and then we'll bring you in in a car with no American ambassador flag flying on it. There won't be an occasion or opportunity for them to make something out of your arrival."

Hagerty sent back word saying that he didn't want to do that, that he didn't want to be sneaking in the back door. We had an open relationship with Japan, the treaty had been negotiated and signed in the White House. He felt that he must come in through Haneda. So I got word--we had observers out there--that the press here had announced that he was coming in at such and such a time, and I drove out to the airport to meet him, and driving out, I passed a number of groups that were converging on the airport, of perhaps a few hundred here, a few hundred there, a thousand here, a thousand there. And we got to the airport, went in, and nothing happened. The airport was a rather large airport, and there were police to keep people away from any demonstrations, away from the airport itself, but the airport is a very large area. In one place you have to go down underneath a runway or a roadway across the top. We came out on the other side of that, and we ran right into about 5,000 demonstrators, who immediately surrounded the car and started pounding on the thing, jumping on the top, were very careful not to break windows or do things of that kind, but they rocked the car. Tommy Stevens got extremely agitated, Hagerty kept his cool completely and started to pull out his little pocket camera and started snapping pictures of the demonstrators. It was well organized, and they had obviously been told not to resort to violence, because we had several American newspapermen that were out there also covering the business right there next to the car, and they were snapping pictures and writing their stories.

Q: Selective violence.

MACARTHUR: But one of them put his hand on top of the car, and one of the demonstrators who was dancing on top of the car jumped on his hand, and the man said, "Ah!" And the man on top of the car immediately bowed and apologized for stepping on his hand. [Laughter] But finally, when they started rocking the car, the police finally arrived, and they decided that we were never going to get out of there without a helicopter. So the police arrived, and they cleared a little area around the car, then made a thing, and a chopper came down in another area where the police cordoned off. Tommy Stevens wanted to run, and I said, "No, no, don't run. When you run in a mob, I've seen it happen too often, it just excites them. It's like a cat running after a mouse or a dog running after a cat. If the cat stands there. But if it starts running, they go after. So we'll walk at a deliberate pace." We had police on both sides of us.

We walked toward the thing. In the meantime, some of these people had brought along clubs and things, started throwing them into the blades of the helicopter, the chopper. To make a long story short, we got off, took off back to Tokyo, landed at a helo-pad not far from the embassy, and just as we got out and the blades were slowing down, two of the

blades fell off that had been hit by these clubs that they had thrown into the blades. So we were very lucky. They could have just as well fallen off up in the air, and we would have been 800 feet up in the air, down to the ground in nothing flat.

So Hagerty went back. Hagerty gave a very excellent press conference, and there was a lot of condemnation that this was not the way that Japan did business, except, again, with Asahi Shimbun. They went back.

Q: What was Hagerty's impression at the time? He was giving the press conference in Tokyo?

MACARTHUR: He gave a press conference in the embassy residence, where he was staying. He called it afterwards and said that this was, in effect, a childish, barbaric act, that Japan had asked for a treaty, we had negotiated, it was more favorable and so forth to Japan than to other countries, we fully recognized Article IX, and that a free and independent Japan we thought was important to us, and we assumed that the Japanese people thought it was important to them. Then he answered a lot of questions and so forth. He handled himself extremely well.

He went back, and I had a long talk with him and then with Tommy Stevens about it. I said, "If this goes on, we're going to have to perhaps rethink this thing."

Well, the demonstrations went on, and they'd moved up to around the embassy and the Diet building, which is not far away. They were confined to those areas. In the rest of Tokyo, you wouldn't have known there was anything going on, but that's what they focused on. Probably the maximum was around 50,000 people. A girl got killed in one of these demonstrations; she got trampled to death in one of these demonstrations. Then the demonstrations started getting ugly. This was in May, after the Hagerty visit.

I went to Mr. Kishi and said that I thought that if the demonstrations persisted, the worst thing for Japanese-American relations would be to have the President come there and have a scandal or incidents or have that kind of a reception, and that if they could not find a way of bringing them under control--and I didn't mean by military means--then I thought the President's visit should be postponed and that I was willing to recommend a postponement of the visit on the basis that the President hoped to be able to work in--he was going to go to the Philippines first, and then I think to Korea or Taiwan or someplace--another one or two more countries on this visit, because he got to the Far East so seldom. Kishi said, "Is this your idea or Washington's idea?"

I said, "It's my idea, but I wanted you to know that I propose to send a message in."

So he said, "Well, I understand. It's a very serious matter, and I understand." Kishi, of course, was fighting for his life, because if the visit was postponed, he would be held responsible as prime minister and would be finished.

So I sent a personal eyes-only telegram to the President and the Secretary, saying that I felt

that the visit should be postponed. It had gotten to the point, particularly after the death of this girl, where it was getting violent and ugly, and there was no assurance--I reported my talk to Kishi and what he had said--that I could possibly get from them or give them myself that the demonstrations would not take place when the President arrived, and that would be the last thing in the world to strengthen the ties of Japanese-American friendship, for which the visit was planned. So I sent this telegram off and got word back very swiftly that evening--it was personal, from the President--saying that he agreed, and that it would be phrased as a postponement and not a cancellation of the visit and so forth. I went to bed much relieved.

By the time I got up the next morning, I had asked for an appointment with Kishi, a follow-up telegram came. Obviously the President had been talking further with some of his advisors. It said, "While I still believe the visit should be postponed, please tell Mr. Kishi that if in his best judgment the postponement of my visit will lead to the total failure of the treaty to be able to be implemented and create a problem for him, possibly calling for his resignation (I don't remember the exact words), then I will come no matter what the risks involved are. I will come anyway."

So I went to Kishi. Instead of going into the thing saying, "The President felt that a postponement was wise under the circumstances," I went with this caveat and put it to Mr. Kishi, and Mr. Kishi thought for a while, said he wanted to think about it. Then he eventually said that he felt that the failure to come on the visit would endanger the treaty. I think that was the word the President used--endanger the ratification, because it still had to go through the upper house of the Diet. It had gone through the lower house only.

So Kishi, who knew that if the President didn't come--and this is not a criticism of him--said that after reflection--I think he asked me to come back later that day, I just don't remember, for his decision, but he said, in effect, that he felt it would endanger the ratification, because it still had to go through the upper house.

The violence, in the meantime, increased, and the attacks on Kishi from the left increased, and I took the position that we should not cancel the visit unilaterally, that the postponement of the visit should come from the Japanese Government, that if we did it, it would show a lack of confidence in Japan and would be construed in various ways, and that their neck was in it. I felt that it was up to them to do it. This decision, I've often wondered about whether it was the right one, or whether I shouldn't have gone back to the President when I got the second telegram, saying he was bound to do it. But in any event, I accepted the President's decision and Kishi's word, except as violence got [worse] later, I sent word to him that it was no longer feasible for me to see him with a crowd, the demonstrations. I felt sure we were coming up against a very serious situation.

Then just before the visit, the President was to leave Washington. The Japanese Government . . .

Q: We had not postponed it up to that time?

MACARTHUR: No, we didn't postpone it at all. The Japanese Government announced

that it had requested the President to postpone the visit. When that happened, the reason that Kishi had not wanted to resign earlier was an admirable one. He did not expect, in the face of all this violence, that the upper house would act on the treaty in the 30-day period, but if a bill under the Japanese thing, as I remember the intricacies of it, if it went before the upper house and no unfavorable action was taken, it automatically became law. They had to act opposed.

Kishi's problem was that he had to remain in office for 30 days after the lower house had acted without the opposition being present, because they walked out. I went and saw a number of the factional leaders, who were going to succeed him, because I knew immediately who they were--Yoshida's boy, Ikeda first, and then Sato. They had an agreement that Ikeda would take it for two or four years, and then Sato would succeed him, and they had the other factions all lined up.

So Kishi stayed in power, deserted by all the factional leaders as somebody that's a has-been. With courage and fortitude, he faced that situation and remained in power until the 30-day period elapsed. The treaty was then ratified. The minute it was ratified and there was no longer any hope, these demonstrations, which I said at the highest, I think, the estimate was 50-some thousand, although from the newspapers, just seeing them concentrated on the crowd, it looked as if the whole city was in an uproar all around the Diet and around the embassy. Kishi stayed in, and then he resigned. Ikeda was immediately elected to replace him.

But the interesting thing was, the minute it was fact that the treaty had been ratified, those 30 days were up and the ratification procedure on the Japanese side was complete, then the demonstrations disappeared.

Q: When Eisenhower was planning to come, when it was still on, you had recommended that it might be a good idea not to come, but Eisenhower had decided . . .

MACARTHUR: No. Let's get it right now. I recommended that the visit be postponed. Eisenhower agreed to that recommendation and sent me a telegram, agreeing. Then he followed it with a second one, saying that if his failure to come would result in endangering the ratification of the treaty, then he would come, no matter what the risks involved were.

Q: But Kishi's role in this?

MACARTHUR: This is explained to Kishi. But if Kishi announces at that time that the Japanese Government is asking the President not to come, the danger, until the groundwork has been laid for him to remain on with the other factional leaders for 30 days to ratify the treaty, and they wanted it ratified, too, they didn't want chaos, with the left having a great victory. This took time, and the time it took was that period of time when the demonstrations were going on after I had told Kishi of the President's message, and Kishi had said, "Well, I think the President should come." And it was between that time and the time when the arrangements had been agreed within the government that the visit had to be canceled, and it was just about three days before, if I remember.

Q: So the final decision was made by the Japanese.

MACARTHUR: Absolutely.

Q: And at that point, you had not backed away, but you were no longer part of the decision process, because it was their decision. They knew all the factors.

MACARTHUR: It was their decision to make.

Q: This is before the upper house had approved the treaty.

MACARTHUR: Yes. The treaty--I can't remember, but the lower house acted something around March 20 or something like that, and the upper house had 30 days, which brought it to June 20, and the President was supposed to come over around the 12th or 13th or something of that kind. The decision was always the Japanese. That had been my recommendation from the beginning, because I felt we could ask for a postponement if there were logical grounds, like the President was going to postpone his whole trip to the Far East for a brief period to try to work in a couple of more countries. That sort of a postponement would wash. But for him to just say, "I'm postponing my visit, period," or because of the demonstrations, this would simply strengthen the hand and encourage the left and discourage our friends there. I felt that it would be generally construed as a lack of confidence in Japan and its people. That was the reason I made that recommendation. Some people take it as a mistake. As it turned out, the treaty has become the cornerstone of our relationship with Japan.

If I could cite just a little epilogue, a few years ago I was out in Japan, and I think it was on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the NATO treaty. A treaty is of indefinite duration for anybody to denounce it after ten years. I was asked to be interviewed on television about the treaty, and a very nice team came to the Okura Hotel, where I was staying, and they got a television studio downstairs. I went down. They had several commentators and people, but a very nice young man from NHK was handling all the arrangements and everything, and the interview went well. Everybody, the Japanese that had participated in it, said it had become the foundation and cornerstone of U.S.-Japan relations.

Then at the end, this young man, he was in his late thirties, it seemed to me, something like that, who had arranged everything so thoughtfully and been very nice, came up to me rather shamefacedly and said, "Ambassador, I was one of those students snake-dancing around your embassy." [Laughter]

I said, "Well, what do you think of it now?"

And he said, "Well, we were totally misled. When our professors told us that the Kishi Government had brought in military force, police force, to expel the thing, what we were worried about was democracy in Japan, and this was a return to militarism and the end of democracy. This is what our professors told us and encouraged us and led us in those snake

dances." He said, "That's what set us off. It wasn't the treaty by itself. It was this business of the destruction of democracy," which I thought was a very interesting commentary coming from one of the boys who had been there.

Q: One last question before we end this interview, Mr. Ambassador. During the time you were there involved in the treaty negotiations, did Okinawa and the Bonins come up as an issue?

MACARTHUR: Okinawa was always there, and the Bonins. But the Japanese, after getting the treaty revision, were not in a mood to push immediately. But I wrote a telegram to the Secretary saying that the next thing on the board was that. Then when I came back in March of '61, after President Kennedy had been elected, and I'd known President Kennedy since he was a Harvard schoolboy, he spent a lot of time in my apartment when he used to come over in the summer, when he was at Harvard, to visit his father, Ambassador to England, and he used to come over to Paris, I saw a lot of him and knew him well, so before I left, he asked me if I had any thoughts about what we would face next in Japan. I left him a one-page memo which said at the top of the list, "It is Okinawa and the Bonins, and eventually they'll have to go back. But that will be the most important single problem that my successor will face, because inevitably, basically Okinawa, the Bonins are just an extension, if you will, of Japan, but until Okinawa is there, until it goes back to them, it's going to be a continuing problem that will be agitated and be exploited by the left, and it's one that we're going to have to face." It was not my successor, Reischauer, but I think it was Alexis Johnson who finally worked out the Okinawa thing.

But someplace in my files is a copy of that memo, the one-page memo for President Kennedy, because, as I say, I knew him extremely well, and he was interested in knowing what I thought would happen and what the problems would be during his presidency insofar as Japan was concerned. Okinawa was high on the list.

The Japanese, after they got the treaty, the Japanese Government, you know, you can take things sort of one bite at a time. That was quite an exercise. There would be no such demonstrations against the return of the Bonins and Okinawa, of course, but they knew that we'd have to move gradually.

There was one point that I omitted, that I should have mentioned. From the very beginning, our military and the Defense Department were extremely opposed to the idea of a new treaty. Why were they opposed to it? Because under the original treaty, they could do whatever they wanted. They could move their troops around. Under the status-of-forces agreement, under that old treaty, if an American committed the most hideous crimes against Japanese civilians when he was off-duty or any other time, the Japanese did not have any custody of him.

I arrived at a most inauspicious time when I arrived as Ambassador to Japan in 1957. It was about ten days after the Gerard case broke. The Gerard case was a G.I. who was out guarding a rifle range where these poor, miserable, wretched women, ragpickers, they called them, would come out to pick up casings and pieces of metal and the metal from

bullets and things and sell them. And he had strict orders to keep his gun unloaded and never to use it during the rest period. He got up there and squeezed off, targeted an old woman who was about 200 yards away, squeezed off a shot and killed her. He obviously had violated his instructions, was just practicing, and had forgotten to unload his gun during his lunch hour period, which were in his written instructions. The military were totally averse to turning him over to Japan for trial. Although under the terms of the agreement we had, in a case such as that, they had a right to try him. The military immediately whipped up the Congress that they should never let the Japanese try somebody, they wouldn't get fair people, justice, and all the rest of it.

So I came home and went over to the Hill and talked to a lot of senior people in both the House and the Senate about this, who all agreed with me that given the circumstances--and I brought back the whole history of the case--that we should turn him over to the Japanese, which we did.

This shows the mentality of the military. But then the idea that they couldn't, without--under the old treaty, we could have put Japan into thermonuclear war without even consulting her, and the idea that you had to give up the right to do whatever you wanted in Japan and Japanese territory was too much for them. Finally, during the course of the negotiations, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, whose name escapes me now, he went out to Korea and wanted to stop by Japan, and I sent a message to the President and Secretary of State, saying that I felt that it would be a great mistake for this gentleman to come to visit Japan, which was on his itinerary, unless he agreed not to have a press conference, because they were bound to ask him, "Have you stopped beating your wife?" questions about the treaty, which he would not be able to answer satisfactorily, and it would be exploited by the left. This recommendation was approved, so he'd come to Japan and hold no press conference, but he was miffed, and so he just bypassed Japan and didn't come there.

But again, this is a business where I think we've erred a great deal. We have some Secretaries of Defense who go abroad and make statements, and Mr. Weinberger is one of them, that are strictly foreign policy statements. Casper Weinberger talked foreign policy the whole time, perhaps because he always wanted first to be Secretary of State, rather than Secretary of Defense. But you should have one senior cabinet voice speaking for the United States Government on foreign policy. You have either the President or the Secretary of State.

Q: But you had very much the feeling, during the negotiations, that your bosses were the Secretary of State and the President, and they were running the show.

MACARTHUR: Anybody in the Defense Department. General Eisenhower knew the Defense Department better than the people who were the incumbents. He'd grown up in that department. He knew its weaknesses. He was the one that later, as you remember, talked about the world of the military-industrial complex. He knew it damn well, and he knew so much more about it than any of the others, that if they challenged him, they would be on very poor ground, and they probably wouldn't be around very long. I say that because

we have so many Secretaries of State that know nothing about the five-sided building and how it operates and how it works and how the JCS works. I worked with the Joint Staff. I helped work on the first NATO Force Goals and everything else in the bowels of the five-sided building. But there was nobody in the Defense Department that knew as much about the Defense Department as President Eisenhower. We hadn't had a President before him that knew as much about foreign affairs as he did, so we were very, very fortunate.

Q: So you felt the President and Secretary of State were running the ship, as far as you were concerned.

MACARTHUR: There was no question about it. Who else?

Q: We are talking about a different era, where the Secretary of Defense often has his own policy.

MACARTHUR: That's been the fault of the President. That's uniquely the fault of a President, to permit a Secretary of Defense to go out and make all kinds of pronouncements when he's on foreign trips, on basic foreign policy. I don't mean that he can't say that we fully support a foreign policy, but to go out and deliberately seek foreign policy, basic statements of foreign policy and things of that kind, that isn't the way to do it. Sure, you support the foreign policy of the United States, but the spokesman should not be because you get conflicting interpretations.

Continuation of interview, March 29, 1988.

Q: Mr. Ambassador, there was one question I noticed when I reviewed our last interview concerning Japan. Was the fact that you were the nephew and had the name of Douglas MacArthur a positive factor? Did you find this helped you, or was it almost an inhibitor when you were dealing in Japan?

MACARTHUR: On balance, I found that it helped me. It helped me with the senior people with whom I dealt in Japan at that time. As today, to a lesser extent, it was the older politicians, the older men that were the people that were in power. It's curious, when I called on the prime minister, my opening call, he referred to my uncle as MacArthur Shogun, and I was MacArthur Taishi, Ambassador MacArthur. But General MacArthur was referred to by those senior people as MacArthur Shogun.

On the whole, I think they felt it had been a very benevolent administration during the occupation that had Japan's interest at heart. The Japanese traditionally, going back to feudal days, and let's remember they were only 100 years out of feudalism, the Meiji Restoration had taken place less than 100 years from the time I assumed the ambassadorship there. When the feudal daimyos, the warlords, were fighting each other and the one that lost, he committed suicide so that there wouldn't be any what the French call revanchists, revengeful people, left, the Japanese would slaughter the losing daimyos'

people so that there wouldn't be any gathering there that could create problems for them.

I don't know what, frankly, they expected when they lost a war that they had started with the attack on Pearl Harbor, but the end result was a feeling, except for the left, which accused me constantly of trying to remilitarize Japan when I was negotiating the treaty, this spurred on by broadcasts in Japanese from both Moscow and Peking at that time.

Q: Did they throw your uncle's name in your face at that time?

MACARTHUR: No, but in some of their broadcasts, they would say I came from a long militarist family, which was quite true, because one grandfather was an admiral, and the other was a general, my father was in the Navy, and General MacArthur was my uncle. My brother had been and died in the Navy. So I was the sign of a military family trying to remilitarize Japan and destroy democracy and reinstate the militarists who had brought Japan to the great disaster that befell it as a result of their action at Pearl Harbor in World War II.

So on balance, I found it a positive mark in my favor. As an example, Mr. Yoshida, who had some very spirited discussions, who was five times prime minister of Japan during the period of my uncle's shogunate there, if I may put it that way . . .

Q: It's still being referred to. In this week's article in the Washington Post, they referred to it.

MACARTHUR: Somebody called my attention to that, yes. But when General MacArthur died, Mr. Yoshida, the grand old man of Japanese politics, who was 86 or 88, flew, and rather infirm--he died just a year or so later--he flew all the way to New York for the funeral ceremonies there, then he flew down to Washington, and then he flew down to Norfolk for the burial ceremony where General MacArthur is buried in the old capitol building in Norfolk. So I think there was a great respect for General MacArthur, and, of course, he had learned a lot, because when the Russo-Japanese War took place, my grandfather, General Arthur MacArthur, the Civil War hero who won the Medal of Honor at Missionary Ridge, was named U.S. observer with the Japanese forces during the Russo-Japanese War, and he took as his aide his son, young First Lieutenant Douglas MacArthur, and they were mixed up with the Japanese military. I think my uncle, as a result of that experience as a very young man, and in the close intimacy of life with the Japanese in a military observer's capacity during a war against a great European power, he picked up the fundamental essence of how the Japanese mind worked and how, if you had to deal with them in the position that he was in, the best way to deal with them.

Of course, they were very grateful that he kept the Emperor, because there was a strong move, as you may remember, to depose the Emperor and liquidate it. They were also grateful that when the Soviets proposed dividing Japan into zones of occupation, as they did in Germany, and we agreed to in Germany, he opposed that successfully with every ounce of his vigor, which was very considerable. Had we divided Japan into zones of occupation, Japan today would be divided between a Soviet zone and an American zone, or

a Japanese Democratic Republic and the Japan that we know. So in the reconstruction effort, his recommendations; in the handling of the Japanese, he handled them in a way that they were accustomed to. They were accustomed to a senior person, like a shogun or a strong man doing it, he dealt with them, with very few of them--the Emperor. Mr. Yoshida, and a few others. But he kept an aloofness from the mass and from mixed social events and things of that kind. This was very much in keeping with Japanese tradition. Of course, with the Emperor, who was surrounded by the silk and veil, and where before the war, when the Emperor passed, you had to bow your head and put your eyes on the ground so that you would not desecrate him by staring at him, I think his mode of operation, call it what you will, and the way he conducted himself was by and large in keeping with something that is similar to what they were used to.

Q: You had served in Japan for the normal time for an ambassador, and a new administration had come in. We're talking about 1961. Had you made any requests for another post or indicated what you would like?

MACARTHUR: No. When I was ready to leave, the treaty had been ratified, and a post-treaty election had been held in Japan, where the ruling Liberal Democratic Party, which had negotiated the treaty, increased its strength, and the time had come for me, I had been there for more than four years, to move along. I did not request a transfer, but I certainly expected it. When the elections came in November of 1960 and a Democratic President replaced a Republican President, I expected in the normal course of events to go.

It so happened that the Democratic President that replaced President Eisenhower was Jack Kennedy, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and I had known Jack Kennedy since he was a Harvard student when I was a young third secretary in Paris. His father was ambassador to London. He used to come over to Paris very frequently and spend a lot of time in our apartment playing bridge and one thing or another, so I'd known him, and then I'd known him later when I served in Paris after the war, when he was a congressman. He came over on several trips, and I was the principal point of contact and set up arrangements for him to see people and everything else in France in that post-war period. He came over once with Tobbert MacDonald, his Harvard roommate. I think he was also on the Harvard football team with him.

So I got a message from him that he had decided that with the treaty and everything else, the time had come for another ambassador to come along, a view with which I thoroughly subscribed. I think four to five years is the maximum that an ambassador should serve in a post. Why? Unless there are extraordinarily special circumstances. Why? Because the first two years are learning years if you're an ambassador in a post. By the third year, you're still learning something, but you begin to think that you know a great deal about the country, and in the meantime, any of the people whom you learned from, senior members on your staff, have been transferred, and by the end of the fourth year, you're probably the oldest Foreign Service officer, if you are a Foreign Service officer, inhabiting the embassy. So you're sort of a senior guy in terms of longevity in that post, and you begin, in your subconscious, you can't help but think that you know pretty much what the situation is. And furthermore, that driving energy that keeps you in your first two, two and a half to

three years to want to know more and more and more and acquire more information begins to slow down, because you have, by that time, acquired a very considerable amount of information and understanding, not just about issues and views, but about personalities and so forth and so on. So inevitably, I think the drive, the intellectual curiosity that spurs you on when you're earlier in your post and all that begins to slow down a bit. So I've always been somebody who says unless there are extraordinarily special conditions, somewhere between four and five years should be the maximum.

Then I got a message saying that the President would like me to go to Belgium, where we were having some problems with Belgium as a result of developments in the Congo. I accepted that appointment with great pleasure, because as a member of General Eisenhower's staff in Normandy, Assistant Political Advisor for French Resistance Affairs, I had not only participated in the liberation of Paris, but on the eve of the liberation of Brussels by Marshal Montgomery's forces, General Eisenhower called me into his office and said--I say on the evening; it was actually about lunchtime--and said, "MacArthur, I want you to go up and see how Monty does liberating Brussels tomorrow." So I went forward. It was only a two- or three-hour drive with military escort, and participated in the liberation of Brussels, which was, to me, not as emotional as the liberation of Paris, where I'd spent years before the war, retreated before the Germans, then been in Vichy, and so forth, but it was a very emotional experience.

Then in October, I was reassigned from General Eisenhower's staff--the Brussels liberation was September 3, 1944--I was reassigned to the embassy to head up the political section in the embassy.

Q: I would like to move on to Belgium. You said you had had acquaintances with Belgium before, one with Eisenhower. You also were sent there as first secretary.

MACARTHUR: I was sent there as first secretary after I finished my tour of duty in Paris in '48. I went to Belgium as first secretary. While I was there, Paul Henri Spaak was both prime minister and foreign minister, one of the free world's great post-war statesmen. I was chargé d'affaires when Admiral Kirk was gone a considerable amount of time; that's when he was being considered for the Russian post.

Q: Admiral Kirk at that time was the American ambassador.

MACARTHUR: He was the ambassador. He had commanded the American elements of the Navy in the invasion of Normandy, the cruisers and ships that did the bombarding and preparatory work, had a very brilliant and gifted wife intellectually, Lydia Kirk, who later wrote a book or two. So I served there. As I say, I was chargé d'affaires on several occasions when he was away.

Then in May 1949, I had been there less than a year, I got word that the Secretary wanted me to become Chief of the Division of Western European Affairs.

Q: You were well prepared.

MACARTHUR: So I had a background of Belgium. Now, let me go into Belgium now.

Q: Yes, what was the situation like when you were going to Belgium?

MACARTHUR: The situation, when I was named to Belgium, American and Belgian relations were on the lowest plain they had been on, I believe, in the history of the relationships between our two countries, because going back to World War I, you may remember Belgian-American relief was a great thing.

Q: Herbert Hoover was God there.

MACARTHUR: Yes. There was a warm feeling on the part of both Belgians and Americans, but the situation had deteriorated very seriously beginning in '59 because of what happened in the Belgian Congo. To explain what happened, I will have to give you a minute or two on how Belgium ran the Congo.

Q: Certainly.

MACARTHUR: And decolonization. I think it was clear to all of us--and certainly by the time I went to Belgium in 1961, and certainly clear to Britain and France and the Dutch, although they didn't care for it--that decolonization and the emergence of new states that had formerly been colonies was a fact of life and was going to happen no matter what anybody did. In the first place, if the former Western European colonial powers, namely, Britain and France, France had some 17 or 18 colonies in Africa and Britain, when it was whacked up at the Berlin Conference of 1885, when Africa was whacked up, Britain had its colonies all over the lot. These were already going by '61 or had gone. The Belgian Congo was still operating just as it had operated before the war.

The Belgian system was totally different from the British or the French system. The Belgian system of colonialism ran the whole show virtually from Brussels. It didn't have the type of governor general setup with a local assembly of some sort, where views could be expressed and things of that kind. It was operated from Belgium, and it was operated not just by the government alone, but by the companies, the important Belgian companies--agricultural and mineral companies--Union Miniere, from whom during the war we got uranium for our atomic bombs that we used in Japan.

These companies who were operating up in this vast area of the Congo frequently handled all the postal services, such as they were, communications, postal services, because they had that network, and you sent letters and packages and things up the river in their ships, and they were distributed by the company people to the inhabitants to whom they were addressed and so forth and so on. But it was basically a paternalistic system operated from Brussels. The Belgians looked around and saw all these things happening to the British and French colonies in Africa, but they persisted in the belief that they had 20 to 30 years to decolonize, that they needed that time to get started in setting up some kind of the beginnings of a local assembly system so there could be an orderly transition from this very

paternalistic system operated from Brussels to a more democratic system with people who had absolutely no training equivalent to the training that the British and French had given the native inhabitants of their colonies, not just in Africa, but in the Middle East and elsewhere.

Q: Why did the Belgians, alone of the powers, not see that they didn't have 20 years? Is this wishful thinking?

MACARTHUR: The system was operating, and I think there were a great deal of pressures from important companies like Union Miniere, which was a big hunk of the Societe General, which is Belgium's largest company that has been in contention recently because an Italian is trying to take it over, because it operates or is the key to 500-and-some major industrial companies that are operating in Belgium. I think there were pressures from them. They didn't want to give up probably their prerogatives. I was not there at that time, but I understood later that there had been pressures from them. But basically, the system seemed to be going all right. It continued to operate all right. There didn't seem to be any outbursts of riots or things for emotionalism.

Then all this changed in 1959, when suddenly there was an explosion, and Lumumba and other people led the business. Then the Belgians panicked. They had to send their armed forces in in 1960--I think it was '60--to restore order, because there were tens of thousands of Belgians in the Congo working. In the meantime, the United Nations got into the act at the request of some of the other African nations and the Soviet Union, China, and the Belgians sent their troops in to restore order, which they did, but a series of United Nations resolutions were passed that were highly critical of Belgium, and Belgium then panicked and said that they could have their independence in less than six months. I think it was on June first or something of that, of 1960, when there was no preparation.

There had never been any preparation of any kind. As you know, the situation is complicated in Africa because of tribalism, because when the European powers whacked up Africa, they didn't whack it up along tribal and linguistic boundaries of tribes; they simply, as far as they advanced their explorers and forces, they declared that along this river or that mountain range or this desert their business, and the result was that the African colonies consisted not of homogeneous tribes that had worked together or lived next to it. There isn't a country in Africa that didn't have four or five or even six different tribes, chopped up bits and pieces of different tribes, and some of these tribes had been hostile to each other from the beginning of time. So within the new African states, they had a tremendous burden. When you never have had a system of government above the tribal system, you've never had a national system, you've had a Middle East and Asia and the Far East, in Europe, you've never been above tribalism, and there's these fierce tribal rivalries, and in one newly independent country that was formerly a colony, you throw together five or six tribes, some of which have been basic enemies from the beginning of time, you have problems. And that's been one of the burdens that these newly independent nations of Africa have had to bear, and the principal reason for the tremendous instabilities that have plagued them.

But in any event, then there was a resolution calling the Belgians to pull their troops out,

and some of the resolutions of the United Nations were very, very crudely or brutally, in terms of diplomatic language, accusatory of the Belgians, and we voted right down the line. Understandably, we were for decolonization. We were once a colony ourselves, we always had been, and so forth. The Belgians, who were cooperating with us in NATO, and we were allies in NATO, thought for some of our people, like Governor "Soapy" Williams, who was Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, to make these speeches or make comments that were then reported in the press, that seemed to be very anti-Belgian.

Q: We've now moved to the start of the Kennedy Administration with [G. Mennen] Williams.

MACARTHUR: Yes. Then by the time I went there, there had been all these votes before in the United Nations, there had been the criticisms, and we seemed to be siding constantly with the Russians, the Chinese, and the other newly independent nations that had formerly been colonies, and on the Belgian side, they considered us an ally in NATO, which we were, and they felt that we had gone beyond what we had to do, if we supported decolonization, in the vigor of our support for some of these resolutions and so forth. So there was a psychological problem on the part of the Belgians, a feeling of bitterness that they had been faithful allies and done what they could to work with us, and we had had friendly relations, and now suddenly, for reasons of our own, we had turned on them and gone further than we had to go in voting for resolutions and statements and one thing and another.

So as I say, when I arrived there, there was considerable bitterness, and it was particularly reflected in certain important companies of the Societe General, like Union Miniere. Now, I don't want to get into a whole history of the Belgian Congo.

Q: Before we go there, I'd like to go back a bit to look at the workings of the State Department. You came back. A new administration was in. You had a President who had declared himself to be on the side of decolonization, particularly he was renowned as a senator because of calling for Algiers to be free at a time when this was rather unpopular.

MACARTHUR: That goes back to Franklin Roosevelt.

Q: He comes in with this. He has a Secretary of State who isn't very interested in Africa, but you have an Under Secretary--I guess it was George Ball, wasn't it?--who was a flaming liberal as far as decolonization goes. You have an Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, G. Mennen Williams, who is very strongly for decolonization.

MACARTHUR: Well, there were people that were unkind enough to say that one of his things in the African business and the reason he wanted that post was that you remember he had been five times governor of Michigan, and he had ambitions to run again, and that the black vote in Detroit and in Michigan itself, as we've seen in the recent Jesse Jackson thing, is a very important vote, and that part of his motivation was to show that he was standing up for blacks wherever they were. [Jesse Jackson, a black presidential candidate who had just won the Michigan Democratic caucus at the time of the interview]. Now, I don't say

that's true, but there were people--and not State Department people; political reporters and other people--who said that that was one of the motivating reasons. Unfortunately, his wife is reported to have made speeches about the Congo matter, in which she told people that the Belgians, if a Congolese stole, they chopped his arm off and things of that kind. These stories all got back to Belgium, to the Belgian Embassy here, and I remember a dinner where the Belgian ambassador and Mike Mansfield, who was then Majority Leader of the Senate, he was the guest of honor, I guess, and the Belgian ambassador started talking about it, and tears came in his eyes and streaked down his cheeks, he was emotionally so upset by some of the things that had happened.

Let me just say one thing about it. We had virtually no people that had any African experience. When Africa was a colonial business, we had posts along the fringes for our ships that stopped in and picked up stuff, you know, at Mozambique. We had a representation in the Union of South Africa, but what some people don't understand is that there are three Africas. There is Arab North Africa, stretching from Morocco across Algiers, Tunis, Libya, Egypt, and part of Sudan north of the Sahara. At that time, European South Africa, which consisted of the Union of South Africa, Rhodesia, and the Portuguese colonies of Mozambique and Angola. Then there was great black Africa, dark Africa, the heart of the continent, that were colonies. We didn't have people in all those colonies, Foreign Service officers. We had them on the fringes, on the water fringes of the place where our ships came in to render the services for seamen and (inaudible) and invoicing the products that are taken aboard along the seaboard, but we had no experience to speak of, diplomatic experience people that had first-hand knowledge of all the complexities of Africa, because it had been a colonial area where, with rare exceptions, we might have somebody in Rhodesia or South Africa.

Q: Where they would talk almost exclusively to the Europeans, anyway.

MACARTHUR: Sure.

Q: They weren't anthropologists.

MACARTHUR: They weren't people that got into it up to their gills.

Q: With that, I can speak a bit personally, because in 1960, I had been named as in charge of the Horn of Africa for Intelligence and Research. I had landed in Cairo airport one time in my life; that was my entire touch with Africa, so I speak with a certain amount of experience.

Before you went out to Belgium, did you run into conflicting advice instructions? You were going to a European country which was under EUR, which had its own concerns--NATO and all. And then you had the African decolonization problem and a new administration which was probably more ideological at that point than it would be later on.

MACARTHUR: Well, from the end of World War II, when the movement for decolonization started as a spontaneous movement in the colonies, encouraged, of course,

by Moscow--there's no question about that--a growing divergence of views within the Department was evident between the European Bureau and the African Bureau. I had been basically in the European Bureau all my life until I came back in the end of 1952, when President Eisenhower named me Counselor of the Department. And as Counselor of the Department, I had to deal with the whole world, literally. I went I don't know how many hundreds of thousands of miles with the Secretary, to South Asia, to the Far East, to here and there and the other place. I mention this only because I had excellent relations with the European Bureau as Counselor, but when I was Counselor from '53 until '57, when Eisenhower took over in January of '53, I went out and saw what was happening in the former colonies and the decolonization movement. Livy [Livingston] Merchant, a very able and wonderful man, one of the finest I've ever worked with, used to always invite me to come back and give an hour or an hour and a half or two hours to the key people in EUR on my impressions and feelings as a result of these trips, and because I'd worked with most of these guys, you know, from '35 until '53, they knew me.

Well, I remember when I came back and started telling them that whether they liked it or not, decolonization was here to stay. If I'd come back from a trip to Southeast Asia, they would take their fingers and put them on the corner of their eyes and pull their eyes into a slant position, as if I'd suddenly become a turncoat and abandoned Europe and turned over and become an advocate of another side. Now, this is understandable to an extent, because you must remember that after the war, we were in the midst of the Cold War, our European Allies were the basis of any balance that we could have that would preserve military power, strategic power, that would preserve war, and to the European people, with the threat of Moscow's expansion and so forth and so on, NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance, and our military structure which had been set up by that time, SHAPE and the like, this was the most important thing to our national security, because the threat came from the Soviet Union. And they recognized, as Eisenhower recognized--that's why every morning I briefed him in '51-'52, before he came home to run for the presidency, on what was happening in the world. The EUR bureau realized that what happened in their colonies and the position we took with respect to decolonization and their problems, which were not just problems of decolonization, losing a colony, but important economic and trade and other interests in that thing, that their actions in support of us and NATO and one thing and another could be affected by it. So I could understand why they had the fix on it.

On the other hand, the African people, in effect, had the position, "Well, to hell with these European guys. The ball game is over, and we don't have to pay any attention to their concerns or their problems. We're building a new world of independent states that are on the basis of freedom and democracy, on the basis of which our country was founded, and we were once a colony and achieved our independence like they are," and so forth and so on. So between the African Bureau in the Fifties, when I was Counselor--and this is going back before, because it continued, of course--there was this complete disagreement and very little that I saw, ability of the two bureaus to try to work together and sort of compromise things that would take care of both sides.

I admit it is very, very difficult, if you oppose decolonization, to compromise. I remember when Winston Churchill came over once to have lunch with General Eisenhower at

SHAPE in late '51 or '52, I've forgotten, when General Ike was SACEUR, a little luncheon of General Eisenhower, General Gruenther, myself, the British ambassador, somebody he'd brought from London, one of his key people from London. There were six of us. Winston Churchill said the greatest mistake that England had ever made, which he could never forgive it for, was giving independence to India. Well, how could any of the European countries, with their resources exhausted, their political clout to nothing, their tremendous economic problems of reconstruction and the like, if they'd wanted to hang onto these places, they didn't have the resources or the power or the energy or the ability to do it. But I mention it only because somebody as sensible as Winston Churchill was still speaking, in 1952, about how India should have never been given its independence. He was very critical of Mountbatten and Lady Mountbatten in this private luncheon.

Q: Were you getting mixed instructions from Washington?

MACARTHUR: I don't think when you've been Counselor and you go out, you get instructions. I think that's a poor word to use for an ambassador that's a career ambassador and has already held two presidential appointments. What you get is throughout the Department, you get the input of all the things. Then you get what our policy is, and our policy is to favor the decolonization and independence for what is now Zaire, which was the Congo then. There was the Congo then and the Congo Brazzaville, which was a Russian satellite.

Q: It was the old French Congo.

MACARTHUR: Yes, that's right. And my instructions were to work this thing out and try, if you call them instructions, to let the Belgians understand why we were doing these things and what our views of the future were, that projection, and also where it was possible to be of assistance then and ease this tension that had developed and the like, to do that, which I would have done normally.

So I went there with a clear mandate. I mean, the Congo's independence was here to stay at that time, but the problem when I went there was not the Congo's independence; it was the fact that a civil war had broken out, an insurrection had broken out, and that insurrection was a very dangerous thing, because it was being supported by the Soviet Union through Congo Brazzaville, which was a client state, if you will, where they had strong influence with resources and the like. The former Belgian Congo, Zaire as it now is, occupies a key position in the heart of Africa. It's surrounded by about eight states, and if the Congo went bad, went the wrong way, that is, went the way where it became an Ethiopia, a Soviet client state, the emanations, exactly what can happen from Nicaragua if it's strong enough, going out to the neighboring Costa Rica, Guatemala, and all the rest, the spreading out of a cancer from the center of Africa, it could spread out on both sides--east, west, north, and south. So this was something that we felt should not happen and that I should work with the Belgians and try to see what we could do to do this thing.

Well, I arrived in Belgium, I had the greatest of good fortune. Seldom do ambassadors have the good luck that I had. I arrived there, and the foreign minister was Paul Henri Spaak,

with whom I had worked as foreign minister and prime minister when I was chargé d'affaires, a man I admired greatly, a lucid man, one of the most lucid men I've ever seen, probably the best orator that this century has produced, in the sense that he never used a written text, and yet he used notes that he'd make sometimes when he was listening to an account or argument. I developed a working relationship with him which he mentions in his memoirs, where he says that from a relationship of ambassador to foreign minister, a close personal relationship developed, where I saw him virtually every day, and when there were crises going on, I saw him several times the same day.

Now, Spaak was a very sensible man, and he did not approve of certain of the things that some of the companies politically, of the Societe General, which was divided on this subject primarily because of Union Miniere, basically they wanted the Congo to be split up, because Katanga, where the heart of the mineral resources were and so forth, was where they had their operations, and that was part of the dissident rebellious part of the Congo that was trying to break away. So there were complications for Spaak and the Belgian Government of an internal domestic order, which had very important economic and political implications for the government and the party.

The situation with Spaak and the relationships--and he said it in his memoirs that he felt that I had always spoken to him with the greatest frankness about our concerns and the depth of our concerns and our basic feelings and commitments, but on the other hand, he felt that I was transmitting to Washington an accurate portrayal of his problems, too, and the kinds of dilemmas that Belgium faced in this insurrection of what to do about it.

They had withdrawn their troops, the insurrection was going on, and then the thing finally came. I won't go into all the things that happened over a three-year span, but it finally came when Lumumba seized about 2,000 foreign hostages.

Q: Was it Lumumba at that time, or had Lumumba been killed? Was it Gizenga?

MACARTHUR: Lumumba was the one that declared that Americans and Belgians were to be seized. He may have been bumped by that time, but in that period leading up to the seizure of the hostages, he had encouraged the idea.

Then as it became clear that the hostages were seized, we became concerned. Why? Because we had somewhere in the neighborhood of 100-plus or more Americans--we didn't quite know--that probably had been grabbed, missionaries, people of various kinds. So on a unilateral basis, we started some contingency planning in the Pentagon about what we would have to do to go in and grab the hostages.

Q: By the way, these hostages were in Stanleyville?

MACARTHUR: Stanleyville and Polis. There were about 1,700 in Stanleyville and about 300 in Polis. So we started contingency plans, and then I started a series of things with Spaak, talks with Spaak about what the Belgians could do. I said that I did not think, given Korea and Vietnam, that we would send any troops there. And as we hashed over the

alternatives, Spaak said, "Well, we can send troops. We can send parachuters in, but we've got no aircraft that can take them there. None. We've got short-range stuff, nothing that can get down there, even with stops, that has the capacity to airlift what you would need."

So Spaak and I came over to this country, the United States, in '64, Spaak allegedly to make a speech in Bermuda and then come on here for some private thing, and I came back on consultation. Spaak and I had put together by this time the idea that American planes could airlift Belgian paratroopers in to smash the rebellion. I say smash the rebellion--to smash in and recuperate the hostages, but on a basis that we agreed that it would not be a military operation, which would immediately bring the majority of the United Nations against us, saying that we were in there militarizing, trying to overthrow the thing and recolonize and imperialism. It would be a pure humanitarian rescue operation, where we would go in, pick up the hostages, and get the hell out. If it had the effect, if we had to smash some of the dissidents, that would be a side effect, but the basic business is a humanitarian rescue operation that we couldn't be accused of in the United Nations, that we would go in there. And Americans wouldn't say, "Gee, they've gone into the Congo. It's another Vietnam."

Q: Was this our insistence or was this agreed upon?

MACARTHUR: No, no, this was something that Spaak and I talked about before we came over, about the nature of the operation and what you would do, because we discussed would they go against the forces that were trying to split up the Congo, the so-called rebels? Would they go against them or what? And this was a basic part of what the mission would be.

Then we came back here and met in the Department with the Secretary, I believe, and that night we had a dinner at Averell Harriman's in Georgetown, and Spaak had, I think, Robert Rothschild and maybe Stevie Davignon, later commissioner of the AEC, a brilliant chef de cabinet adjoint. We put the proposition--I don't remember who was at the dinner; it was a very small one--to Harriman and the Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, and I guess we had EUR there, too, because of Spaak, and Livy, maybe, that this would not be a commitment of American troops, we would simply provide the airlift to rescue hostages.

So it was agreed we'd meet again the next morning in the Department after there had been time to consult the President.

Q: This was President Johnson.

MACARTHUR: Yes, President Johnson. We went to the Department, and there we got the word in that afternoon, I think, they'd cleared it with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and everybody and the President, and we would go ahead and start planning for a joint operation, American aircraft and Belgian paratroopers.

Q: Was there any opposition? I have heard that Wayne Fredericks and Governor Williams were unhappy at having American military involvement in something which was against the Africans.

MACARTHUR: I think that's correct. They were unhappy about it, and they were unhappy about it because to them, black Africa was the only thing that counted and so forth. But I heard they were unhappy, too, but when the decision was taken, it was made and was a considered judgment. But the interesting thing is that while I was back here, I went over to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to see how they were coming on their contingency plan, and the first contingency plan, which I'd not seen, called for six battalions. Six battalions would require a wagon train of airplanes about five times around the world. Then they limited it to the absolutely irreducible minimum of four battalions that would be necessary to do this job. Well, this business was U.S.-eyes-only business and was not imparted to the Belgians.

So Spaak and I returned on the same plane. I remember the trip very well, because I always flew back and forth to conserve money for the Department--it's only a seven-and-a-half, eight-hour trip--economy class, Spaak, of course, with Rothschild and Davignon, was in first class. So we were only about 15 minutes out--it was a Sabena plane--when the stewardess from first class came back and said, "There are extra places in first class, and the foreign minister wants you to ride with him first class." [Laughter] So I went up and rode with him first class, while we talked a lot about some things, and then I said, "I'm going back to economy."

He said, "Why?"

I said, "Because there are several places with four seats across the back, and I can pull up the arms and lie down and go to sleep." [Laughter]

But in any event, we got back, and the Pentagon agreed to send over within 48 hours four of their best planners as tourists with civilian tourist passports, and they arrived the day after we got back, and they went to work right away. They worked all that day, and they worked that night until about 2:00 o'clock in the morning. They were going to meet again at 8:00 o'clock the next morning, and I had left word with them--I had been coordinator on the American side to work with the Belgian Government--I wanted them to meet with me before they went back to the Belgians. I wanted to hear exactly what had transpired.

Well, in the first place, they made out a line of flight directly down to the Congo, which went across Libya and other countries that would never give us right of passage, and we would be violating air space and creating endless problems for ourselves. So I said to them, "First you've got to go back and find another way. You've got to find another way by Spain and somewhere where we can go, where we're not violating with American aircraft and Belgian paratroopers the inviolable air space of countries who would not give us permission if we asked, so we don't ask, we just violate their air space anyway with a military operation, what they will call a military operation.

Then they said--I'll never forget it--"You know, these goddamn Belgians. They say they can use one battalion. Some guy Laurel, Colonel Laurel, do you know Laurel? He said we can do it with one battalion."

I said, "Well, Colonel Laurel, in 1960, jumped five times in combat in the Congo. He knows it intimately." And I said, "Furthermore, Colonel Laurel has jumped over 1,000 times."

They looked at me, and they said, "Jesus Christ! We've got nobody that's done that."
[Laughter]

So they went back, and then they came up with the idea that we'd pick up the Belgian--they gave the code name for the operation Dragon Rouge, Red Dragon. I've forgotten the origin of it, but it sounded like a great name. They had worked out a business where we'd have to get some permission, where we would pick up the Belgian paratroopers at a small air base in northern Belgium. We would fly them to Spain to refuel, then we would fly all the way down to Ascension Island, under British business, and then we would regroup and fly over, when the operation was on, to the Congo. So it was up to our governments to get permission from Spain for a refueling flight and Britain for a refueling flight and a rest. We got the permission, and the flight--everything went according to plan, except that when they got to Ascension Island, deep in the South Atlantic, some string British journalist sent off a wire--there was no censorship or anything--to a paper in London, saying that American planes with some uniformed characters had landed in the Ascensions. Well, this got a very low play. We had some cooperation from our British friends.

But the operation, then they rested. It's a long flight, I think an 11-, 12-hour flight, something like that. And the interesting thing about the operation is that going down--Colonel Graggle told me this later--Colonel Graggle commanded the American squadron of six or seven planes, because we had jeeps, we had all the armament, jeeps, equipment for these guys. Maybe it was five planes; I can't remember, somewhere between five and seven. He said, "As we flew down from Spain, I got Colonel Laurel up in the co-pilot's seat, then we moved back to a little office place I have in the plane." And he said, "I want to talk to you about the operation itself. What height do you want to jump at--1,200 feet? That's what we use for maneuvers, and even then we break a few legs. And I remember Colonel Graggle saying so well, 'Twelve-hundred feet? Twelve-hundred feet? If we drop my men at 1,200 feet on these tiny little airfields, they'll be scattered in the brush all around, and the Simbas will cut their throats one by one. We must jump at 550 feet.'"

Graggle said, "550 feet? There's hardly any time for the parachute to open."

He said, "We've done it before. We jump at 550 feet." Now he said, "It won't be a jump where we empty the plane. It's going to take maybe four or five passes. I'll be in your plane, the lead plane. I will jump with at least 12 men, 14 if we can get them. Four of them will have light machine guns. We'll hit the ground and center this place. The next plane will come along and drop a packet of 12 right on the area; the next one will. We'll make three or four passes, whatever is necessary. When our first unit hits the ground, we'll start spraying the jungle automatically, and the operation must be exactly at dawn, because at dawn the Simbas, the natives, are very, very nervous. They're edgy, they're jumpy, they're not in control. So we jump at dawn, 550 feet in packages of 12 to 14, so that we all hit on the airfield, and then as soon as we're down, the two planes with the jeeps come in, and we load

up and go into Stan."

Well, that's the way the operation was conducted. Graggle told me, he said, "From the moment the first guy hit the ground until the first jeep loaded with ten Belgian paratroopers started pulling away was 23 minutes." Twenty-three minutes! An incredible operation. He said, "We could learn a lot from the Belgians." So we got into Stanleyville.

I should have mentioned that while we were waiting in the Ascension Islands, then we flew over to a base in the Congo, the question came up each day, "Go or no go?" There was about a three-day hiatus between the time we landed in the Ascensions and finally went, when we were in the Belgian side. We had a direct line from the embassy to the White House, using a NATO setup, and every night after the planes were in Ascension, the prime minister, whose official residence was only a block away, would walk over all alone to the embassy, the defense minister, whose defense ministry was a block and a half away, would walk up along the edge of the park and come in, and Mr. Spaak, who lived about a mile and a half away, would drive his car down and park in the boulevard just above the embassy and walk the block. The "go or no-go" room was the small upstairs library in the embassy, where we had the direct wire to the White House. The "go or no-go" depended basically on weather, because in those areas, you can have tropical storms suddenly or thunderstorms, things of that kind, that can screw up the whole business. They had to have a fix on the weather. And with the time, there was a slight time difference.

So we were hooked right through to the State Department and the White House. We talked to the President, the Secretary first and then he was on the wire, and we talked to the President. We got the go signal, and they went. I described the operation. They got into Polis. When the Simbas understood what was happening, they started lining these people up, and some of them started shooting, and there were a number of the hostages wounded, but none fatally wounded. We lost not one single person killed in that operation. It was extraordinary. It's the only good one we've done since the war, where we haven't had a problem of one kind or another.

Then there was a sigh of relief. We rescued about 1,700 hostages there, including 1,500 to 1,700--I've forgotten the exact numbers. Spaak gave me a call and said he had to see me right away, and he came over. He said, "The prime minister wants to have us continue this operation to Polis, which is about 300 miles to the north, where their 300 people will certainly be butchered."

Spaak and I, as part of the business of the announcement, when the operation was go and the planes had left, we informed the United Nations' Secretary General, the U.S. and Belgian Governments did, we informed everybody, we issued a great press release and said this was not a military operation, it was a humanitarian operation to save hostages, and that we would withdraw upon completion of the mission of saving these hostages.

Well, then Monsieur Le Fevre, the Belgian prime minister, wanted to go on a second target. Le Fevre had no foreign affairs experience at all. Spaak and I were very reluctant, even though the lives of 300 hostages were involved, because we said, "We committed

ourselves to this operation, and then we say we're going to get out. We've done it successfully, we've picked up 1,500 to 1,700 hostages and saved their lives. They're not going to die, they're being tended to and everything, and now we're going on another one. The Africans, spurred on by Moscow and Peking, will say, 'This is just the first of a beginning of things. They're out to reimpose colonialism,' and all the rest of it."

So we were very reluctant, and the prime minister was very insistent, so I finally said, "Well, I'm not willing to recommend this to the President unless you give me your commitment, Mr. Prime Minister, that this will be the last. If we go in Polis, it's Polis and out. Otherwise, I will recommend strongly against it. There's got to be a cutoff and so forth."

Spaak approved immediately and said, "That's the only way we can preserve our position." So we then got on the thing with Mr. Saggars, the defense minister, and Spaak, and I think Stevie Davignon, who later became quite famous as commissioner of the European Community. He was Spaak's deputy chef de cabinet. Robert Rothschild, later ambassador to London, who was chef de cabinet, myself, my DCM, in this little room, about half again as big as this.

Q: This room we're talking about is about 15 by 15.

MACARTHUR: Yes. I would think that this one, the one we were in, was about 22 by 15, but it wasn't cluttered up as this one is. We got through to the Secretary and the President. Le Fevre spoke no English to speak of, so I explained the situation to the President, and also said that there were thought to be perhaps as many as 15 or 20 Americans in this group, that we recognized that this could only be a final move, that we had made a commitment to the United Nations that it was a rescue operation and we'd get out after it was completed. This could be considered as the second stage of an operation which was in two stages, and that I had the solemn commitment of the prime minister and the foreign minister that after the Polis operation, we would pull out immediately.

The President said, "All right. Did you get it in writing?" [Laughter]

I said, "No, sir. I will if you want."

He said, "Did they give you their word or something like that?"

I said, "They gave me their word of honor."

He said, "Well, all right, Doug, but this is the last, the very last, the last I want to hear of any more operations." [Laughter]

So we were very nervous about the Polis operation, because it's in an area where there are sudden literally downpours, buckets of water, storms come and so forth, and the field was an earth field, and if you get one of those things, our planes could get down and get stuck in the mud and couldn't get out. So we signed off with the President saying, "The operation is

going to go tomorrow morning unless there's a weather thing, in which case we'll call back and say it's been postponed."

Well, the Belgians watched the weather, and they knew it fairly well, and the operation went off well. We saved 300 more people up there, including several Americans, and we brought them back and we pulled out, and the operation was over.

Q: What was President Johnson's initial reaction to this? Not the second operation, but when it was first sprung.

MACARTHUR: I had worked with President Johnson when I had met him and been his escort officer when he was Vice President. President Johnson was a very skilled American political operator, but he knew virtually nothing about foreign affairs, but he surrounded himself with some very good people, you know, solid people, people with good judgment and common sense. We didn't go through this business of having, like President Reagan has, five National Security Advisors in six or seven years.

Q: Most of whom are not really very skilled.

MACARTHUR: And he had skilled people, and they were people, basically, of good judgment. I think if I were picking out a guy to advise me, or if I were picking out an ambassador, I would give perhaps the highest rating not to his brilliance or his intellect, but to his basic good judgment and common sense, because it is judgment and common sense and weighing all the factors, and then arriving at that balance, where it's either yes or no that counts. "Soapy," of course; Livy Merchant, the European guy, was a guy of balanced judgment, even though they had the European interests at heart; Bob Bowie, who was head of the policy planning staff, a superb balance of judgment in the Department; Dean Rusk, a very balanced man, but he had good people around him of balance and judgment. On foreign affairs, the President did not know enough himself and did not have enough experience to be able to make those judgments.

You asked me what President Johnson's reaction was. I would say his reaction was a grudging, "Well, I guess it's the right thing to do." I don't mean those words, but that was the spirit of his reaction.

Q: We're not talking about somebody who was eager to get out and try his military muscles.

MACARTHUR: Absolutely not. We're talking about somebody that's thinking of the political implications, who is thinking about our heavy involvement already in Vietnam, who is thinking that the American people don't want another adventure in a dark continent, as it were, and so forth. I think that the operation went superbly well. I mean, you know, there have been a couple of other brilliant operations that have been carried out, one by the Israelis and another by the West Germans. But this was an operation involving thousands and thousands and thousands of miles, when you think of down to the Ascension Island and then all the way back over to the thing, back up and around, one battalion, the way the

operation went, the coordination between the Belgian and American commanders later on.

Q: This, by the way, bypassed NATO, I take it.

MACARTHUR: No, we informed NATO. We informed NATO of what we were doing. We kept them fully informed. I should have mentioned that. When we informed the United States, before we did it, we informed NATO and so forth. The British, of course, already knew from our visits, but we were very careful. I think Spaak himself went and informed the NATO council of what we were up to before we took off. So that NATO was fully informed about the nature of the operation, the commitment that it was not a military operation as such, but a humanitarian rescue operation, the commitment to withdraw afterwards and so forth. As I say, the only itchy point that came up is when Le Fevre suddenly said he wanted to go in Polis, took Spaak and myself completely aback, because the other thing had gone just like the pictures in the book. As a medical doctor once said to me when I asked him how my operation had gone, he said, "Just like the pictures in the book." And that's the way the Dragon Rouge went. But I think I could have been elected vice mayor of Brussels.

Q: I was going to say how did this sit after it was all over.

MACARTHUR: Well, with the Belgians, they were just ecstatic. You see, this operation saved over 1,500 Belgians that would have been butchered, and that's quite a little when you think that we get concerned about 100 or so. And also it had the double effect, although that was not the primary objective by any means, it broke the back of the resistance. This operation smashing in, taking Stanleyville, going up to Polis, broke the back of the insurrection and led to the reunification of Zaire, as it's now called, the Congo. So there was the mission which was accomplished, and the side effect which was every bit as valuable in the longer term or more valuable in the longer term politically, the smashing of the back of an insurrection supported by Moscow and so forth to break up the Congo into things where you could pick up a few client states that you could operate around the surrounding eight countries that surrounded, and expand the influence and so forth.

I would say that it goes down as one--and not just because I happened to be U.S. coordinator for the operation with the Belgian Government, but just because the conception by our military people and the execution was 100%. You couldn't possibly improve on it.

Q: Did this turn things around as far as American-Belgian relations were concerned?

MACARTHUR: Oh, sure. As I say, as American ambassador, I could have almost run for mayor of Brussels and won.

Q: Did we have other concerns with Belgium?

MACARTHUR: This was the big thing that dominated the four years. That's why we spent so much time on it. We had no problems with Belgium as such. I mean, we had no trade

problems with them of any serious consequence. We had a deep interest, because of Spaak's influence, two things that we spent a lot of time on, of course, were working and keeping informed of the Belgian views and positions on European unification and on NATO. Because Spaak, you must remember, had been a former secretary general of NATO, so the business of notifying NATO about this operation, as a former secretary general, he was the person to do it and did it magnificently. But we really had no serious problems.

We had a problem where I had a *prise de bec*, a beak-to-beak confrontation with the head of Union Miniere, because we discovered through intelligence that they were giving some aid to the Katanga rebels or they were encouraging them and giving them some kind of resources. But that did not involve the government, because Mr. Spaak was 100% on my side on this thing. In fact, it was in support of what the Belgian Government was doing. That was on the business side.

On the economic side, we were trying to keep the economic policies of the common market, particularly in the agricultural field, I must say without too much success, because agriculture is so important to the political parties in Western Europe that are in power. We were trying to keep the discriminations that are built into the common agricultural policy within limits that were bearable. But as I say, when you are fortunate enough to have such close personal relationships with a foreign minister or prime minister, where you can talk with complete frankness and they talk with complete frankness, so that you can expose their considerations, because very frequently--you have worked in the Department and so have I--we keep thinking of our policy and our point of view and our problems, domestic and foreign and international or whatever they may be, but the other guy's problems, he's got political problems, too, of a very serious nature. And we know our Congress; their number one motive is not the national interest of the United States in the first instance. Their primary objective is to get re-elected. Sure. They say they're both the same, because "When I get re-elected, I will support the national interests of the United States." But when they vote for things, and you see some of the add-ons and some of the amendments that are proposed, those are not in the perceived interest of the United States by its government or by, in some cases, a very substantial majority of the Congress.

So they have their political problems of a comparable nature. They are people who have interests in getting re-elected, and who depend on support, money, and votes from certain groups and so forth. They have in-fighting within administrations, as we do. If Washington understands all these things, and you can give them a feel of the nature of the problems and what the government is up against, I think it makes the possibility of arriving at some sort of a compromise, it makes you a little less dogmatic about your own position.

I've had positions until I've understood, really, more about the other thing, where I modified my recommendation, because I modified it in a way in which I thought would not at all impair the fundamental problem, the national interest and the problem we were doing. But it would help and perhaps give them a fig leaf to cover a certain area of nudity that they had if it just weren't the way we originally proposed.

Q: How was the Vietnamese War playing? It must have been rather difficult, wasn't it? We were beginning our buildup at the time you were there.

MACARTHUR: Yes, the buildup began with President Kennedy, when he sent 16,000 combat troops to Vietnam early in his administration--'62, I think it was. President Eisenhower refused to do that. I think I've already recorded the fact that when the French asked us to bomb the Viet Minh around Dien Bien Phu, Admiral Radford said that he could do it, he was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, he with his two carriers off there, President Eisenhower pointed out--and I think it's a lesson that every President should remember, the position he took--he pointed out that for us to go in and bomb in the jungles around Dien Bien Phu would not in any way break the stranglehold they had. People just pull back until the bombers go away; then they move right back in. But that once we had committed our military forces, even the Air Force, to a military operation, we then had only one of two choices if it failed--to retreat with our tail between our legs and show all our friends and allies that we were all bluff and we conducted these operations, but when they didn't work, we pulled out and abandoned, or to go in and pursue it to the end with as much force, ground forces and everything else that was required. President Eisenhower said in that luncheon meeting, which I was one of a very small group, which included the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of State, "Never while I'm President will we go in with ground troops into Vietnam."

Q: But how did the Belgians feel about this? In a way, we were supporting a colonial war of a nature in Vietnam. Or was this not as much of an issue while you were there as it became later?

MACARTHUR: This wasn't much of an issue. You know, the thing that we so often forget in the Foreign Service is that to most people in Europe that don't have direct interest--and France had a direct interest, Britain had an interest in Hong Kong--but to the rest of the continent of Europe, the Far East and the Pacific, what happens there is not their business. They've got no commitments there, they're not going to get involved there, and "that's America's problem; let America deal with that." That's a fact of life that you have to do. They couldn't care less. I say they couldn't care less; that's perhaps not quite fair. But what I mean is they don't feel any involvement, they don't feel anything; that's somebody else's problem. "We've got problems of our own in Europe with the Russians here along the line there, the Iron Curtain, and we've got problems with our decolonization, we've got problems with this, that, and the other. What happens in the Pacific, to hell with it."

Q: One last thing, and then I think we might come back another time to pursue this.

MACARTHUR: Yes.

Q: During all this time, there was one set of initials that wasn't mentioned at all--the CIA. Again, this is an unclassified interview, but at that time, did they have much intelligence or much input on the Congo?

MACARTHUR: I don't remember anything coming to me that I can recall that was

significant coming from the CIA. Perhaps they didn't send it to me. I don't recall it. But the basic source of our information of what was happening there was from Belgian sources who were there, and, of course, the Belgian sources, they put the military in in 1960, when they put down the insurrection, because when the lives of so many tens of thousands of Belgians were threatened, many of whom returned after that, but after that, they gave the Congo their independence. I'm sure we had CIA operatives there, but the Belgians, who still were operating these very large almost--I wouldn't call them communal farms, but these huge agricultural installations and Union Miniere's operations and the business operations, their people were going back and forth all the time with information about Spaak and his government sometimes coming to see me, with what was happening in that particular area and so forth.

They were still running these things, because the Congolese had never been prepared for independence, and they didn't have any people capable of administering and running industries or these huge collective farms and things of that kind. So there was a constant flow of information coming in from different parts of the Congo that we got in Brussels, and that the Belgian Government got 1,000 times of what we got in the embassy. Spaak would pass it on to us.

But I don't remember the CIA being a significant information factor. Certainly it wasn't insofar as the operations were concerned of Dragon Rouge or our decision to go in there. As I say, I'm sure they had people there, and they probably had information on the assistance that was being channeled through Congo Brazzaville and so forth, and attempts made to do it through Burundi by the Russians that some Chinese aid was filtering in. But the station chief in Brussels, whom I liked and admired very much, he was a very bright guy, he picked up all sorts of information from his various contacts in Belgian intelligence and the like, but all that was made available to me as part of my embassy input. It isn't like some CIA station chiefs, who send it back to Washington without letting the ambassador know anything about it.

Continuation of interview, May 19, 1988.

Q: I'd like to move to your reassignment to the United States as Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, often known as "H," in Department of State lingo. How did this assignment come about?

MACARTHUR: I must go back just a little bit. When I was still ambassador to Belgium, shortly before President Kennedy's assassination, Vice President Lyndon Johnson, whom I had known since my days as counselor of the Department, made an official visit to Belgium. Lyndon Johnson was supposed to know very little about foreign affairs, but his Belgian trip was a very considerable success, both in the personal way he handled it, and with the press reaction over there to his visit. He had an excellent meeting with the King and struck it off very well with Paul Henri Spaak.

Indeed, after one formal dinner, he had Spaak, who was the foreign minister, one of the great statesmen of that time, one of the fathers of the European Community, come back to the embassy. Vice President Johnson took him down into the kitchen, where we scrambled eggs for the foreign minister. It was a good human visit, and he enjoyed it. I had known him, as I say, and had contacts with him before.

President Kennedy was assassinated. Johnson became President. On New Year's Eve 1964, I got a telephone call from the Department, from the Secretary for Administrative Affairs, saying that I was to return on the next available flight, because the President wanted to see me on January 2nd about a new job. I got away on New Year's Day, the next day, January 1, 1965, and flew back. On the next day, January 2nd, I think it was, I went in to see the President.

The President said that he wanted me to give up the ambassadorship to Belgium and come back and be Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations. So I said to him, "Mr. President, my whole life has been spent in the formulation or execution of foreign policy. Why do you think I have the capability of doing this job?"

He said, "You know an awful lot of people on Capitol Hill from your days here in the Eisenhower Administration. You also hosted two successive American delegations to the Inter-Parliamentary Union in two successive years, and briefed them and their wives and everybody. You're extremely well thought of on the Hill. Furthermore, with your name, the people on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans, with the name Douglas MacArthur II, you certainly have a psychological business there. Your wife being the daughter of Alben Barkley, the great senator and former Vice President of the United States under Truman, gives you an entre on the Democratic side. Your general knowledge and the great assistance you gave me makes me think that you can do the job."

I said to him, "I'm very reluctant to take it, Mr. President, because I'm a professional man, and my profession is formulation and execution of foreign policy. It's exactly as if you asked a distinguished gent in another profession, say the medical profession, about my age, in his fifties, who had gone fairly high in his profession, to abandon the practice of medicine and become a lobbyist for the A.M.A."

He said, "I want you to take it."

I said, "I will take it for two years. That is the life of a congressional tour. But beyond that, I really don't want to spend the rest of my life doing congressional relations." I said, "My life is in the foreign field."

And he said, "All right, we've got a deal. You take it for two years."

Well, two years came and went, and nothing happened. After two and a half years, I reminded him of our agreement. After about two years and eight or nine months, I went back into the field again to another embassy.

Q: It seems that the President normally would not be paying as much attention to a job such as this. This was a President who knew Congress, being a creature of Congress, knew what he wanted, and knew the right person for this. Much more care, it appears, was taken in this appointment.

MACARTHUR: I certainly wasn't the candidate of the State Department. It was the President who dreamed this up. Whether it was the right appointment or not, one can discuss. But the President, of course, knowing the built-in rivalry built in by the founding fathers of our Constitution to preserve a balance of power or to balance the power between the executive branch and legislative branch, he understood that no presidency could be successful unless there were tolerable and good relations with the Congress, and that this was particularly true in the field of foreign affairs.

Because, as I may have mentioned, after I was well into two years of my life on Capitol Hill as Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, I took a canvas of about 180 senators and congressmen about how much time they spent on foreign affairs. The consensus of those 180-odd gentlemen was that with the exception of people on special committees like the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, the average congressman and senator spent less than 2% of his time on foreign affairs.

If I may, I'd like to talk about the importance of congressional relationship--that is, a relationship between the Department of State, particularly, and the Congress, because of this very reason, whereas local or national issues are the issues on which the Congress at that time spent the overwhelming majority of its time and were well informed. They were not so well informed and didn't spend so much time, less than 2%, on international affairs.

I think the most important principle that anybody that deals with the Congress for the executive branch to observe is honesty and frankness with the members of the Congress. They never forgive somebody from the executive branch that misleads them, lies to them, and gives them an impression which later turns out to be quite incorrect. In my dealings with the Congress, this is the reason why I explained to Secretary [Dean] Rusk that I must be in on the inner circle, because I could deliberately mislead members of the Congress if I didn't know the direction in which the thinking was going, even if the final decision had not been made. When you go over to Congress, they say to you, "What about this article I read in such and such a paper this morning about the administration doing this in the field of foreign affairs?" And if you don't know what's happening and the direction in which the Department is leading in a discussion of that article, you might undeliberately mislead them.

Q: Or give the idea that you really aren't knowledgeable, and therefore you're dismissed.

MACARTHUR: Or the idea that you're concealing something.

When we were engaged in what I would call contingency planning--only contingency planning, because the final decision of an important and very confidential subject was in

the process between the White House and State Department, when I was asked about such matters by members of the Congress, I would say to them very frankly that I could not discuss the substance, because no decision had yet been taken. It was under very careful examination, but any input or ideas that they had about this subject I would be glad to relay back to the people who were working on the problem where the decision would ultimately be made, and it would be relayed back at once, and very accurately, but that I was not in a position to discuss it, because the decision hadn't been taken, there were sensitive aspects, it was multi-faceted, and it was one of those things where their input, I was sure, would be appreciated if they wished to do so.

I found them generally responsive to this sort of thing. I didn't have any confrontations that I can recall about saying, "I want to know this or that." They seemed to understand that when it's put that way. But if the decision had already been taken and I had said that to them, and then it turned out later that I had lied to them, my utility would have been utterly destroyed on Capitol Hill. So frankness, forthcomingness, while at the same time preserving where it has to be preserved--and there are always sensitive matters that have to be preserved--is essential with the Congress, and it has to be done in a way that they understand.

Q: You saw your role as not only telling Congress what our thinking was and trying to get them to support it, but also to act as the relay back to the inner counsels of the Department of State about Congress, the thinking of Congress.

MACARTHUR: Yes, but, of course, part of the job as Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations is to keep in touch with the committees, and particularly the principal staff members of the committees that are dealing with the problems that the State Department deals with.

So in your relationship with the congressman himself, you tell him that you'll do that, but you're also not just dealing with individual congressmen; you're dealing with the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. You're dealing with the Chief of Staff and some of their experts, and they're frequently trailing you and after you for more input, and you're after them for the latest information on how the chairmen, particularly, because chairmen are so important in congressional committees, how the chairmen of the committees seem to be leaning or feeling about a particular subject.

Members of those committees don't hesitate to speak to the press about their concern about what an administration is doing, so it is a two-way street. The job is a two-way street, but there is an institutional job of dealing with what the Congress and the committees are thinking about. Then there's a personal relationship aspect of building a personal relationship with members of the Congress, so that when you have to give them news that is not exactly what they wanted to hear, the personal relationship is not destroyed, and they understand that it's a decision, because personal relationships are very important in our job.

Q: This transcript will be read by people interested in American foreign policy. You said

you would sit at a small meeting of the Secretary of State, when they were talking about relations or dealing with some country, and say, "Mr. Secretary, I don't think this will fly in Congress."

MACARTHUR: When you come back from Capitol Hill with the chairman's views on any matter, or staff members' views or anything else, you make a memorandum of conversation immediately and feed it in, of course, to the Secretary's office to the Under Secretary for Political Affairs, which in those days I think was called Deputy Under Secretary for Political Affairs. We didn't have as large a staffing at the top as we have now. And to the policy planning group, because in policy planning, they've got to know also what the Congress feels and what may or may not fly, or how strong are the personalities that are perhaps supposing something or have definite ideas about things, and all that. Of course, in the meetings, the record is there. The Secretary presumably has seen the memorandum that you sent him, but that doesn't always happen if he gets overburdened at a certain time. So if a subject comes up that relates to a policy that the Congress is going to have a say in, certainly you alert him to any problems or the personalities. Indeed, you make suggestions that he make an arrangement, maybe, to have such and such a senator or somebody for lunch, or make an occasion when he's over there to make a special effort with a certain person.

Q: Who would participate in the staff meetings that you would have with the Secretary?

MACARTHUR: I think they were at 9:15 in the morning. There was the Under Secretary of State, the Under Secretary for Political Affairs.

Q: Of course, Dean Rusk was the Secretary. Who was the Under Secretary?

MACARTHUR: I will give you the complete lineup, because there were changes made while I was there.

Generally speaking, the Secretary's small, limited meeting in the morning--and all Secretaries of State have it, Republican or Democratic--consist of the Under Secretary, the head of the policy planning staff, the counselor of the Department, the legal advisor, the congressional affairs assistant secretary, and the geographic bureau expert, if the Secretary intends to raise something that involves that geographic bureau, the Assistant Secretary for the Geographic Bureau concerned. There are two other people that attended it, the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration and not always, but on occasions, the person that headed up the economic side of the House.

Q: During this time, I suppose the number-one item on your plate was Vietnam. This was the period of the great buildup from '65 to '67, when we moved from a small number of people, maybe 20,000, 30,000, up to almost half a million. This must have been the major item you dealt with.

MACARTHUR: Yes, Vietnam was an important subject, obviously, and one of my jobs was to arrange presidential briefings in the East Room of the White House for key

members of the Congress, under the President's direction, with, of course, the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In that period, it was an extremely difficult time, because the Pentagon consistently underestimated the nature of the task.

You see, we had never fought a war of this kind since the days of our war of independence, when we were the insurgents and the guys in the bushes ambushing the Redcoats. We had fought the Civil War with organized armies on both sides. We had fought a Spanish-American War, organized, but against a very third-rate military power, where sea power was the principal weapon. We had never fought a war against an insurgency. In a sense, we made the same mistake that the French made in World War II. In World War II, the whole French buildup in military strategy for World War II, if it should break out, was based on a World War I concept of fixed lines and trench business, and not a warfare of movement and mobility. They had the Maginot Line and a large standing army, although not too well trained, and so forth, and they thought, "We'll sit in our fixed positions, and these guys can't get through."

Then World War II built up a different business that you could break through the massive German defenses if you could bring enough air power, bombing, and enough artillery, and enough metal and weight against the enemy. But of course, in the Vietnam War, an insurgency in a jungle region, those concepts didn't fly.

I think when I took over, we had something like 35,000 men in Vietnam, something like that. And then in several months, I hadn't been there very long--I don't remember the exact dates--suddenly I was asked to sell Congress the idea of jumping this up to around 55 to 60. The committees, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Foreign Affairs Committee, Armed Services Committee, and so forth, said, "Will this do the job?" And the answer that I gave them, which was the answer, "The estimate in the Pentagon is this will do the job." Then about three months later, you'd be back and say, "This really isn't enough. We need some more people." And it would be up to 85 and suddenly 125,000, and it went on. This process started undermining the confidence in the Congress that we knew what we were really doing.

I remember once setting up a big meeting in the White House East Room with the President presiding, Joint Chiefs of Staff there, on this whole subject of Vietnam. It was after we'd asked for another large increase. The Secretary of Defense, Bob McNamara, gave his speech, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff each gave their evaluation. Maybe it was just the chairman that gave the evaluation for them, but the other chiefs were there. I think Senator Stuart Symington, of Missouri, put up his hand to ask a question. Because McNamara made clear that with this amount of forces, 300-some thousand, 325, I think it was, or something like that, we could handle anything and win the war. Senator Stuart Symington spoke up and said, "Well, supposing the Chinese intervene. What then?"

And Secretary McNamara said, "We have war-gamed that, and with this force we can handle even a Chinese intervention." That was 325,000 people. We ended up losing the war with about 550,000 people there. So this was one of the unhappier problems that was constantly in the mind of particularly members of the committee staff and the committees,

of course. But also as the casualties started coming in, it became a problem for every congressman, because the families of boys that were lost in Vietnam started writing letters, so it became a very critical congressional issue.

Q: Was there anything at that point that perhaps the State Department didn't do, that it could have done? Or was the situation such that it wasn't a matter of management?

MACARTHUR: I don't think the State Department is in a position to--we're not military experts. We can't evaluate and say, "The numbers are wrong. They're going to need more men." Only military people can do this. It would be just like asking the Pentagon to prescribe foreign policy.

Q: I laugh only because they often try to do this.

MACARTHUR: Yes. Mr. Weinberger really wanted to be Secretary of State, and he spent much of his time, instead of seeing that we got the biggest bang for the smallest amount of bucks, traveling around the world and making foreign policy pronouncements, a practice which I don't think many Secretaries of State would have tolerated. Certainly that never would have happened in the Eisenhower Administration.

But I don't see what we could have done more than we did. You have misgivings. You lose confidence in the State Department when you get told each time that, "This is the last that we'll need. We can do the job," and then that turns out to be all wrong. I had particular misgivings, because having a long background in the French picture, I'd served in France in several incarnations. And when President Eisenhower, who was not going to get involved under any circumstances in Vietnam, when the French tried to get us involved, I did go over and see the prime minister of France and did make a commitment of financial and military assistance on behalf of our government to the French, to help them in their insurgency problem in Vietnam. They were running short of equipment and one thing or another, that they wanted to buy. I've forgotten the details of the whole thing, but I knew that the French, with years of experience in Vietnam, and with what they had put in there, were having a very, very rough time in the Fifties, and that the concept, when you're surrounded by jungle, that fire power can eliminate the problem, is all wrong.

When French General Healey (phonetic) came over in the Eisenhower Administration, to plead for Americans to put a carpet of bombing around Dien Bien Phu, to relieve the pressure on the French troops that were trapped there, 17,000 or 18,000, we had a meeting in the White House on this subject, a small meeting with the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford, myself, the Secretary of State, the President, and one or two of his advisors, perhaps General Goodpaster, then Colonel Goodpaster. I'm not sure if he was there or not.

But I remember when Admiral Radford, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said, "We've got two carriers standing 200 miles off the Vietnamese coast, and we can put any number of strikes in and relieve the pressure," President Eisenhower looked at him very coldly and said, in essence, "Radford, we can't possibly do that without grave

consequences. What are those consequences? First, we have aerial pictures and we know what the situation is there. A carpet of bombing in that jungle area, they'd just pull back and let you bomb the hell out of the area around the fortified defense of Dien Bien Phu, and then they'd go right back in there." But he said, "Then we have committed not just American prestige; we have committed American military forces to combat in this zone, and we're going to have two choices if it doesn't work, and it isn't going to work. This is not going to dislodge the Viet Minh," as they were called then. He said, "We have two choices. One, when it doesn't work, to retreat with our tail between our legs and show all our other allies that we're a toothless hound. Or two, to go in with ground forces and other forces and join with the French. This we will not do as long as I'm President."

And it was President Kennedy, you remember, who committed the 16,000 combat troops. We had some people with this equipment that we gave to the French or they bought or a loan basis, whatever it was. We had some instructors over there, I think about 1,000 people, on the equipment as the equipment was delivered to the French forces on the use and upkeep of the material and its tactical things. But they were not involved in combat, and they were not with French combat units.

Q: Going back to the period when you were Assistant Secretary of State, when you were at the Secretary of State's early morning meetings at 9:15, was there considerable disquiet or not about what we were doing in Vietnam among the people, or was it just, "Let's take care of the problem as we see it today"?

MACARTHUR: That's a long time ago, almost 25 years ago. I know that when we had the job with the Defense Department, they also sent their people over to the Armed Services Committee, of saying that an increment of 35,000 more troops would do the job, and then you have to go back to the Congress again, and you're involved in it, because foreign policy is involved in it, because an ally of ours is involved in it, although we're not involved in the Vietnam hostilities, we were involved in Vietnam. Certainly there were problems. When you have a situation like that, it was an embarrassment and one of concern, but the world doesn't stop because of what was happening in Vietnam. There were plenty of things happening elsewhere during that period.

The Department did not have a fixation on Vietnam. The Defense Department had to have, because it was the one that had committed the forces and said that it could do the job. We had much more than Vietnam to think about; we had the whole damn world to think about, the problems that we were having with the People's Republic of China on Quemoy and Matsu, one thing or another. During that period, they still seemed to be sort of a firm member of the Communist bloc, which included the Soviet Union. There were problems in the Middle East, there were lots of problems with the Israeli lobby. I'd like to say a word about lobbies.

Q: This is where I'd like to address some of the other problems. Why don't we start with the Israeli lobby.

MACARTHUR: Let me start with the whole question of lobbies. In the middle Sixties,

when I was doing this congressional relations job, I think the most powerful single lobby was the Israeli lobby. This was before K Street in Washington, D.C., had built up with all the modern buildings we see today. Because in those days, while there were lobbyists and people were sent here to lobby high members in organizations or companies to lobby the Congress, but the day had not yet arrived when we had this huge agglomeration of what they called corporate offices in Washington, which is now the biggest business in Washington, the corporate office, which is another name for Washington lobbyist organizations for industry and business and organizations' corporate offices.

The Israeli lobby was extremely, extremely effective on anything and everything that in any way the government of Israel felt affected adversely its interests and in anything that the government of Israel wanted, such as money, billions of dollars each year in support.

I had one very difficult experience with the chairman of a very important committee. I will not name him. I went over at a certain moment when the President and the State Department had reached an agreement on modification of our Middle East policy, to try to be a bit more even-handed between Israel and the Arabs in our presentations and in what we were doing. It was not a major thing, in my judgment then. But I went to the chairman of this very important committee and explained the reasons why we felt that the importance of the Middle East and the Arab world should be the appearance and the substance of a more even-handed approach to the Middle East problem, not always simply taking the Israeli position on any problem that arose in that area, in which Israel had an interest, virtually none in which it did not have an interest.

And the man looked at me and he said, "Doug, you go back and tell the President to get off that line." He said, "In our great urban centers, the East, Middle West, California, we have anywhere from 12 to 15, 18% of our population in the urban centers, in important urban centers, very important ones, are Jewish. The Jewish people are a very civic-minded people. The average record for the average American, just barely over half, 52% or 53% of them, even take the trouble to go and vote. They go and vote 100%." And he said, "You know and I know that the Israeli lobby is very strong, and that by and large, Jewish people support the position of the government of Israel." That was true at that time. He said, "Take a constituency that has 12% to 13% Jews. When election day comes around, that's 25% of the vote. And if there's 15% or 17%, it's over a third of the vote that's automatically against you if you oppose this particular thing. And they'll certainly be against this. So you go back, tell the President and your friends in the State Department that it won't go, that I'm against it, and there will be plenty of other members from the urban centers who are against it." And that's how they operated.

I had a very good Jewish friend who was deeply concerned about the growing impression that the Jewish people put the interest, although American citizens, born American citizens, many of them, put the interests of another country, Israel, ahead of the United States. He was concerned that the lobbying was so open and blatant in the promising of campaign contributions and votes that it would fan anti-Semitism at some stage of the game. He was a very sincere, thoughtful man. He told me how the operation worked. You go into a congressman's office when something came up that was controversial with Israel,

and he'd have a desk as big as this desk, six feet long, stacked, a foot and a foot and a half high, with telegrams from his constituents or from his state, if he was a senator.

This man told me how it worked. He said, "The Israeli Embassy knows, or is convinced that you've got all their telephone lines tapped, and when something comes up that's important in the Congress, a member of the embassy staff goes to a public pay telephone, he calls a certain number in a certain city, gets a guy on the other end and says, 'We want 5,000 telegrams on the desk of Senator So-and-so (or Congressman So-and-so) in the next 48 hours.' And there's no record, no trace of that or anything else. Then the organizational man there of the lobby whom he's called gets those telegrams on the desks of the senators and congressmen."

Well, if you're a congressman and had only a two-year pulse, and you get 5,000 telegrams on your desk from people in your constituency or in the general area in which you come, even if it's outside of your constituency, it makes an impression on you if you've got to run for re-election and only have got a two-year pulse, and maybe a year of that pulse has already been used up when you get smothered with telegrams and telephone calls and letters.

Q: Were there any other lobbies that were of particular importance that you dealt with?

MACARTHUR: Sure there were in a national sense, but in the foreign affairs sense, there was no other lobby that could approach this.

Q: How about the China lobby?

MACARTHUR: The China lobby, consisting of the old China hands, they were still there. They were still trying to make their influence felt about how perfidious the People's Republic of China was and what a danger it represented and so forth and so on. But by that time, as contrasted with the earlier decade, the Eisenhower years, where the perception in America, generally, and to a considerable extent in the State Department, too, right to the top . . . [telephone interruption]

Q: You were saying that the China lobby had pretty much dissipated its major strength by this time.

MACARTHUR: In the preceding decade, the U.S., including the State Department, and the Secretary of State, to a certain extent, Mr. Dulles at that time, certainly at the beginning of the Eisenhower Administration, we all regarded the Chinese-Soviet relationship as a steel-hard ball with no cracks or fissures that you could get your fingernails into, and that they would work and support each other, whether it be in the U.N. or here or there, more actively in support of the propagation and spread of communism. That, of course, was before the 20th Party Congress of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union, which, under Khrushchev, pronounced that war was no longer inevitable.

Q: That was 1956.

MACARTHUR: Yes, '56, the 20th Party Congress. The whole doctrine before of the Communist bloc led by the Soviet Union, enunciated first by the Soviet Union, was that war was inevitable between capitalism and communism, and that communism would triumph. Khrushchev, who came in--I'm reminded today of the euphoria about Gorbachev--Khrushchev came in as a reformer also. Under his leadership at the Party Congress, they dropped the inevitability of war; war was not inevitable. And they adopted the slogan of "peaceful coexistence." This had an effect on the Maoist-type leadership in China, and another thing that had an effect on them was a growing belief in China that the Soviet Union wanted the Chinese as partners, but as junior partners, not as full equal members of the Soviet Communist bloc. The Soviets would be the directing force, and China would be a colleague at a secondary status.

This did not come out publicly or very clearly until the latter part of the 1950s and early 1960s, that there were differences between them, that it wasn't this steel-hard globe that we had mentioned, with no cracks that you couldn't get fingernails into, that there were differences in one thing and another. So we did not have, really, much of a problem with the China lobby, not nearly as much of a problem in their vocal business as the Eisenhower Administration had, because that was before the scales had been lifted from our eyes, before we had realized the full impact of the 20th Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the Chinese perception of the Soviet Union that wanted Chinese allegiance, but not equality.

Q: I am speaking to you now as a former professional consular officer, where the great majority of our dealings with Congress and the State Department actually is done by the individual officers or the visa office, dealing with visa cases, passport cases, and all. This is sort of at the working level, but did you find yourself getting involved in visa and passport matters?

MACARTHUR: No. Those letters that you got, and I got them when I was doing consular work, too, in Vancouver and Naples, before the war, those letters are largely prepared by the staff. The congressman, if he signs them, it's a staff job, and they go to the proper place in the State Department, and they're forwarded to the consul or a copy goes, if they go direct. Usually they are sent via the State Department. The congressman didn't raise the multiplicity of that sort of stuff that, on the receiving end, if you're a consular officer, you have to take account of and write the reply.

Q: You didn't find yourself sitting down to talk about a mega-policy problem of whether to support our cause in Vietnam, and a congressman would say, "This is all very fine, Mr. Ambassador, but what about a visa for the husband of . . .?"

MACARTHUR: No. Congressmen weren't going to waste their time. Another thing that goes back to this business, the point I made that the average one spent less than 2% of his time. Even those that spent more, I'd call up and want to get a message to them from the Secretary or want to inform them of something, and I wanted to do it personally, not have it go just through the staff, because you can never tell what the staff is going to do, whether

they'll forget it, as they sometimes do. And if you do send a letter or something, that can get buried under the pile of congressional mail.

So I'd call up the office and say, "The Secretary has asked me to see the congressman (or senator) personally about the matter, and I'd greatly appreciate it." I got to know a number of these people. They'd say he was awful busy and everything, and then I would get a reply back, "Well, come on over at such and such a time, and there will probably be a roll call or quorum call. Walk over or ride over, use the little subway, and you can discuss it with him on the way over before he goes into the chamber."

People don't even begin to understand the burdens on a congressman's time. Every day his desk is piled high with letters and pleas from his constituents, some of whom are important to him not only because they vote for him, but they contribute to his campaign contributions, others because if he is not responsive to their business, they sure as hell won't vote for him again in either the primary or the secondary. He's got then constant quorum calls. There's a quorum--back they go. Then there's another quorum. He's got roll call. They run him back and forth. And their constituents, from 8:30 in the morning, are lined up outside their door over there, waiting to get in and get at the congressman or the senator or somebody to personally push their business. So these fellows don't have much time.

One of the reasons that I favored what some people called congressional junkets, when I was an ambassador abroad, that is the one time when they're over there for an interparliamentary union or something, you have a chance to talk. I always set up a briefing the day after they got up there. If they brought their wives, their wives were to be included. They should understand the problem as well as the husband, and that was much appreciated. You set aside two and a half or three hours, first for presentation, then all the questions that they want to bring up about the various things that are going on in the world, because they don't just stick to the conference that they're coming over there for the interparliamentary union, which is multi-faceted, anyway, in subject matter. But they can bring up other things.

In the two and a half, two and three-quarters years that I was doing congressional relations, I never had the opportunities, with the exception of a very few rare friends who I might say, "Come on out on Sunday morning or Sunday afternoon and talk to me about it," or something like that, or would give me a half hour.

Q: I think this is very important for officers in the active duty Foreign Service to realize, the importance of these congressional trips. They may be buying sprees, but at least you get the ear of a congressman or senator, much more than most other people.

MACARTHUR: And he gets an understanding of your problems and the problems of when you answer these questions about visas and so forth and so on, that they're pretty formal and non-human, when a guy's on a quota, and the waiting list is three years on that quota, there isn't very much you can say to comfort that guy.

Q: I know. Right after an earthquake, I deliberately took a new senator into my visa lobby on purpose, to have him see this crowd of people screaming and yelling, just to give him a feel for what it was.

MACARTHUR: This is another aspect of the thing. When they are over on Capitol Hill, they're the kingpin, the king of the roost over there. But when they're out with you heading up a consulate or heading up an embassy, you're the wheel. It doesn't mean that you're arrogant or anything like that, but it just means that there's a difference in relationship. You're the guy that they depend on for help, assistance, entertainment, whatever it may be. There's a little difference in the feeling.

Q: I understand. Before we move on to your next assignment, I would like to ask about your relationships with some of the key members of Congress. Obviously, during the Vietnam War and that period, Senator William Fulbright of Arkansas was a major figure. How did you get along with him?

MACARTHUR: I got along well with Bill Fulbright. I had known him for many years. He had made many trips abroad to various places where I happened to be. He was always a member of the interparliamentary union delegation, or almost always. My wife and Betty Fulbright were great friends. We all were friends in everything else. This doesn't mean that it made it, when he had his mind fixed or anything, that just because out of friendship, he would change an opinion that he held very, very strongly. But it did mean that you had access to him.

The other one, of course, whom I'd known even better and longer was the Majority Leader of the Senate, Senator Mike Mansfield, whom I first knew as a congressman when he was on the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. He was also Majority Leader, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. But Mike, I had known all over the world. I had a relationship with him that was excellent--still is, for that matter. But he was also very frank and forthright in his views about matters. He was one of those rare ones that followed foreign policy very meticulously.

I remember President Eisenhower was the President that attached most importance, I think, to the relationship with the Congress. He was dealing with a Congress that was in control of the other party for part of his eight-year term as President. I remember coming back, when we were into the business of negotiating a new treaty with Japan based on equality, as Japan came back to replace the one that was rather an unequal treaty, which it had to be at that time, that was negotiated during our occupation of Japan, and which was the price of their getting their freedom back, their independence back. The President thoroughly understood that a treaty, no matter who signs it or how important they are or how stern the occasion is, is only useful and is only enforceable or will only be honored as long as both parties think it serves their interest. He thought that we should move to a new treaty, as I had recommended.

I remember when we discussed it with Mr. Dulles, we spent an hour-plus discussing it in

the White House. He said, "Okay, but before we move anywhere, you go over and sell it to the chairman and the top three people on both sides of the aisle, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to the Senate Majority Leader, and explain it to the Speaker of the House. Even though the Senate is the one that has to ratify, I want him to know what we're doing." And I did. Took me about eight or nine days to get appointments with all these people and explain it.

I got from Fulbright, who was Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, a very forthright response. He said, "Doug, I can't say that I will agree to any treaty that you negotiate," but he said, "What I can say is that I fully agree to the framework within which you're negotiating. That is that the treaty must be fully consistent with our other treaties, that we will recognize Article IX, the no-war article of the Japanese constitution, that the United States was responsible for inserting in the constitution, and that it will go no further than our other treaties in American commitments, and will generally follow that framework, with the exception that I've mentioned."

President Eisenhower, when we were working on the SEATO treaty, had Senator Mansfield and Senator Alexander Smith, a Republican from New Jersey, as members of the delegation that was to negotiate and sign it. We had it virtually finished. I was coordinator of the advanced party that worked out the thing. But we still had some parentheses, differences that had to be done on a leading member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and a leading Republican member, Democrat and Republican, were members of the delegation and signed off on what we finally did.

So the importance of working closely with the Congress and bringing them into things when you can, it's not possible to do it with all people. It's impossible to work with a fellow like Senator [Jesse] Helms of North Carolina, presently in Congress. He's a believer in hostage-taking. He's a believer, if there's a promotion list or a list of ambassadorial appointments, if he dislikes the politics of one, he's one of those that takes hostage of the whole list that's set up, and holds it until that guy is removed from the list. Under the archaic senatorial courtesy agenda that the senators treat each other with, it's very difficult sometimes to get things unblocked when you get a stubborn, opinionated, ideologically motivated guy trying to block something.

Q: Mr. Ambassador, let's move on now to your time in Austria. How did this appointment come about?

MACARTHUR: First let me just say a word about Austria and my relationship with Austria before I went there as ambassador. My first visit to Austria was when I was third secretary attached to the ambassador's office in the political section in the embassy in Paris in 1938. When the Anschluss came, Hitler marched in. Ambassador Bullitt, our ambassador in Paris, said he wanted somebody from the political section to go down there and get a first-hand feel of how things were going and the way it would be done, because Germany had absorbed Austria and we had not yet recognized this. It would be simply a courier run.

Q: Our embassy was still intact?

MACARTHUR: No, we didn't have an embassy in Vienna then. We had a legation headed by John Wiley. But it was gone, because when Austria became part of Germany, John Wiley was there and his staff was there, but eventually the legation was absorbed into a consulate general. Austria was absorbed, and that was one of the things that I wanted to mention, with the enthusiastic approval of the Austrian people, the overwhelming majority of the Austrian people.

I remember when I got there, being appalled, because it was just a few days after the Anschluss, and Hitler's appearance had always people running around with swastika bands on their arms, enthusiasm, and everything else. Why was Austria so eager to give up its sovereignty and become a part of Hitler's Germany? The answer, of course, goes back first to World War I. As early as 1915, when things were going very badly for Austria, there was an Austrian political Social Democrat or some such thing in the old days of the monarchy, I've forgotten his name now, but who wrote a document about the desirability of a greater Germany, in which the German-speaking people, that is Austria and the Germans, would be one. So when things started going very badly for Austria in World War I, a small minority that felt that Austria's future lay in the greater German world, of which it was a part, at the end of World War I. Austria, which had been part of an empire, was now a truncated state with few natural resources and major economic problems. It had been on the losing side--reconstruction problems. I know it's fair to say that there was political unrest, there was social unrest, which you always have when you have economic privation.

Then there was the period of the Thirties, with the assassination of Dollfuss and one thing and another.

Q: The Austrian chancellor at the time.

MACARTHUR: Yes, chancellor. And the growing conviction on the part of the Austrian people that they had no future at all, except with Germany. They were German-speaking, there was nobody around them. Czechoslovakia was an independent business and so was Hungary. So there was this feeling that the future lay with merging and becoming part of a greater Germany. So when Hitler moved in, there was overwhelming popular support for this joining Austria to Germany.

I remember seeing the hotel, I think it was the Hotel Bristol, when I was there. It was pointed out to me that up in a room way up in the top of the hotel, the chancellor at that time, Schuschnigg, was being held by the Nazi authorities up there in a small couple of rooms until it was decided what would be done with him.

I remember also that there was a disturbing streak of anti-Semitism in Austria at that time. One of the most horrifying spectacles I saw were these flatbed trucks being driven around as the Gestapo and Nazi people with swastikas--I don't doubt that some of them were probably Austrian--were picking up Jews and loading them into cages on the back of these open trucks, cages that were about four feet high, so they were crunched in there and

crowded together, squatting and crunched in these cages to be driven off to someplace to be held in deportation. Of course, many of them eventually died in the extermination camps. That was a thing that shocked me most at that particular time.

Then I had no further communication or relationship with Austria until I was Counselor of the Department. The war came along. When I was Counselor of the Department, I became a member of the Austrian peace treaty negotiation. Austria was still occupied at that time, '54, the eastern part by the Russians and the western part by the Allied powers.

In 1954, the Berlin Conference of the four foreign ministers, Russia, the United States, France, and Great Britain met in Berlin. One of the subjects on the agenda was the Austrian problem. Mr. Figl of Austria came and bravely put up a good performance, but the Soviets made very clear then that they had no intention of doing anything about Austria, lifting the occupation or anything else, until the German problem had been solved. By a solution of the German problem, they meant a solution of the German problem that would give the Soviet Union satisfaction. This was in January of '54, the Berlin Conference of foreign ministers.

The reaction of that in Europe, that the USSR was blocking giving the Austrian people freedom from occupational forces with all that that implies, was so detrimental to the general Soviet propaganda line, that the Soviets changed their position. Suddenly, we started getting feelers and word that we could talk about an Austrian state treaty on the basis of an Austria that would be neutral.

The Soviets obviously hoped to garner propaganda advantage from this change in their position, but they also were giving up strategically and militarily absolutely nothing, because while we in the Western powers withdrew their occupation forces back to the NATO area, the Russian forces were poised an hour and a half from Vienna on the Czechoslovak and Hungarian frontiers. They could reoccupy all of Austria within a matter of hours almost if they ever had to. So they gave up nothing strategically or militarily by the Western withdrawal, and they still stood poised on Austria's borders where they could be sort of a psychological influence on any decisions Austria was able to take within the status of neutrality.

I think one of the most moving experiences I ever experienced was when Secretary Dulles and Livy Merchant and myself flew into Austria for the final signing of the Austrian state treaty. The thousands and thousands of people that greeted us, waved to us, and many of them women in black, who had lost their sons and their husbands. And then at the signing a day or so later, the thousands of people had gathered in the Belvedere Palace, where the treaty was signed by Molotov, Dulles, I guess it was MacMillan, and Pineau, the British and French foreign ministers. Then there was this tremendous applause and shouting for Mr. Figl. He appeared on the balcony. These tens of thousands of people were absolutely hysterical with joy. Then he came back in, and they went on shouting and shouting. Finally, he came over and saw Mr. Dulles and the French foreign minister, Mr. Pineau, and Mr. MacMillan. Before that, he came back in and went out with the four foreign ministers, and there was more cheering. Then he went back in, and they still cheered. Then he went

over to Dulles and Pineau and MacMillan and said why didn't each one come out with him separately. But Molotov immediately saw what was up, so when Chancellor Figl took out Mr. Dulles, Mr. Molotov came right along and shared the cheers. (Laughs)

Q: Didn't want to stand on his own.

MACARTHUR: And did the same thing with Pineau and so forth, because if he went out alone, he was afraid there might be a deathly silence, so he went out with each of them and did not wait for a turn for himself to come out alone with Figl.

You asked how I came to go to Austria. When I finally wanted to either go back in the Foreign Service and be doing formulation or execution of foreign policy, or retire and go into some other line of foreign affairs activity, preferably economic, which I spent a great deal of time on, there were no posts available, except Austria.

I had warm memories of Austria. It was 1967, after the elections of '64, the various posts had been filed, but Jimmy Riddleberger, our ambassador to Austria, indicated a desire to retire. So I went to Austria, basically, because I had had the background and been a member of the delegation to the Austrian state treaty, had some background on it. It was within the EUR bureau which I had worked with. After almost three years of working with the Congress, I would say it was not the most arduous post that I had.

Q: You looked upon this as being at least a little bit of a place for some decompression while you kept your hand in the Foreign Service?

MACARTHUR: I did, very definitely. I went there, and I must say there was hardly enough--I shouldn't say this, but compared with the posts that I had held, I had to think to keep myself gainfully busy and doing things that were both useful and of interest.

Q: What were our concerns with Austria?

MACARTHUR: Our concerns basically, the only problem that ever came up where there was a bit of a problem were economic problems, trade problems. At one stage of the game, Austria, which, if I remember, was part of EFTA then, European Free Trade, that was set up. The people that didn't join the EEC, I think joined EFTA. I'm not sure if Austria was a part of EFTA.

In any event, it dealt with the EFTA people, the people who stayed out of the EEC originally, many of whom are now members of the EEC because it's been substantially enlarged.

The Austrians adopted a policy with respect to soybean products, soybean oil, soybeans themselves, and the like, which, in effect, closed the door on the market for American soybeans. Although the Austrian market was not a terribly important market, this was a problem for us. It had been assumed that we would simply sit back and accept one country's position, because if you accepted such a position from one, then everybody else goes on and says, "They let them get away with that. We'll do the same thing because it's

competing with our vegetable oil people." In countries that have substantial agricultural communities, this is an important point.

So when I did this, I went to the chancellor and the foreign minister, who happened to be Kurt Waldheim at that time, and said that if this was not lifted, I would have no choice but to recommend that we take a measured, but definite, response, and my recommendation would be that we would put prohibitive tariffs on the export of all their splendid, outstanding winter garments of various kinds, woolens and other things, all kinds of knitwear and so forth that people over here, particularly the big and expensive stores, treasured, because they had the highest quality, and they're magnificent if you're a skier or like winter sports, or even if you like to walk.

So we solved this amicably by my not having to make that recommendation, and the Austrians now putting into effect the rule that affected our soybeans. That, frankly, is the only active matter that I remember ever having to negotiate with them.

On the other hand, my principal interest in Austria was that it was the finest listening post in Eastern Europe into the Soviet bloc of Eastern Europe, because of Austria's past history and the empire, the Holy Roman empire, then the Austrian empire. You look in the telephone book, and there's every nationality of Eastern Europe there. Every family has cousins in Czechoslovakia, Poland, what is now Yugoslavia, the various parts of it all around. These people were permitted to come over and visit their relatives in neutral Austria. You could get together with them in their family home and pick up the feelings and what was going on inside these countries, but not the stuff that you can read in the newspapers. What the people felt, what the flow of opinion was about things that were happening.

This was a fascinating experience for me, because sometimes there would be the Poles about what they were thinking about this and that and the other things, or the Czechs. Of course, the Dubcek matter was coming along in '68. Then there was the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia, when the Dubcek power came to an end. The hundreds of people that had been vacationing in Austria and in Italy gathered together all these cars with Austrian license, people talking whether or not they should go back to Czechoslovakia or declare themselves political refugees or something. But basically, what I'm talking about are the people that came out of Hungary, some of the Yugoslavs, although Yugoslavia was not part of the Soviet bloc. They broke in '48, as you remember. Tito broke with the bloc, although still a communist state. This was the most interesting and fascinating thing for me. Of course, the Austrian people are charming, warm, friendly people. I saw a great deal of the country. I did a lot of traveling, because I had the time in different areas, had different problems, different economic outlooks.

Q: You mentioned the charming Austrian people. Did you ever sometimes have a flashback to these flatbed trucks and the anti-Semitism that you saw?

MACARTHUR: Sure. The Austrians were leaning over backwards at that time to overcome that past, and it was a place where people were allowed from the Soviet Union.

Emigres were allowed to go to Austria en route to someplace, because it was not aligned and had a status of neutrality.

I remember of all the states of Eastern Europe, the most brutally dictatorial state was Romania at that time, of Ceausescu. They allowed nobody outside the bloc to Austria. Finally, while I was there, they finally allowed a large motorbus with 72 people to come out to neutral Austria only, to sightsee and get a little change. Of the 72, 68 defected and became refugees, and the Austrians took care of these people from Eastern Europe until they could be placed elsewhere. So when I was there, I saw no vestiges of anti-Semitism in the various places that I went, because, I repeat, Austria was trying to overcome its past, just as Kurt Waldheim was trying to overcome his past by not mentioning in his biography, when he was U.N. Secretary General, his duties with the German Army down south of Austria during that critical period in Yugoslavia and Greece, when things were happening that he couldn't prevent.

I'm not one of those that say that because the Austrians fought with Hitler, they were all pro-Hitler, by any manner of means, because once a country's taken over by a ruthless, brutal system such as the Hitlerian system, you do what you're told and ordered to do, or the Gestapo comes and gets you, and you go to a concentration camp. But not only you may go to a concentration camp; your family can go, too.

I'm not sympathetic with collaborationists, for obvious reasons, having served in France during the German occupation. But I can understand how young Austrian men called up to the colors, under Hitler, to serve had no choice but to do that or go into a concentration camp.

It's also interesting that Hitler, an Austrian himself, didn't trust them too much. The reason that the parks were so full of old women in black, feeding the birds and squirrels on Sundays, sitting alone, all alone, or two or three of them huddled together, was that Hitler sent the Austrian divisions to the eastern front, where they were just torn to shreds by the Russians, and many, many, many families, there were only the women left. They lost their children, their brothers, their fathers. They lost everybody.

Q: Was the embassy well staffed to deal with the intelligence potential of Austria as a listening post?

MACARTHUR: I think we had a good system. We had the usual setup that one has. We had a CIA representative and so forth. The intelligence estimate, the interesting part to me was not the military intelligence aspects so much, because the Allies had poolings of information and different intelligence services, but it was the psychological feelings of people. Because down the road, if people feel certain ways and certain things happen, that influences mass movements in one way or another. We've seen that in Poland, with solidarity and other things.

Q: I was in charge of the consular section in Yugoslavia in Belgrade much of the time when you were in Austria. We were dealing with people who were seeking asylum from other

East European countries, and we played somewhat of a passive role there, being a Communist country, although the Yugoslavs were not trying to force people back to their own countries. How about in Austria? There was a tremendous flood at the time you were there of Yugoslavs who were going. Those of us in Yugoslavia considered them mostly to be economic refugees, rather than political ones. You were receiving refugees from all over, and this was a burden on the Austrians. What role did we play? Were you saying, "Please do more, and we'll try to help you out?"

MACARTHUR: No. We welcomed the fact that they were so kind and good, if you will, to these refugees, because they were. They established places for them to stay and live while they were waiting to go further on. We thought that was fine. But I, frankly, don't remember. This was an initiative that was Austrian; we had nothing to do with the initiative.

As I said earlier, I think they have recollections that other people might remember how they embraced Hitler, and the disaster that that had been, and they themselves had been an occupied people by the Russians, and a lot of things that were very terrible happened in the Russian zone of occupation, as you can imagine. I'm not saying that there weren't incidents from time to time in any zone of occupation, but what I'm saying is that they'd been through an experience of occupation and having no country, no nationality, no government, being an occupied power. I say no government in the sense of no sovereignty. I think there was a genuine desire to be helpful, in addition to the fact that for some, certainly it was a desire to overcome any impression that they had welcomed Hitler's atrocities, rather than welcomed a greater German state.

Q: So your role and the role of the embassy was not one of intervening or saying, "Do the right thing."

MACARTHUR: No, we didn't have anything to do with that. That was an Austrian problem, their responsibility. Once you start going and intervening, they say, "Fine. Give us more help. You do more. Take more people," and all the rest of it. This was an Austrian initiative, and it was theirs, and they did an excellent and very fine job. They are a great people. They are a people that have some very sterling qualities.

Q: Mr. Ambassador, you were mentioning Kurt Waldheim, who was the foreign minister when you were there. He's a figure of some controversy that has certainly been on the center stage in the world for some time. At that time, what was your evaluation of him?

MACARTHUR: I had a very close and friendly relationship with Kurt Waldheim. I used to stop by almost every day at his office, not always to see him, but to see his chef de cabinet, to see if there were any problems, if anything was new, if they had anything on their mind, because I had a certain amount of time. Time wasn't as tightly scheduled as it had been here in Washington and certain other posts. My relationship with him and his wife, Sissy, and my wife, were warm and friendly. He was warm and friendly. We had no political problems between the United States and Austria, and it was just a very pleasant relationship.

Of course, the controversy that has arisen about him covered a part of his career about which none of us had any knowledge about at the time.

Q: For the record, at the present time Kurt Waldheim has become president of Austria. His role during World War II as an intelligence officer with the German Army in both Yugoslavia and Greece and its dealings with partisans and deportation of Jews has come under considerable scrutiny and criticism.

MACARTHUR: My own feeling is that the greatest mistake that Kurt Waldheim made was when his biography was published and his credentials and background were looked into before he became Secretary General of the United Nations, that the fact that he served in the German Army was not included in it. Because the choice was either go where you're called if you're called under the colors, or go to a concentration camp and the gas chamber and the oven. I think, from the very beginning, he's said he served with this unit and so forth. Some people would say maybe he wouldn't have gotten the U.N. job at that time. Well, maybe he wouldn't have gotten the U.N. job, but certainly he would have avoided a terrible situation which he presently finds himself in.

Q: This is somewhat similar to the one that probably Richard Nixon had in the Watergate situation.

MACARTHUR: I think it's very similar. If, at the very beginning, Waldheim had said, "Yes, this happened. I was there. I didn't contribute to anybody's death or deportation or anything else, but I was assigned and off I went. If I was a mutineer, they could shoot me or do whatever they wanted with me."

Q: Mr. Ambassador, we have probably reached the end of this interview. There has been an interview done with you, concerning your last assignment as ambassador to the very important country of Iran, and at some point I would like to interview you concerning maybe any additions that were not included in this interview, which was conducted from somebody at Columbia University.

MACARTHUR: Do you have a copy of that?

Q: I have a copy of that, yes.

MACARTHUR: Yes. I'll try to find it.

Q: We'll both take a look at it.

MACARTHUR: Perhaps after I've taken a look at it, I don't think I ever tried to edit it, and there might be things that I want to add.

Q: Good. One question I would like to ask, because I'm hoping the series of interviews, among other things, will be read by young Foreign Service officers or people interested in

the Foreign Service, looking at it today, rather than back over your career, but looking at it today, because you keep your hand in, how do you see the Foreign Service as a career today? Would you recommend this to a grandchild, the American Foreign Service?

MACARTHUR: Foreign Service, in my judgment, has been enlarged too much. Certainly that was true in the early Seventies, when I retired. If you look at the size of the British or French or German foreign affairs establishment, the equivalent of our State Department and Foreign Service, you will find that they do with perhaps a third less people than we do, and that's a good many thousand people.

The problem that I have with the Foreign Service now is that it's gotten so huge and there's so many people doing so many things at the junior level, that the junior officers don't get enough responsibility early enough. They're doing sort of routine things for years.

In my own case, I'd been in the Foreign Service only five years when I was one of three people selected to accompany the French Government, when it was retreating before the Germans, to be the American Embassy near the French Government when they retreated to Tours, first, Bordeaux. We thought we were going on to North Africa. One of three people--Doc Matthews, Woodruff Wallner, and myself.

Then a little bit later, during the occupation two years later, seven years, I undertook a mission for President Roosevelt, a secret mission which the papers, the documents--that's a different story, have not been uncovered--to try to enlist General Weygand, if we landed in North Africa, to do that.

So my complaint is that I don't think our junior officers, the Service has gotten so big and there's so many of them running around, we certainly expanded, I think the administrative services unbelievably. But basically, if you go into the Foreign Service with all this cone system and everything else, I don't know where you get the feeling that you're contributing something and get some responsibility placed on you, rather than just doing a routine job.

Q: I might add, for the record, the cone system is when somebody's recruited today, they're recruited into the administrative counselor, economic or political cones. It's a term for a type of specialization.

Let me ask this. Because you are still involved in foreign affairs, do you feel that with this proliferation of jobs within the Foreign Service community, that the people who need it, the President or Secretary of State, are any better served by having more people?

MACARTHUR: I don't think so myself. The Secretary of State, he's a busy man. He's got all kinds of things on his platter, and he listens to key advisors, a handful, five or six people, usually. I'm not referring to the President, of course, who is the boss, but I mean the Secretary of State, in reaching his own conclusions.

We have developed a habit of increasingly going outside the Service for key advisors. I'm not saying that you can't go outside the Service usefully, but if

you do go outside the Service with somebody that has a nodding acquaintance, maybe, with the facts of international life and that's all, they go through a learning process, with the new Secretary of State going through a learning process. And there isn't the continuity that the British and the French have with the secretary general and a career staff. They couldn't afford the luxury and the mistakes we make sometimes which are certainly, in part, due to people that are brought in from the outside because of their support of the party and their political friends and colleagues, that contribute not as much as somebody that knew the score would.

The other thing about the Foreign Service is, I think the greatest mistake as one goes along in the Foreign Service is to fail when a policy comes up or a problem comes up that you have reservations about, even if the Secretary has strong feelings about it, you're in a position to speak to him or to your boss, if he's the ambassador, not to make your views known. Because if you're an ambassador or the Secretary of State, no matter who you are, you have your limitations, you have your preconceptions of the problem that are in your subconscious, you have your way of looking at it.

As General Eisenhower once put it, "When you look at some of these problems, there are areas of gray and black. You just see the front of it, largely, and you don't know what the gray and the black is behind it." Sometimes by challenging a view held fairly strongly by the Secretary of State or by the head of your bureau or whoever it is, with valid reasons, you illuminate these areas of blackness and grayness and make for a better policy.

So what I'm saying is I think the worst thing that can happen to anybody who goes into the Foreign Service is to be a "yes" man. Now, I don't mean to be an absolute idiot and simply go around trying to challenge everything that's somebody said, for the sake of challenging it, or trying to test, as a vice consul did in Iran, the limits of what he could get away with, the limits of tolerance.

Q: Will you give me an example? I'm not sure that was covered in your other interview.

MACARTHUR: In Iran, we had a vice consul assigned to Tabriz. It was a two-officer post, quite busy. He had already been in the Department and he had strong political views about Vietnam. He had tested to the limit and gotten away with it, the Department's indulgence. He was assigned to Tabriz, and then whenever there was a protest in the United States about Vietnam, he would refuse to work, go to the office, or do anything, and leave the burden to his staff. This was brought to the embassy's attention.

I had such strong feelings about it that I designated a very fine officer, who was head of the political section. I said, "I'd like you to set a panel and make a recommendation on this business. Because to me, I feel so strongly that when a demonstration is occurring halfway around the world by some organization that's against our involvement in Vietnam, that he, as an act of loyalty to that demonstration around the world, refuses to carry out his duties and refuses to go to the office, leaves the whole burden on his principal officer, or if the principal officer happens to be away, lets the office stay closed, is all wrong."

In any event, the report was made on his activity, and he was not included on the next promotion list. He immediately, with the aid of that strange organization, the American Civil Liberties Union, brought a \$2 million suit against me and the Department and other people, for having deprived him of his promotion and his rights.

I remember I came back here to make a deposition to the ACLU, the lawyers, I forget the legal term now, before the trial started, and went through the whole business. Then at the end, my wife had been ill, and I had to get back to Europe. It was after my retirement that this suit was brought. I came over at my expense, not at theirs. One of the lawyers of the ACLU who had accompanied me downstairs said, "Ambassador, let me get a taxi for you. They're hard to get at this time of day." We had gone through the whole day, and it was around about 5:00 o'clock. He said, "If I had known what I have heard today, I never would have been a part of the ACLU's team on this particular case." But it went before the court and it was thrown out. Then it was appealed and was thrown out again.

So when you try to test the limits of tolerance and the like in the performance of the duties you're sworn to perform, I think if you have the advantages of being in the Foreign Service, there are obligations that go with it. We're just as much obligations as the members of the armed forces. In the armed forces, it would perhaps be called mutiny, insubordination, whatever it might be called.

Q: And give them a chance to sue.

MACARTHUR: Yes.

Q: Mr. Ambassador, why don't we close the interview at this point, and we'll both take a look at the Iranian time to see if there's any addenda.

MACARTHUR: Fine. I'll be leaving next week for Europe. I'll be back around the seventh of June, so sometime afterwards.

End of interview