

HOLY SEE

COUNTRY READER TABLE OF CONTENTS

August Velletri	1949-1955	Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Italian and Vatican Affairs, Washington, DC
	1955-1960	Political Officer, Rome
Thomas W. Fina	1952-1957	Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Italian, French and Vatican Affairs, Washington, DC
William C. Sherman	1960-1965	Political Officer, Rome
George G. Higgins	1962-1965	Second Vatican Council, Holy See
Douglas G. Hartley	1964-1967	Consular/Economic Officer, Milan
	1967-1968	Aide to Ambassador, Rome
George F. Ward Jr.	1974-1976	Consular Officer, Genoa
	1976-1979	Political Officer, Rome
Peter S. Bridges	1981-1984	Deputy Chief of Mission, Rome
Alan Flanigan	1981-1983	Director, Bureau of Western European Affairs, Washington, DC
Peter K. Murphy	1984-1988	Deputy Chief of Mission, Vatican City
Michael G. Anderson	1987-1990	Political Officer, Rome
Thomas P. Melady	1989-1993	Ambassador, Holy See

AUGUST VELLETRI Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Italian and Vatican Affairs Washington, DC (1949-1955)

Political Officer Rome (1955-1960)

August Velletri was born in Ithaca, New York, but after his father's death when he was just two years old, his family moved back to Italy. At age 16, his family

returned to the States, where he finished high school and began studies at Cornell. Because of finances, he transferred to Rice University in Houston, Texas. It was during his graduate work at Ohio State that someone offered him a position at the State Department. He has also served in Italy, Pakistan and various other positions in Washington. Mr. Velletri was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 1993.

Q: Today is February 12, 1993. This is an interview with August Velletri on behalf of the Association for Diplomatic Studies and I am Charles Stuart Kennedy. Mr. Velletri could you give me a feel for your background--when, where you were born, your education, etc.?

VELLETRI: I was born in Ithaca, New York. When my father died I was about two years old and my mother decided to go back to Italy. We were four in my family...my mother and three children. I spent almost 12 years in Italy.

Q: Where in Italy?

VELLETRI: Well, it was south of Rome in towns by the names of Terracina and Fondi, but I spent some time in Albano Laziale, which is right outside of Rome and also near La Spezia where I spent about two years with my uncle. I went to school in Italy and completed the third year of gymnasium. Then I returned to the United States.

Q: You were born in 1916?

VELLETRI: Yes, a long time ago.

Q: When did you go back to the United States?

VELLETRI: I came back in 1932.

Q: So you were in Italy for part of the Mussolini period.

VELLETRI: Yes. Well, during the march on Rome I was there, but I was very small. But even in these two little towns you could see the trouble between the Socialists and Fascists. They were fighting right in the middle of the streets sometimes. The Socialists were picked up and were given, I remember, large doses of castor oil and marched up and down the main street of the town. It was very embarrassing for them because naturally nature was taking its course. It was tough and many times I had to seek refuge in churches because often I was caught in the middle of these wild confrontations.

Q: How old were you then when you came back?

VELLETRI: I was almost 16.

Q: So you came back to...?

VELLETRI: Ithaca.

Q: What were you doing during that time and the time when you got involved with the Department of State?

VELLETRI: I went to high school there. Then I graduated from high school and went to Cornell for less than a year because I could not afford the high tuition of \$500 a year in those days. So I happened to get a scholarship at the Rice Institute in Houston, Texas. I went there and spent about a year at the Institute, which is now Rice University.

By that time I had an offer to come to Washington by the Securities Exchange Commission which had offered me a job. So I came to Washington and have stayed here ever since. From there I went to Dayton, Ohio during the war and then I went to Ohio State and did some graduate work and stayed on a while teaching. Somebody came from the Department of State and offered me a job in INR.

Q: This is when?

VELLETRI: This was in 1949.

Q: You had already done some graduate work on the Christian Democratic Party.

VELLETRI: Yes. I passed my orals but did not present my dissertation.

Q: You then came into INR. What were you dealing with there?

VELLETRI: I was dealing with Italy and the Vatican. At that time, in fact, I went to Rome for three months to get some information to write the NIS (National Intelligence Survey) on the Vatican. Then in 1955 the Wristonization movement...

Q: Now, I would like to go back to the INR period. You started there dealing with Italy and the Vatican in 1949. This is a very interesting period. One of the most crucial things at that time was the election of 1948. It was an open secret that the Soviets had been pouring money in and we had poured money in, particularly to the Christian Democrats. What was the attitude towards Italian politics, Italy's role and concerns about the Communists in this late forties, early fifties period?

VELLETRI: Strategically Italy occupied a very important place as far as the United States was concerned. I think we really feared a Communist takeover in Italy. That would have been a catastrophic occurrence. That was the way we thought at the time. All sorts of money and aid was poured into Italy to prevent it. Of course we worked very closely with the Catholic Party, the Church and the Holy See to prevent the Communists from taking over. The only place in Western Europe where the Communists were in charge was San Marino. If that happened in the rest of Italy it would have been too much. In fact San Marino was taken care of later on. I was in

Italy at the time assigned to Rome in the political section and was the liaison officer to monitor the San Marino question.

Q: How did we view the Christian Democratic Party during that time?

VELLETRI: Well the party was our faithful ally and we accepted its Catholic ideology. We were not worried that it would bring a theological government in Italy.

Q: What was the role of INR in Italian affairs? What did you do?

VELLETRI: We looked at it from the intelligence point of view. I think INR worked very closely with CIA at the time. We did exchange information. I don't think at the time INR had any great input into the policy making.

Q: It was just an analytical tool.

VELLETRI: Yes. If the analysis put out by INR was accepted and did influence the policy, well then I think that was to some extent incidental.

Q: What about relations with the Vatican in this 1949-55 period?

VELLETRI: There weren't any because, as you remember, the special representative of Roosevelt was withdrawn after the war. There was a gap. During his first campaign for the Presidency, it was rumored that Truman had made a deal with Cardinal Spellman. If the Cardinal could help him get the Catholic vote, Truman, if elected, would sponsor legislation to open up an American diplomatic mission to the Vatican. He won the election, as you well know, and he did present Congress with a bill proposing a diplomatic relationship with the Vatican, but Congress turned it down.

Q: It is hard to recall, but at the time there was great concern of church relations...

VELLETRI: At the time, I believe, The Washington Post was somewhat anti-clerical, and anti-church. Also, there were a number of liberal refugees from Italy, who still were fundamentally anti-clerical and viewed the Christian Democratic Party and the Vatican in a very negative sense. They heard that the Vatican would eventually dominate the Italian political scene.

I think I made a mistake in accepting an assignment in Italy, because at the time, the sending of a Foreign Service officer with antecedents in that particular country was not looked upon favorably.

Q: So the fact you were of Italian background was...

VELLETRI: Of course my assignment was not to the political section of the Embassy but as deputy to the political counselor who headed the Rome Liaison Group.

Q: We had these different groups. I was in the Dhahran Liaison Group, which was evacuations from the Middle East. You would be doing this with southern Europe.

VELLETRI: This is correct. The Rome Liaison Group was responsible for the evacuation of American citizens in North Africa, Egypt and the Middle East in general during a war. After the Suez War in 1956, I moved into the political section as a political officer.

Q: Did you get involved while in the Rome Liaison Group during the 1956 war in getting people out?

VELLETRI: Oh yes, indeed. Lansing Collins as chairman of the Group, and I worked with Admiral "Cat" Brown, the head of the Sixth Fleet. We tried to "pressure" the Admiral into using the Sixth Fleet to get the Americans out from the Middle East. The Admiral, was somewhat reluctant, because as he was trying to point out, the Sixth Fleet had the primary responsibility of watching the oil fields of Saudi Arabia. He reminded us that he could not spare ships and men to get the Americans out of all those countries affected by the war. Yet, he did help us a great deal.

VELLETRI: That I do not know.

Q: Then let's move to Vatican relations. When did you start this and how long were you dealing with that in Italy? What had the situation been prior to your taking over?

VELLETRI: Well, as I said, Roosevelt's personal representative, Taylor, left Rome after the war and all diplomatic contact with the Vatican was cut off. Pius XII was a true diplomat and refused to do business with the American Embassy because he always felt that the American Embassy was accredited to the state of Italy. Pius insisted on an Embassy official duly accredited to the Vatican if the U.S. wished to maintain any contact with him.

Q: There was a strong anti-Catholic Church feeling at the time in the United States.

VELLETRI: Especially in the south.

Q: They felt that the Pope was a subversive element, etc.

VELLETRI: Today I read that some religious people in the South are asking President Clinton not to appoint an ambassador to the Holy See. Suspicion of the Vatican still exists. With the departure of Taylor establishing contact with the Vatican was done through the Vatican Secretary of State. At the time this office was headed by a substitute Secretary of State whose name was Dell'Acqua. Archbishop Dell'Acqua was assisted by Iginio Cardinale, a second cousin of mine.

Q: Who was Iginio Cardinale?

VELLETRI: He was born in this country. His parents who had emigrated to this country early in the 1900's returned to Italy during the depression. I knew him in Italy when he came back. We

were just about the same age. In fact, he was teaching me some English at the time because I had forgotten all my English. Lansing Collins, the political counselor learned about my relationship with Cardinale and he thought I might be of some use in renewing State-Vatican contacts. There was, of course, Pius's initial reluctance to allow this sort of informal diplomacy, but I was told by Cardinale that Pius had been won over by Archbishop Dell'Acqua. CIA objected to all this but their objection was dismissed by Robert Murphy.

Q: Oh, yes.

VELLETRI: As you know, he was Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs and had the authority to decide in favor of the Embassy.

Q: What were we getting out of it and what were we getting out of these conversations?

VELLETRI: I used to meet with Dell'Acqua twice a week and we talked about American policies; worldwide and also towards Italy. Dell'Acqua kept us informed about the problems Italy was experiencing in Italy as well as in other countries. I think the situation worked to our mutual satisfaction. I cannot tell you in detail what was discussed at the time, but there is a record in the Department of State as well as in the Vatican archives.

Q: I am sure. Looking back on it how valuable did you find the Vatican approach to things? Did they have a good intelligence service? Did they have a different view of the world than we did or not?

VELLETRI: The "intelligence" was provided primarily by the Bishops throughout the world. The Bishop, as I understand, is required every three or four years, maybe five, I don't know exactly, to inform the Vatican on the political, economic and social conditions in his diocese. Probably, the various orders, like the Jesuits, may also provide some intelligence.

Q: What were we getting out of this? Were we finding out things that we could use?

VELLETRI: I don't know what the Department was doing with it. I have no idea. But I do know that the Church was our ally, not only in Italy, but in other countries where Church influence was considerable. To that extent if the Department knew what the Church was thinking in general or in particular, it benefitted us to a great extent.

When Pius XII died, the Cardinals organizing the consistory which elected John XXIII, invited Cardinal Mindszenty, who was "our guest" in our Embassy in Budapest, to come to Rome to participate in the elections. The Embassy had also made a suggestion to the Vatican to invite Mindszenty knowing full well that Vatican was not happy with Mindszenty living in our Embassy.

Q: Yes, he was a pain to everyone, including the people in our Embassy.

VELLETRI: He also was a source of irritation. The Vatican was interested in maintaining proper relations with Hungary. They could not appoint Bishops, train priests, etc. The Vatican was

interested in the welfare of the Catholic Church generally, and Mindszenty was interested in Mindszenty. He was still dreaming of being the Primate of Hungary and claimed that under the old constitution he was the legitimate leader of Hungary. They tried to get him out of there by inviting him to the Consistory. He accepted provided that he was guaranteed passage back to the Embassy. The government of Hungary refused to do that. The Hungarians also wanted him out of the Embassy and out of Hungary. Unfortunately it was not the course of action which would be approved by Under Secretary, Robert Murphy. When Mr. Murphy came to Rome, accompanying Eisenhower on his last visit before he left the Presidency, Mr. Murphy told us that the idea of getting the Cardinal out of Hungary was not a wise course of action since the Department was looking upon Mindszenty's movement out of the Embassy as a bargaining chip in our relationship with Hungary. Mindszenty would be pulled out if the Hungarians made some concessions. We tolerated Mindszenty. He apparently was useful.

Q: We must have been reporting back to Washington what was going on?

VELLETRI: yes.

Q: But nobody told you don't...?

VELLETRI: Nobody told us anything.

Q: You left Rome when?

VELLETRI: I left in 1960.

THOMAS W. FINA
Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Italian, French and Vatican Affairs
Washington, DC (1952-1957)

Thomas W. Fina was born in Pennsylvania on March 25, 1924. He served in the U.S. Air Force for two years. He received a bachelor's degree and a master's degree from Harvard University. His career included positions in Paris, Bologna, Luxembourg, Brussels, Milan, and Washington, DC. Mr. Fina was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy on May, 21, 1992.

Q: Tom, I wonder if you could give me an idea of your background? When were you born? Where were you born? And a bit about where you grew up?

FINA: I was born in Pennsylvania, March 25, 1924, and attended public schools there.

Q: Where in Pennsylvania?

FINA: Allentown. Allentown is in the heart of the Pennsylvania Dutch country and when I first started to go to school in the country, it was in a one-room school house built in 1863. There

were a number of children in that school, which numbered no more than about 25, who spoke no English, only Pennsylvania Dutch. It was commonly used by the street car conductors, the hucksters, farmers - even many of the older professionals - my dentist. I would ask my grandparents and uncles, who spoke it readily, to teach me Pennsylvania German, but that never got very far. They didn't have the time and I got along perfectly well in English. So I grew up speaking the adopted language of the new world.

Then my family moved to Winchester, Massachusetts. I attended the Winchester high school, and then we moved again to Needham, Massachusetts, and I graduated from the Needham high school.

Q: What was your father doing?

FINA: My original father was an immigrant from Italy. He came here as an infant around the turn of the century. He died when I was quite young, and my mother had already divorced him. The Pennsylvania German-Dutch background which she came from, and the southern Italian society from which he came apparently didn't mix all that well. So, unfortunately, I've had very little to do with the Fina side of my family, although I discovered on the other side of my family (the Witmers) that some of ancestors came here in the early 1700s from Alsace Lorraine.

Q: I was Consul General in Naples for a little while, yes.

FINA: In any event there is a long reflecting pool, and it actually had water in it--some things were still functioning in Caserta. And in keeping with the etiquette of the Armed Forces at that time, the reflection pool was segregated. There was an MP on either side, and on one side of the invisible line across the pool the blacks swam, and on the other side the whites.

Q: Incredible!

FINA: And ne'er the twain should meet because you had MPs separating them. Well, I'd gotten a taste of that in Biloxi, Mississippi in basic training and thought it was pretty awful. And then on various other occasions I went out of my way to sit with black troops at mess halls, and that got me into some trouble, but it was an eye opener to see that these other Americans--after all, all of them descendants of slaves not too many years before the Second World War, very few years, were still being treated in what seemed to me to be a way contrary to everything that we were out there fighting for. Well, that's an aside but it was one of the benefits that I derived from my military experience.

After being returned to the United States, I entered Harvard. I decided that Northeastern was interesting but not interesting enough. I had done well enough at Northeastern that I could claim to have the academic qualifications to enter a more demanding school. So I started a campaign of sending telegrams and writing letters to the Director of Admissions at Harvard, applying for admission well before I knew when I was going to be mustered out, but when I could see that I was going to survive the war barring some accident, so I peppered them with my cable communications, and despite many discouraging messages, in the end they caved in, and admitted me.

So I went back to the university at Harvard. I must have gone back in '46 because I registered in Harvard the day my to-be wife graduated from Wellesley. I went to Wellesley for her graduation in the morning, and then zipped into Cambridge, and registered for my own returning to school. I remained at Harvard, where I majored in government, graduated magna cum laude and then entered graduate school in Arts & Sciences in the International Affairs Program, with a specialization in Italy. And that was really the course of least resistance because having been in Italy for part of the war, I had learned enough Italian that I could get around. I had known none when I arrived. I remember arriving in Naples, our troop ship had dropped anchor during the night. We got up on deck in the morning and there was Vesuvius against the morning sky. I turned to the guy next to me, Gene Edstam, (who is now an architect in Washington state), and said, "How do you say yes and no in Italian?"

So it was after having spent a couple of years in Italy, where I studied when I could, that I figured the easiest language to meet my language requirement in college was Italian, and having the language and being interested in Italy, I went on and on. Well, that got me to studying with Gaetano Salvemini.

Salvemini was a famous Italian anti-Fascist, and one of the leaders of the anti-Fascist movement, a great anticleric--I shouldn't mention that here in the halls of Georgetown University! an historian who came to Harvard during the Fascist period. I decided I'd write a paper, my honor thesis, I guess, on some aspect of Italian affairs. And my faculty adviser said, "Look, you ought to take this over to Salvemini because he knows more about these questions than anybody else around here." And I hit it off with Salvemini very well. He was an elderly man, already in his late '70s, a great scholar and a wonderful man. He had written one of the great books about the French revolution and knew everything about contemporary Italy. He was an acerbic critic of the policies of the United States with respect to post-war Italy. He and Giorgio La Piana, who had been defrocked because of his support for the modernist movement in the '20s, were great friends. La Piana was Professor of Church History at Harvard, so I saw a good bit of them both and tutored with La Piana in church history. I was very much interested in church history and still am, although as an atheist, I came at it differently than La Piana.

So that led me to graduate from the International Affairs Program with a specialization in Italian affairs, European affairs. I then spent a summer at the Middlebury Scuola Italiana to try get my spoken Italian into more useful shape. By that time I was married--we were married in 1946. Then I got a Harvard traveling fellowship to go to Italy for the summer. My wife and I started in Palermo and worked our way north through Turin interviewing people from top to bottom.

Q: Did you have a theme, or purpose, in this traveling fellowship?

FINA: I forget what the theme was, it had something to do with the contemporary political situation. Salvemini had kindly written me letters of introduction to everybody who counted which was just an indescribable advantage. That included Don Luigi Sturzo, the founder of the Partito Popolare the original Christian Democratic Party of Italy, and various anarchists, socialists, and people all over the spectrum as a result of that. And then it was a time when you could just knock on doors and introduce yourself saying, "I'm a student studying post-war Italy,"

and all kinds of people would let you in. I went to Rome, went around and knocked on doors of various ministries. I met all kinds of people and they were very, very nice. I remain friends with some of them to this day. They were a little surprised at this young student appearing out of nowhere, getting by the various portinai and uscieri, and other obstacles. I must have seen a couple of hundred people. I ran from interview to interview. My main objective was to get to know as many people as I could, and understand what they were saying. I ended up with a lot of stuff. Anyway, that was a very good introduction to Italy--for my wife too since she had never been abroad before.

Then I got a Fulbright scholarship, the first year of Fulbright scholarships to Italy. It made it possible for me to go to Florence in 1950, and Salvemini had then returned there and that's why I decided to go to Florence so that I could continue to work with him on my thesis. We set ourselves up there in an under-heated suite of rooms in an ancient palazzo (the palazzo Frescobaldi) which was a fantastic experience. I proceeded with my research on the Marshall Plan in Italy including interviews to get to know people, etc. I attended some classes but they were very disappointing because the quality of Italian classroom work at that time was not challenging for an American. It seemed to me that in intellectual terms their economics teaching was outmoded. Keynesianism had not yet been accepted in the Italian classroom or elsewhere!. So the few courses that I attended were on Italian history. The Italians knew more, and were a lot more sophisticated about their own history than they were on most other things that interested me. That was a good experience although I was handicapped by not having a really native command of Italian.

After my Fulbright scholarship came to an end, I returned to the United States, after having swung around Europe on the money we saved from our Fulbright stipend--we went to France, Switzerland, and Italy. I don't remember whether we hit Spain that time or not, and England, before we came back to the United States. By then, I had applied for a job with the Department of State in the Office of Intelligence Research--OIR which was descended from OSS--Office of Strategic Services, the analysis branch of OSS. OSS was split up after the war with the analysis branch going to State and the rest becoming CIA. And there I was hired by Clinton Knox, who was a black Ph.D. from Harvard, a very able man who later became an ambassador, and who unfortunately subsequently died at a rather early age.

My field was Italian and Vatican political and economic affairs. We were located in an old apartment building at 23rd and Virginia - now part of the access road. It had no air conditioning at first, but a wonderful view out over the Potomac River, and over what was then already New State.

Q: Did you find, I mean Italy not too long ago had gone through this climatic election of 1948 where it seemed to be very much in doubt whether the communists would take over or not, and with massive infusion of American money and all sorts of assistance, and the formation of the Christian Democrats, they didn't. Looking at this, since we considered it a very touchy situation in Italy, but did you find this affected your reporting, this whole atmosphere, or how we looked at things?

FINA: My recollection, and in the absence of what I wrote at the time, one has to be prudent, but my recollection is that I didn't feel that the Communists were going to take over Italy. That seemed to me highly improbable. The only way that that might have occurred would have been if they had come to power politically. I don't think that I believed that a military threat was real at that time. And I don't think that I saw the possibility, or the likelihood, of their winning a majority. However, it was a very serious question, and there's no doubt that we were all genuinely worried about the Communist Party which appeared to be very closely tied to the Soviet Union through the Comintern, through the Yugoslav connection. There was no doubt in my mind at the time that Palmiro Togliatti and the other principal Italian Communists were linked to the Soviet Union.

I remember having interviewed one of Togliatti's close collaborators, one of his vice chairs, I guess, when I had been in Rome as a student, and it was a very conspiratorial business. I wrote a letter asking for an interview at the Via Botteghe Oscure, which was the headquarters of the Communist Party in Rome, and it took a long time, and many telephone calls before I was finally granted an interview. There were the usual security guards at the front door, and I was taken to a very small sparsely furnished little room, and eventually this unsmiling middle aged man, who I guess at that time was the number two in the party, appeared by himself, and wanted to know what I wanted. All this was conducted in Italian, my Italian was hardly...well, no one would have confused me for a native born Italian! Nevertheless, I was perfectly competent to conduct an interview. I didn't get much out of that interview except the feeling that these people really saw the world divided, and that they were committed to the Soviet Union.

(machine turned off)

Q: You were saying your impression was...

FINA: My impression about the Communists was that this was serious business and they were absolutely our adversaries. But the other thing that I came to early on in my experience in the Department of State on this subject was, that the Communists and the Socialists were not the same thing. And that is really the fundamental marker in my experience in the Department of State at that time. I concluded that the Communists and the Socialists could be split, and I thought that was the thing that should be done in the interest of the United States. That the main way to assure that the Communists would not come to power legally in Italy- -and I didn't think they could come to power illegally--would be to deprive them of their alliance with the Socialist Party which gave them a very big hunk of the vote. I reached that conclusion on the basis of my interviews with people in Italy, my studies in Italy, my study of the information that was available to me as an intelligence research analyst, at the time. The key to all this was that the Communist Party had made an alliance with the Socialist Party in Italy, that those two would function as one in the interest of the working classes, and all the methodology, and all the serious commitment which they had to reform Italian society constituted a very large block of the vote, very powerful. The question was, were they really the same thing? The position taken by the conservatives in the Department of State, and in the United States, and in the Administration, was that the Communists and Socialists were the same. Socialists were Communists.

This simplistic political analysis that was prevalent in the United States at that time, had antecedents in the Bolshevik revolution during the First World War. The Bolsheviks claimed they were socialists. That certainly put a cloud over the socialist movement which was by no means ideologically, authoritarian, dictatorial, or anything but democratic.

But what had happened in Italy by this time was, that the Communists and the Socialists had been the most aggressive and the most disciplined people in the underground fighting the Fascists and Germans. During the war the Christian Democrats, (the Catholics), were also active in the underground but perhaps not to the same degree of militancy, but nevertheless very important. These three had an agreement that they would work together in the underground, together with a couple of the minor parties, the Republicans and the Action Party, which was a very important group--small, but very influential in shaping the nature of Italy's post war system of government.

At war's end, the Communists and the Socialists stuck together and they split with the Catholics and other minor parties. We took the position--we, the United States, and our Western European allies, the two were now really the same thing: that the Socialists were simply Communist tools, if not willing, or crypto Communists. Well, I didn't think that was true. From what I knew of people in both parties, from personal experience, and from my readings on it, that was simply not true. There was no doubt that the Socialists were deeply committed to their alliance with the Communists primarily (but not only) because they had similar (though not identical ideas) about domestic reform. But it seemed to me the sensible thing to do in geopolitical terms for the United States was to work on separating them. The chance of reducing their votes at the polls I thought was very small. Worthwhile doing but still small. But what really would count would be to have them split. Once they were split the whole dynamic of the Italian political situation would change.

Those views were supported by, I should say, virtually no one whom I ever met in the Department of State. At a time when Mr. McCarthy and his buddies, the right wing of the Republican party, were taking the position that the Department of State was a bunch of pinkos, my experience was that it was filled with very, very conservative Foreign Service officers, and civil servants, who were if anything right of center, and not left. Now they may have had a much more cosmopolitan view of the world than the Republican and Democratic right. They had a much more sophisticated view of post-war collaboration, the importance of removing some of the causes of the Second World War. They were more supportive of the IMF, of the United Nations, of all those institutions that grew out of our analyses of the causes of the Second World War. And those things had not been accepted by a large part of the Republican Party, certainly not by Mr. Joe McCarthy and his more or less respectable allies who viewed them as a subversion of American values.

So I thought this was somewhat of a joke. All these attacks on the Department of State for its wild-eyed radicalism, when my experience was that most of my colleagues were very conservative indeed. And therefore anyone who came along to question the orthodoxy of saying Italian Communists and Socialists are really the same thing wasn't likely to find it easy going, nor did I.

Q: Let me ask. Here you are sort of a young squirt in...I'll call it INR, I mean how would you make your ideas known? And to whom would you make these ideas known? And how?

FINA: That is one of the great redeeming features of the intelligence community in my view, a tribute to the intellectual quality of the Department of State, and of OIR at that time. My bosses didn't stand in the way of my expounding my analysis of the situation. In fact their position was, we want you to give us your best intellectual analysis of the situation. That's your job. Don't worry about the policy. We don't make policy, but we have an obligation to present the policy makers with the clearest, most objective, analysis of the foreign situation for which we're charged. And we have confidence in your intellectual integrity, and that you know more about it than we do. You write it, we'll critique it, and we'll send it forward. That's your job. You've got the job of the intelligence analyst. Don't worry about whether its politically correct or not. And so the Deputy Division Chief (Clinton Knox) and Dick Scammon (the Division Chief) and the two branch chiefs for whom I worked at that time, Eddy Schodt and ___, and another very able economist, who were my immediate bosses, were very severe critics. They were very demanding and they were, I would say, very intellectually competent to question the views of this neophyte civil servant who said he knew what he was talking about in Italy. But they never tried to prevent my stating the views, they just insisted that (a) it be written in an effective way, clearly, unambiguously, and (b) that I be able to justify everything I said. So it was a very tough exercise.

But in terms of the system, the system said, yes, we want you to give us your unvarnished views. Well, the result was that as far as the intelligence organization went, I got good grades. The Assistant Secretary at the time, during the Acheson period, and maybe during the Dulles period too, was a man named W. Parker Armstrong. An investment banker, an East Coast liberal Republican, I assumed. A very impressive man. And pretty soon I began to get little notes back on my intelligence memoranda from various people higher in the organization, saying nice things.

Then, over the period of time that I worked there, little by little, I guess people increased their confidence in my work, and I was invited to be on the morning briefing team for the Assistant Secretary for Intelligence, Mr. Armstrong, who always had a briefing--I think it was 7:00 or 8:00 in the morning before he went in to see the Secretary, to gave him a morning briefing. That was an interesting experience too.

My entire period working on Italian affairs was dominated by the Communist Socialist issue, and while the intelligence people were willing to have this view presented to the policy people, the policy people did not want to hear of it. They not only didn't want to read it, they didn't want it written. So I was in constant, or frequent, conflict with the Italian Desk in the Bureau of European Affairs - the policy part of the Department.

Q: Maybe if you can remember any of the names, but other than that, how did they relate to...

FINA: Well, the Italian desk has the responsibility for backstopping the embassy. It was the policy side of the Department of State, staffed by career Foreign Service officers. I don't remember all the names, Bill Knight was one of the officers with whom I differed over a period of years, in a nice enough way. But he was firmly opposed to the views that I expressed about the Italian situation, and so was his boss who was a great deal more important. (tape stopped)

Suffice it to say that Bill and I were at odds about this, but his boss, the Assistant Secretary for European Affairs--what was his name? He was formerly in Naples, his father had been a CG in Naples.

Q: Homer Byington?

FINA: Homer Byington. Homer Byington had, shall we say, even more conservative views on this subject than Bill Knight.

Q: He really wanted the King back.

FINA: He and Mrs. Luce. I don't know if you've ever seen Mrs. Luce's airgram--I think it was an airgram--in which she recommended the restoration of the monarchy. Anyway, we had a running debate with them, and then embassy Rome weighed in on the question because eventually they got hold...maybe I or, my office sent them, or my boss..sent copies of this heretical stuff that I was turning out. One of these main areas of conflict was the question of the trade union movement. The Italian trade union movement, at that time, was divided into three general...

Q: It still is.

FINA: Yes, they certainly are still there. The Christian Democratic trade union CISL, the Social Democratic UIL, and the CGIL, the Italian Confederation of Labor which was the Communist-Socialist labor movement and the largest. Well, I was very much interested in the trade union movement, and had seen a good bit of those people while I was a student and traveling in Italy. My impression was, wrongly, that CISL would never become a significant trade union organization because of its historical (pre-Fascist) association with yellow (Catholic) trade union movement.

Q: Yellow Trade Union means basically like company unions.

FINA: They were historically much too close to management, and my feeling was that they didn't have a future in Italy. I thought that the way to break the hold of the CGIL was by supporting the socialist unions, because the socialist unions had the best entree, it seemed to me, to the Italian working class. At that time the socialist trade union was the FIL, the predecessor of the UIL. I had written something about the importance of FIL as a counterweight to the CGIL, in fact I wrote a rather big paper on the subject. That hit the fan and got Tom Lane, who was at that time the Labor Attaché in Rome, to weigh in. Now, the Labor Attachés at that time, and for all I know to this day, were named by the AFL-CIO, but principally by the AFL, and by their very militantly anti-Communist people back here in Washington.

Q: His name escapes me right now, but who was an apostate of the communist party.

FINA: His name escapes me, he died just a couple of years ago.

Q: We can fill that in later.

FINA: Anyway, the key Labor Attachés around Europe at any rate, were all AFL people who had been chosen by the very conservative wing of the AFL. Tom Lane always half kiddingly boasted that he was a card-carrying brick layer. He was a charming man. However, in political terms he had chosen the Catholic union --he was a Catholic himself, if I'm not mistaken--and he was going to do everything he could to make sure that the resources which the United States controlled, and they were considerable, went into support for CISL.

Consequently, when my little paper came out analyzing the situation and disagreeing with this, that brought down the wrath of the gods on me for that as well. During a visit to Washington Tom dropped in to see me at the Department to straighten me out. He had various black loose leaf binders of clippings which he used for his briefings to show how the socialist union was really nothing more than a tool of the communists. He was quite wrong about that. That was idiocy. But nevertheless he was very successful in convincing the United States Government, and everyone who counted, that that was the case.

It was about that time, and it seems to me it was 1955, that I came up for an orientation trip. The Department of State--the Office of Intelligence Research--periodically was able to send its analysts to the countries for which they were responsible, for on-the-spot familiarization to get themselves freshened up, find out what was going on, etc. And by some miracle, my bosses decided they would send me to Italy. That required the clearance, of course, of the Italian desk which was very reluctant to see a person of such debatable intellectual orientation going to Italy. And eventually it had to be cleared with Mrs. Luce who by that time was the ambassador. But, nevertheless, it was approved. So I went to Italy on my best behavior. But I intended to see as many people as I could to ferret out what was going on, to inform myself directly, because I was not very confident in the reporting from the embassy, and much less from the consulates. Some of the consulate reports were incredible. I remember one from the Consul General in Turin, in which he reported on going to the horse show and some comments by one of the members of the royal family who was there, that the women really should be wearing corsets. He was shocked at the appearance of these women. That was the sort of reporting that we were getting. But the consulates, of course, were not encouraged to do serious reporting. That got in the way of the embassy, but that's another story that I learned more about later.

Suffice it to say, I got to Italy. I had met Mrs. Luce back here. She was a very charming woman, funny. But there in the political section in Rome the deputy director of the political section was an officer with whom I had crossed swords back here on the Italian desk. He had been Officer-in-Charge of Italian-Austrian affairs. He was not, one would say, as civilized or gentlemanly as Bill Knight.

Q: Was it Wells Stabler?

FINA: No, this was before Wells, I think. Anyway, he was there. He wanted me to provide a list of the people I was seeing, and what I was doing in Rome. They really wanted me to spend my time in Rome where they could brief me on what was happening from the Embassy point of view. I'm by nature not one to want to be fed pablum, so I spoke to them, made my way around, met people there, discovered that the people in USIA were by far the best informed about what was

going on in Italy. The political section certainly was not. I went around and interviewed people in the political parties.

Now, the CGIL, the Communist Party and the Socialist Party were off-limits. We were not, at this period, permitted even to speak to them. There was no way in which you could go to speak to those people even if you ran into them at a cocktail party which in the American circuit was so unlikely you hardly needed a rule. My impression was that you were to look the other way. Therefore, I made no effort, much to my regret, to see the Communists, or Socialists or the CGIL. However, I did go around to see the Italian Confederation of Manufacturers, which is the CGII. They are on the political spectrum somewhere to the right of the NAM in the United States.

Q: National Association of Manufacturers, a very conservative...

FINA: ...a very conservative organization nevertheless, very interesting. They had a good statistical office, and they were really worthwhile people with whom to talk. I always find these people have a lot of interesting things to say. The Italians are incredibly articulate, and normally very analytical.

Well, in reporting to my keeper in the political section about whom I had seen, I wrote down...Dr. somebody, CGII. The next day there was a summons from Ambassador Luce. I was called into her chambers, and she pulled out this piece of paper and said that she understood that I had been forbidden to speak with the communists. "Absolutely, Madam Ambassador, it's certainly too bad, but that's true." "Well," she said, "right here you've admitted on this paper that you went to see Dr. somebody of the CGIL." "That's a mistake", I replied. " That isn't CGIL, that's CGII." Well, someone had changed the "I", that I had typewritten, to an "L" with a pen, because he, poor dear, had assumed it had to be the CGIL because he, I guess, didn't know there was a CGII. I don't think it was malevolent. I think it was ignorance. That hardly improved the attitude of the political section toward its young visitor from the United States.

I then went back to my interviewing, and seeing people. Mrs. Luce called me in again and said she didn't think I should travel elsewhere in the country; my presence could be misunderstood, and people would misunderstand. I was pretty mad but really had no leverage. So I asked if I could go to Sardinia? "I'll take a couple of weeks, or a week's vacation in Sardinia." So my wife and I went to Sardinia, which we had never been to before. I dutifully avoided politics, and we explored the ruins, and visited the beach, and did things like that, and came back to Rome. Then I may have been released to go to visit some other places, and I came back to Rome.

When it was all over Mrs. Luce called me in again. "Before you go back, what are your conclusions?" Now, talking with people around Italy hadn't changed my mind. It had reinforced my view that the Socialists were eager to separate themselves, or at least a lot of them were eager to separate themselves from the Communists, whom they disliked. And that Pietro Nenni, the head of the Party who was the key to all this, was interested in that.

Q: He was the head of the Socialist Party.

FINA: He was the head of the Socialist Party, a man of great repute, who had been Foreign Minister in the Italian government immediately after the war before the split came among the resistance parties. An interesting man, if not the most politically farseeing. While I was in Rome I was in touch with a number of Italian newspaper men. To my way of thinking, they are often the most interesting sources; they know everybody, know all the gossip, and are sophisticated people. Anyway, one of these journalists said that he had told Nenni that I was in town, and Nenni had offered to meet with me. That was pretty seductive. I would have loved to hear what he had to say to the United States. But the embassy answer was, "No," which didn't surprise me. It disappointed me, but it didn't surprise me. In any event, my impression through various newspaper men, and others whom I met, was that the Socialists really wanted out.

In view of my conclusions I told Mrs. Luce that I thought that the Communists and Socialists could be split. The alliance could be broken, and it would be in our interest to do so. It would solve this whole problem of whether they could gain a sufficiently large number of votes either to obstruct any movement in Italy, or to impair the ability of Italy to function in NATO. And it would remove the risk of the Communists ever attaining a majority. I said I thought that would be a very worthwhile achievement for the United States. If we could bring that off, we would have done great and good things in the interest of our country.

Mrs. Luce said two things in reply, as I recall: First, that was something that would take too long to do, and she didn't have much time; what was going to be done she wanted done in the short term. She wanted short term results because she was only going to be Ambassador for a short time. And secondly she said--I can hear her nasal little voice--"Oh, Mr. Fina, you may be a very bright boy, but there's no one else around here who believes that, and I guess we'll just have to wait and see." Several years later when the split did come, I had the satisfaction, (of no career value!) of receiving a telegram from the CIA Italian analyst to whom I had recounted this episode that read, "Congratulations bright boy".

Q: You're talking about a policy thing that dominated our relations with Italy for decades. My Italian is off, but the apertura a sinistra, opening to the left. OKAY, this sounds fine, but here's the United States which is not the sovereign power in Italy, I mean this is something for Italians to do. What could the United States do? We're talking at that time...let's say somebody says, "Gee, this would be a good idea," but what's the United States got to do with the Italians deciding how to configure their political system?

FINA: It's true, of course, that any of these things have to be done, or will be done, by the people who actually hold power in the country. But the United States there, and in other places in the world, frequently has what you might call the tilting power to shift decisions marginally one way or another. And we had resources at that time, financial resources, political resources, friends, the ability to blackmail, all the things that a great power at the peak of its power traditionally has done dealing with its friends and its enemies. We were placing military contracts, denying military contracts, subsidizing political parties, withdrawing money from political parties, giving money to individual politicians, not giving it to other politicians, subsidizing the publication of books, the content of radio programs, subsidizing newspapers, subsidizing journalists, granting and denying visas. All of the things both of a covert and an overt nature that a great power, at that time, and in the tradition of what the fascists, the communists, the Nazis, the British, and the

French, had done before, we were doing in Italy. Clearly we could not have placed a call to the Prime Minister and told him that we thought it was time for something to happen to split the Communists and Socialists. But we could have told him and other leaders in private and used the many means at our disposal to have made it easier to happen. Once we had told Mr. De Gasperi, for example, that we would support the elimination of the Communists and Socialists from the post-war coalition government and that is what happened.

Q: He was the Prime Minister, again, and again, and again.

FINA: Yes, a very able, exceedingly competent, politically astute, committed Christian Democrat, as well. If we had told him that we would support a governmental alliance, including the Socialists that could very well have happened.

Q: Well now, as you were there, I'm talking about you and the American delegation look at this, view the major countries as far as their cooperation? I mean were there some that gave annoyance all the time as far as where we felt things should be going? I'm thinking obviously of France, Germany, and Great Britain, particularly.

FINA: This was the period before the British had been admitted to the Communities and the issue of their admittance was a central political issue between the French (General De Gaulle) and the others.

Q: But they were a factor all the time, weren't they?

FINA: They were always the factor. They were always just over the horizon. We wanted the British in the Communities, and we made no bones about it. The French wanted them out, and made no bones about it, and they had a vote. The British sometimes wanted to be in, and sometimes wanted to be out. While I was in Brussels, we were still supporters of the concept of European unification. I might say that ended with the Nixon administration, but that's down the line. At this point we were committed to doing everything we could to bring about European unification, behind the scenes, before the scenes, while protecting our immediate political and commercial interests. Well, the French, the French Government, were always difficult from our point of view. French officers, who were seconded to the European communities, or who were direct employees of the European communities, were a different kettle of fish. The French had, and may still have, the most able, best prepared, cadre of civil servants of any of the European countries, as far as I could see, very possibly including the United States. French civil servants and diplomats were of the first water, well educated, sophisticated, with a great sense of the state, which I think is something that often is lacking in American diplomats, and lamentably, in American presidents, but not so in the case of French civil servants.

Q: Excuse me, when you say "a sense of state"?

FINA: I mean a sense of the responsibility of the individual for the collectivity of the state, not as seen from the point of view of one political party or another, but the state as the collectivity of

Frenchmen, or Americans, which has a stature that overarches the individual political parties, and the political institutions. A sense that one has a loyalty to the community that one represents, and that requires comportment of a certain dignity. The state is important. It has not only a juridical existence, but it has a philosophical and ideological existence as well which you, as a statesman, or as a politician, to some degree represent. And in doing that, you carry some of the historical burden of the state, and your actions are informed by a recognition of the past of that community. It means the sense that you represent something more than this morning's cable that you've gotten from Paris about what you're supposed to do. And that you're invested with a certain dignity because you represent a historical community tradition. That's what I'm talking about.

Anyway, the French have that, or at least the ones with whom I dealt, had that to a degree that practically no one else did, except, perhaps, the British. So they were very difficult, very effective people if you were in conflict, as was the case when they were opposing the admission of the British. They were very effective. On the other hand their people in the Commission were very effective in carrying out the goals of the Commission. So the French, and France, are two different things, and sometimes they were our best friends, and sometimes they were the people we most regretted.

The Germans, I think, were almost uniformly the good guys. They were very much in favor of European unification without protectionism. They supported the enlargement of the community. They wanted it to work. They made sacrifices for it to work. A lot of their people were absolutely first rate, not quite of the glittering skill, I would say, of the French but very impressive.

The Italians were totally committed to the success of the European community. They were committed on ideological and political grounds. They believed in a united Europe. There's a long tradition of Europeanism in Italy that goes back to the 1800s. Carlo Sforza, the first post-war Italian Foreign Minister, had been a great advocate of European unification. So they had the political will, and this includes the Catholics of course, who have a vision of a Catholic Europe. They also saw it as economically advantageous to Italy, and the Community has given the Italian economy a shot in the arm, and has helped to bring it to the very high level of efficiency and prosperity that it knows today.

But in terms of the personnel with whom I dealt with at the time, I'm sorry to say, they were poorly represented. Italians don't really want to leave Italy, and Italian politicians especially don't want to leave the home playing field where all the plums and all the careers are made. No one would dream of leaving Rome, which is where political intrigue boils from morning till morning. You know if you turn your back, you've had it. So you could never get a political figure of any significance to go to the European Community institutions. Not even as a reward for after you've been thrown out of something, could you get any Italian politician...a guy with political savvy, and skills, to come up there. Their best representatives were their top career diplomats like Prince Colonna. Otherwise, there were a lot of second string people. When it came to the recruitment of civil servants, the Italians really don't want to leave home. It's a much too nice place to be, so it was difficult to employ people even at the secretarial, or the middle levels, as well. That isn't to say there weren't some good ones, there were. But it was a genuine problem.

So when you attended a meeting of the Council of Ministers, which I did all the time as an observer, you'd see the French delegation come in and there would be Couve de Murville, the French Foreign Minister, big, handsome, striding into the room followed by a series of experts with briefcases, each one more brilliant than the predecessor. And eventually the Italian ambassador would arrive because the Minister couldn't make it, the plane broke down, or he couldn't come. So the Italian ambassador would arrive, and he'd come with somebody from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

And that was sort of the way it ran. The French fielded a brilliant team on every occasion, at every level. And I'm afraid that the people who brought up the rear were the Italians who always came...they were charming, and they knew what they wanted lots of times, but they didn't pack the clout that their vote would have given them.

Q: I was going to say, having myself been forced down the caw of the EUR establishment somewhat later as Consul General to Naples, I know these Consul General jobs, particularly in Italy are held like little jewels in the EUR establishment hands, and you didn't belong to anybody's establishment.

FINA: No, I was not a member of the EUR inner circle, to say the least. What happened was that, in Congressional Relations the White House assigned one of its people from Kissinger's staff to the Department to be the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations. David Abshire had wanted to put me in that job, and he told me that he was nominating me for Deputy Assistant Secretary, which I thought would be great. I was enjoying the job enormously, I liked the Congress, I liked what I was doing. Even if I was out of sympathy with the Nixon administration the things that I was doing were things that I believed in. I wasn't obliged to do things on Vietnam where I was increasingly uncertain, and the Nixon administration position on keeping troops in NATO, and on multilateral trade negotiations, GATT, and so on, those were all things of which I was very supportive as I was of some of their other activities.

So I was glad for the opportunity to get on, and David proposed me as Deputy Assistant Secretary. Unfortunately, the White House must have gotten wind of the fact that I had views that were not exactly safe Republican views, and I was black-balled. I'd moved into the office, I was settling my papers in the desk, I was feeling hot-dog, I'd made it. And then the announcement came that, in fact, I had not made it, and the White House wouldn't approve.

So that increased my interest in leaving H, and going somewhere else. Then Personnel told me that this job was up in Milan, there were a lot of competitors for it. But interestingly enough, the guy who had been brought over from the White House to fill the job that I had thought that I was going to get, was a 32-year old Republican whiz kid, who had restaffed the Arms Control Agency after Nixon's second term, and cleaned out all the guys who had been responsible for the SALT negotiations because that had been part of the political deal that Senator Jackson had made with the White House. The conservatives were being paid off by purging all these people of dubious wisdom who were in the Arms Control, and in the Department of State, for their role in the SALT treaties. Anyway, this guy appeared on the scene and he knew nothing about nothing when it came to the Department of State or foreign affairs. However, I rapidly

discovered he was a very attractive person, and he was open to learning, was interested, and very candid about what he was doing, and what he had been doing in the White House. He escaped the Watergate thing by a hair although his buddies were implicated and dragged through the courts and the hearings, etc., but he, Stanton D. Anderson by name, escaped all that. Anyway, I became very fond of him. I thought he was really a very able, well-intentioned, and intelligent person, who wanted to do the right thing. And he rapidly caught on to what he was supposed to do. I thought he was very impressive.

Anyway, about that time, I found out about the Milan job, and it kept escaping from my grasp. There were always further meetings, there were always further problems, there were other candidates. In the end there were supposed to be objections by other agencies to my getting this job. I'd been keeping Stan Anderson informed of this, and he said, "Why don't I see what I can find out about this." After all, he had been in the personnel business in the White House, and had been fixing these things. So he called the Secretary of Agriculture, whose name I mercifully forget, and found out that he really didn't give a damn about who was assigned there although I had been told by Personnel that the obstacle to my getting Milan was that Agriculture had put a hold on it. The Byzantine life of the personnel business.

Anyway, Stan made a couple more telephone calls, and I was presently informed that in fact I had been paneled and I had gone through, and I was going to be Consul General in Milan. So I owe that, not to my buddies in the Foreign Service, but to a Republican, and a Nixon Republican at that!

Q: I might add that right now that you're...what's your title, what you're doing right now? We're talking about this is the election year of 1992. You're doing what?

FINA: I'm Executive Director of Democrats Abroad, which is the overseas arm of the Democratic Party.

Q: Okay, now let's go back.

FINA: Well, Stan Anderson, after leaving the Department I might say, has had a very successful career. I forget whether he made his first hundred million, or whatever it was very shortly thereafter. He's now running a lobbying firm here in town, and he's been a lobbyist for the Japanese and one of the principal organizers of the Republican conventions. Anyway, suffice it to say that I would never have gotten a decent job after Congressional Relations, if it hadn't been for the friendship of this Nixonian Republican.

So I went to Milan, and found it a rather dismal post, run down, sort of neglected, and with a long tradition of trying to do as little as possible because the embassy didn't really want other people second guessing it on political, or economic, things. You were supposed to stick to airgrams about local agricultural affairs, or something like that, but certainly not be involved in anything that the political section in Rome cared about. Well, inasmuch as I was interested in everything, I was into everything. and I wanted to make the Consulate function the way I thought a government office should. It should serve the public.

So my period there was one of, I would guess, relatively high profile. I got rid of people whom I thought were not doing anything, and I insisted that we do various things. We remodeled the Consulate, got in new contemporary furniture (Knoll) since I wanted Milan to see that we were living in the present, creative world. We took down partitions which allowed local employees to close their doors and be insulated from that nasty public out there that wanted visas or other services. I opened it all up so that there was no place you could hide from the public. That was a revolutionary concept when I got there, but I wanted both the consuls, and the local employees, to be serving the public whether it was the American public, or the Italian public. I figured we were there to serve them. And I wanted them out, visible and available, and being nice to people. Well, there was a lot of time spent on doing things like that, some deadwood in the locals who were hard to get rid of but eventually they retired, or we moved them, or something. And I thought that the Consulate became a pretty effective and active place, because I asked a lot.

I gave people a lot of responsibility and I urged them to do things. My theory was that we should know everybody in our Consular district, which incidentally ran from the Turin consular district, which was Piedmont, all the way to Trieste. We had the whole of northern Italy down almost as far as Bologna, a big consular district. And I wanted to know everybody who counted, and I wanted them to know us. I wanted our people to go out and visit them, to find out what they were doing, and to know them before the problems arose so that when something happened, we could call up and go see someone who already knew us. We shouldn't have to make the acquaintance of some guy for the first time when we needed him. So we drew up lists of the people who counted, and assigned them to people as their contacts, and we went out and did it. I traveled a lot through the consular district, constantly calling on all the right people, the prefect, the bishop, the cardinals, the leaders of industry, trade union leaders, all the political parties and the press.

Another aspect of my tenure in Milan was having a very active social schedule. I tried to know everyone who counted politically or economically. That meant a lot of entertaining. To do that within the rather tight budget that I had, nearly all was done at our residence. My wife supervised it all and did all of the shopping. In one year we had some 1,500 guests!

My access was increased when I became Dean of the Consular Corps in Milan. There was a large consular community and some friction between it and the government for very silly reasons. The Mexican Consul General made a big fuss about the Prefect not giving an annual dinner for the Consular Corps! I tried to clear that up and turned it into a quite active group which gave me further entry to both the consular community and to the Italian community. It was a lot of work, but it advanced the interests of the United States.

Our residence was a new apartment that we had leased and furnished with contemporary furnishings and art. I had small lunches there with every sort of local leader and we also had larger receptions on July 4 which reached out to the broadest range of Italians. I did not want to spend our limited funds on the American community, so I organized a community picnic funded with private donations. That worked pretty well except that our Foreign Service people got stuck with all the dirty work. So that had some drawbacks.

I was in a very happy position at this time of having John Volpe, a Massachusetts Republican, as ambassador. He arrived in Rome a day or two before I arrived in Milan.

John Volpe was an unusual man. He was a Republican, and I was a (closet) Democrat, although I didn't advertise the fact. He was a very energetic and committed Catholic. I was an atheist. He was a sort professional Italo-American which I certainly wasn't. But he had a lot of qualities which I very much respected. And one of the first things he did, which has endeared him to me ever since, was that he changed our policy with respect to dealing with the Communists. From the time that I had entered the Department of State in the 1950s, until I got to Milan in 1973, it had been forbidden for Foreign Service Officers to deal with Communists. Until the 1960s you had not been permitted to speak with many socialists. Well, I thought that was absolutely idiotic. And I was so delighted when...I forget how it came about, but I asked for authority to deal with everybody, to talk to everybody, to report on everybody. And Bob Beaudry, who was the Deputy Chief of Mission in Rome to Volpe, a very fine career Foreign Service Officer, a very professional guy...I don't know how he brought it about, but at any rate Volpe agreed. And Volpe believed in it. His view was, that if you didn't talk to the enemy and understand them, how could you possibly know how to cope with the problems they were creating for you. So eminently sensible, but that was a politician, that wasn't a professional diplomat. That was a man who had lived his political life competing with, and rubbing shoulders with his Democratic opposition in Massachusetts. He had a much more sophisticated view of dealing with your political enemies than this very ideological approach that I think the Foreign Service had taken, and which was undoubtedly caused in large part by the McCarthy period.

Well, suffice it to say, that I began my contacts by dealing with all the political parties, and wherever I went whether it was Milan, or Venice, or anywhere else, I methodically saw them all. I saw the Christian Democrats, the socialists, the communists, the neo-fascists, whoever it was that was a political party, who counted. I wanted to go around and meet them, and interview them, and hear what they had to say. I did that in every provincial capital of my territory...it seems to me there were ten, or something like that, or twelve.

Q: It's amazing how divided as Italy is to areas (overlap conversation)

FINA: There's a great deal of decentralization, and long cultural history for all these places like Mantua, or Varese, or Verona, and Como. Each one of those places is a little society, and a little world. My objective was to go and see them all, talk to them all, find out what they had to say. So I began a series of telegrams, not airgrams, called "Cable from Mantua". Each place I went to I wrote a reporting cable.

Well, those cables gave me great grief, and great pleasure. I love to write, and I love to report, and I dealt with all the major political, and economic issues, that faced these areas. I reported with as much candor as possible without regard to whether that jibed or didn't jibe with the political views of either the ambassador or the political section, or much less, the desk in Washington. I believed strongly that somebody ought to be telling it the way it is. You may draw different conclusions, but my job was to tell you what they're saying in Mantua, and what they're doing in Bergamo, or what they're saying and what they're doing in Trento, or what they're saying and doing elsewhere. You owe it to your government to tell it exactly the way you see it. Washington can disregard your truth. It can conclude you're wrong, but you should never fix your reporting to suit your listeners. And that's what I did.

Well, the ambassador was very good about that. He was very supportive. The political section in Rome, I think, had a constant case of indigestion from these cables. One reason for that was that I sent them as cables, and therefore they got back to the Department of State, and somebody read them. Airgrams traditionally have gone to the researchers, and no one has paid any attention to them because you're submerged in material. And I wasn't interested in writing for the archives. My cables were sufficiently lively to be read. They not infrequently got passed up to the Secretary of State, and I heard about it. I heard about it in complaints from the embassy saying that I was getting too much attention for a point of view which was obviously wrong! All this business about how the communists were no longer communists, and how the Christian Democrats were stealing out of the public treasury. This thing only misled people back in the Department. You shouldn't do it.

On the other hand, Beaudry and the ambassador didn't try to stop me. I certainly didn't make any friends among the traditional right wing Foreign Service community. They didn't like being upstaged by a guy in Milan who was dealing with all the hot issues of the day, and with national level political leaders to whom I had access, and who were very, very willing to see me, and to talk with me. That included Cardinal Giovanni Colombo, who was the Archbishop of Milan, who at one time was in the running for the Papacy. I think he would have been very good, a very impressive man. On the other hand, it was his colleague the Patriarch of Venice who got the job, who in my view, was really a second rater. I had seen him regularly when I went to Venice. I always call on the Patriarch. An incredible experience to go Venice and call on the Patriarch of Venice, and you think of the history that lies behind him. But he really was not...

Q: Who was this:

FINA: This may have been Pope John Paul, anyway he's the Pope who had a very short reign.

Well, suffice it to say that I was busy reporting from all over the area, and obviously making the political section very unhappy. And, I guess, to make things worse, the ambassador started picking up my stuff as an example of what he wanted all consular posts to do. Some of them could and some of them couldn't. Some of them were interested and some of them weren't. If I had had only career aspirations, I would have done things differently. I had career aspirations, but I also had substantive interests in what I thought ought to be done.

Volpe was a fascinating man, but he certainly caused us all unlimited anguish because of his Italian-Americanism. I don't know whether you were there when...

Q: I wasn't there when he was there, but I heard about it.

FINA: He was such a nice, decent person in many ways, although he was pretty tight, I guess. The people who worked with him in Rome thought he was tight-fisted. I think what agonized us all was that when he'd come to visit, and we wanted ambassadorial visits...these pastoral progressions, around the country were important in public relations terms. He insisted upon speaking Italian, and while he speaks and spoke impeccable English, excellent grammatical English with a fine accent, no one could ever fault him on his English; when he shifted to Italian, it was just awful. He spoke, and speaks the Italian of an uneducated mountain peasant from

central Italy. He's very articulate, and undoubtedly in Massachusetts, and the Massachusetts political milieu with lots of Italian immigrants, lots of people with that kind of a background who still speak kitchen Italian, it must have been a tremendous asset. But in Italy there is a racism something like that of the United States with regard to blacks, and it's based on your cultural level, or your social standing. The minute you open your mouth, you're typed by any Italian. He knows immediately where you stand in the social scale, whether you're educated or uneducated, whether you're from the north or the south. And unfortunately the movers and shakers in Italy are, for the most part, the educated, traditional, upper- class. Ambassador Volpe sounded to them as lower class, which he certainly wasn't. And when they weren't laughing at him behind his back, they were disdainful of him. It was very humiliating for those of us who wanted the United States to look good to see our ambassador tarred like that.

Q: Did anybody tell him this?

FINA: Oh, it's a very hard thing to tell an ambassador something like that! He was such a nice man. We'd beg him to read an Italian text. And USIA, which was as conscious of this problem as any of us, always prepared him fine speeches. They were good literate Italian, and he could read it properly if he wanted to. But he'd always arrive at the rostrum and say, "Well, the staff has written this for me, but I want to speak to you as paisani", or something like that. And he would then launch into his idiomatic Italian. He had them rolling in the aisles in some ways. He had this wonderful electric communication with people, but in the end there was disdain for the man among the movers and shakers, at least those who did not really know him. What the common man thought, I don't know. But among trade unionists, among business leaders, among government officials, in my area, they were not very generous about him. The problem has been that so often we've sent ambassadors to Italy who were beneath the dignity of the United States to send. There have been some good ones, but often they have been second raters. Ambassador Volpe was not a second rater, but he appeared to be in the eyes of many of these people because of his vanity, and because of this insensitivity to the cultural world in which an ambassador has to live.

His successor was an entirely different kettle of fish, and that was Richard Gardner. Did you work for Gardner?

Q: I worked for him, yes.

FINA: Richard Gardner had the intellect, the education, the background to be a great ambassador.

Q: He spoke fluent Italian, and was a professor of political economy...

FINA: ...and of law.

Q: And of law, which put him right up in the upper reaches of intellectual heights of the Italian scene.

FINA: Absolutely. He understood all the issues. There was never any question about Richard Gardner understanding the issues, being sensitive to the politics. He had a great command of

what was going on, and he was a great credit to the United States in many respects. He made an excellent impression upon Italians. From my point of view, he was very supportive, very complimentary, he was very good to me. Among the things that I very much respected in him, was that even though he disagreed with my views on the central issue of the Communists, he never tried to close off open discussion.

I reached the conclusion toward the end of my tour in Milan that we really ought to favor the reconciliation of the communists, and bring them into the government. It was a time when the Christian Democrats were struggling for majority, it was the period of the Brigade Rosse, the Red Brigades, the kidnapping, the knee cappings, a very fascinating, and very tense period in political and national security terms. I concluded, after several years of getting to know these people, and really spending a lot of time working at the grass roots...or at any rate, at the provincial level, getting to know the political leaders, that it would have been in our interest to have favored bringing the communists into the government. They were no longer loyal to the Soviet Union. They were no longer a subversive threat to anybody. They had become a bourgeois party, sort of a liberal democratic, or a liberal socialist party. All of the Stalinist, Leninist, revolutionary, totalitarian stuff, had gone down the drain sometime after Czechoslovakia, from my experience.

WILLIAM C. SHERMAN
Political Officer
Rome (1960-1965)

Ambassador William C. Sherman was born in Kentucky and raised in Pennsylvania and Ohio. He attended the University of Louisville until he joined the Navy on the onset of World War II in 1943. While in the Navy, he was sent to the Navy School of Oriental Languages in Colorado to study Japanese. This marked the beginning of his career in the international field. His Foreign Service career included positions in Korea, Japan, Italy, and Washington, DC. Ambassador Sherman was interviewed by Thomas Stern on October 27, 1993.

Q: Then you were assigned to Rome. How did that come about?

SHERMAN: It happened much to my surprise. One day, as I was happily working on the Belgium/Luxembourg desk, Wells Stabler, who had become the Office Director for Italian/Austrian Affairs after having been Benelux Office Director, called and asked me to stop by his office. He told me that, as I may have already heard, Outerbridge Horsey, then DCM in Rome, had requested that I be assigned to Rome. Horsey had been the DCM in Tokyo during the last few months of my tour there. I had not heard of Horsey's request and I was surprised that Outerbridge would even remember who I was. These were still the days in the Foreign Service when an Ambassador and a DCM could request or reject almost any assignments to a post in their country. The vacancy in Rome was not to occur until the following year. I was to replace Gus Velletri in the Political Section.

Horsey's advice to me was that I attend early morning Italian lessons at FSI starting almost immediately. The assignment was made well in advance of our departure and I did study Italian at FSI. I continued that at the end of my tour on the desk because my replacement arrived a couple of months before my departure time allowing me to study Italian full time. That gave me a language rating of 3/3 by the time I arrived in Rome (sufficient to converse easily, but not bilingual). The ability to communicate in Italian was a great help. In Japan, people used to arrive without knowing a word of Japanese and left after their tour without knowing much more of the language. But in Italy, that was not possible. From the moment you arrived, you had to be able to navigate in the language.

When I arrived, I found there was a major policy dispute between the Political Section and Outerbridge Horsey and Tully Torbert, who was the Political Counselor. The issue was the question of a center-left coalition to govern Italy. Velletri was a strong advocate for the US to support such a coalition. Horsey was very much opposed. The Political Section position to which I had been assigned was responsible for liaison with the Christian Democratic Party, the Liberal Party and the Vatican. so I was in the middle of things. For a while at least I could plead newness on the job to avoid taking a position on the dispute..

I think it was Velletri had actually started the work with the Vatican. He had some family connections with officials in the Vatican. Horsey also had a lot of personal connections in the Vatican. His sister was a nun and he was a devoted Catholic. But Pius XII had laid down a dictum that there would be no relations, formal or informal, with governments that did not officially recognize the Holy See. So when Velletri went to the Vatican, he went in an unmarked car without CD license plates. Of course, senior Vatican officials were well aware of Gus' visits, they publicly denied any connections with the American government. By the time I arrived, the pattern had been pretty well established and, when required, I could go to see Archbishop Dell'aqua, who in effect ran the Vatican's Foreign Ministry. He was not actually the Cardinal who was the Secretary of State, but he did manage the Vatican's foreign affairs on a day-by-day basis. So I could see him when necessary, but my usual contact was with Monsignor Cardinale, the so-called Chief of Protocol.

When the Ecumenical Council was convened, we made it clear to the Vatican that we were interested in the meetings. We talked to Cardinale often during this period as well as to the American Cardinals who attended the Council. The Ambassador was very interested and that helped. He would go to the Vatican, after I made the necessary arrangements, seeing the Pope or any official that he wanted to see. We were invited as official "guests" of the Vatican for the opening of the Council. So that even with Pius's restriction, we had adequate access to him and his staff. When Horsey went, he went as a private person. In light of the sensitivities on both sides, the Ambassador had established a rule that only he and I would be allowed to visit or contact the Vatican officially. He was trying to avoid any semblance of official connections between the US and the Vatican, especially in light of the political sensitivity of President Kennedy's position as the first Catholic president. Once Pius XII died, the official restrictions were lifted. John XXIII couldn't have cared less whether there were formal relationships. Paul VI was the same way; no one mentioned the Concordat or any other formal limitations on contacts.

Vatican II started in 1961 -- Vatican I had taken place sixty years earlier. It had a number of sessions over an extended period of time. For each sessions, all the Catholic leaders -- Cardinals and bishops -- around the world would come to Rome. They would meet in Council for three months and then would return to their dioceses. Then they would come back to Rome. The Sacred Congregations (similar to ministries in a secular government) and the special committees of the Council stayed essentially in permanent session, but the Plenary sessions were convened periodically and then lasted for three or four months. We tried to stay in touch with the American prelates in attendance, particularly the active ones. The American Jewish Committee was very interested in the proceedings because the Council did discuss its historical and current relationships with the Jewish community. The Council did produce a new statement (a *schema*) on Catholic-Jewish relations. It was important to the American Jewish community that the statement be as forthcoming as possible. So we followed the progress on that issue. We arranged for meeting between the Jewish and Catholic leaders. It was a narrow line that we walked because we couldn't give any semblance of becoming involved in what were essentially church issues. We were very mindful of the separation of church and state under our Constitution as well as the appearance of any impropriety . President Kennedy was certainly not anxious to give any impression of personal involvement or interest, although I think that the White House did follow the Council's proceedings quite closely. As I said, Salinger maintained contact with the Vatican even before Kennedy's visit. Washington did not show any official concern or express interest in the Council's proceedings, but no one ever told us not to report.

Beyond the Council's meetings, we were also interested in the Vatican's information on events behind the Iron Curtain. They had good sources, but it was not, as many have suggested, a great depository of information. It had a lot of intelligence, but it was primarily church related. They knew about their bishops and converts and church attendance and what churches had been closed; that was of limited interest to the United States government. The Vatican was incidentally only aware of security or political intelligence. It was more active in some places than others, but by and large, its information concerned religious matters and not issues of interest to a country's government. We had practically no requests from Washington to pursue any particular matter, so I was pretty much left to my own devices on what issues to pursue and report.

We did have conversations with the Vatican about China. The church was essentially out of business in China and therefore not a very fruitful source. I used to see Cardinale about every other week; we were on the phone frequently, but many of these meetings and conversations dealt with visitors. We did institute a series of lunches hosted by the Ambassador for various Cardinals -- we rarely had two at the same time. The discussions around the table were mostly philosophical. He invited all the leading church theologians -- John Courtney Murray, Malachi Martin, Xavier Renn and Cardinal Bea. These were mostly Jesuit commentators on church developments. Bea was a German who had started as a simple priest and suddenly been named a Cardinal without going through any of the intermediate stages. He was most active in coalescing the Council. These lunches were unrelated to Embassy business, but were intended to pursue some of Reinhardt's personal interests, although some of the conversation was recorded in despatches to Washington.

Q: Tell me a little bit about who the various officials in the Embassy were?

SHERMAN: When I arrived, the Ambassador was James David Zellerbach. He was followed a few months later by G. Frederick Reinhardt. The DCM was Outerbridge Horsey first; he was followed by Frances Williamson. The Political Counselor was Torbert when I arrived; he left soon thereafter and John Auchincloss was acting head. Then Terry B. Sanders was assigned as Political Counselor. He had had no previous experience in Italian matters and was an impossible man to work for -- the worst boss I ever worked for. He stayed a little more than a year and then was followed by Bill Fraleigh. Jack Herfurt was the Administrative Counselor. He had followed Leo Gentner. The Economic Counselor was Sydney Mellen, who had followed Gardner Ainsworth.

I think the Embassy functioned reasonably well. We had very good language capability. Even most of the secretaries spoke Italian. That was almost a necessity because at that time, many Italians would speak only Italian and the secretaries had to be able to respond. All officers spoke Italian, certainly enough to get along. Some were bilingual almost. The USIS operated well. The Consular Section was busy and handled its work-load efficiently. The Political Section was active. The relationships between the various sections of the Embassy were good. I don't remember any policy disputes that occurred except for question of whether the United States should support a left-center coalition. That important and probably key US policy question was essentially a political issue dealt with by the Political section. I was of course also interested in the Vatican Council. Economic questions were pretty much relegated to the back-burner because Italy was at the time enjoying "the Italian miracle". There were some trade problems on such things as shoes, which were usually stimulated by one U.S. politico or another, but there were never any serious trade or economic issues between the two countries.

Life in Rome was pleasant enough. The office was generally pleasant. It was not so for Bill Fraleigh because he felt that he was being by-passed on matters that were in his area of jurisdiction. The main bone of contention of course were the Vatican issues because he had some friends there with whom he maintained contact and whom he believed should have been consulted. It was an unusual situation. My colleague, Steve Peters, who was the contact man with the Socialist Party, entertained members of that Party frequently. Bill Fraleigh was of course dutifully invited to all these affairs. The Socialists were anxious to meet with U.S. government officials; they welcomed any invitations from U.S. Embassy staff. Those contacts were important to them.

The Christian Democrats -- the Party that I covered -- had no particular interest in the U.S. Embassy. They were reluctant participants in any American social occasions. They were the governing party and didn't feel that contacts with Americans were of particular benefit to them. Getting appointments in their offices with them was difficult. When I did get a chance of meeting, it more likely than not to be a cup of coffee late at night on the Piazza Navona. It was unusual that they would show up for a dinner party. They might accept, but would usually call at the last minute and cancel. So that was nearly impossible for me to introduce Fraleigh to the Christian Democrats as Peters did for the Socialists. I think that added to Fraleigh's frustrations and concerns that I was keeping information and contacts from him.

My relationships with the Political Counselor were also complicated because I was a very close friend with the DCM, Francis Williamson. That, I am sure, added to Fraleigh's unhappiness. Francis died while in Rome and after that, Fraleigh wrote a very damaging efficiency report.

Like all large European Embassies, Rome lacked close cohesion after work. There was not much social interchange among the officers. It was not at all like Tokyo, where there was a good deal of Embassy community activity which stemmed in part from the fact that all the staff as housed relatively closely together. It was very difficult to settle in Rome. First there was the Italian way of doing things -- the landlords, the service industry, etc. The Embassy provided virtually no assistance to newly arriving staff. An officer was on his or her own to find living accommodations, negotiate the lease, pay bills, etc. It was a difficult adjustment for someone who had just arrived from an Embassy like Tokyo. Of course, in Rome, the top-ranking officers -- Ambassador, DCM, the Counselors -- and the staff lived in government-owned housing and they didn't have the same problems as the more middle grade and junior officers had. It was only later that I recognized how many of those personnel problems Bill Crockett had tried to address as Administrative Counselor in Rome, for which he was severely criticized by the Inspectors and others. Staff morale was relatively good, although, again as in all European capitals, the staff corps people are largely ignored because the assumption is that anybody living in "the lap of luxury" should be able to navigate on their own. Anyone who could not enjoy one of those posts was obviously the one at fault and not the system. The single women had a difficult social circumstance in the Italian world. It was not a hospitable atmosphere for a single woman. Unless in the company of another woman or an American male, they were prey to the well-known Italian male predilections. The Embassy showed absolutely no concern for that problem, which was a serious morale issue. The Embassy did not organize any after-work hours activities. Mary Jane and I started a small theater group as we had done at every other post we had served in. We put up a set and the actors read from scripts, but went through the on stage action. It became very popular and that group went on for some years after we left Rome. We had a lot of fun. We also performed in some regular theater productions. The Embassy gave us no support, but the Ambassador and other members of the staff came to watch.

The Zellerbachs had Embassy people at their official functions. They were called "co-hosts" and assigned specific functions, like keeping people from wandering upstairs to the family quarters, making sure that everybody was being served and that they all would leave at the appropriate time. It was very formal. The invited Embassy staff had to arrive fifteen minutes before the guests. Mrs. Zellerbach would brief us on what needed to be done, etc. The Reinhardtts were much more informal. They would also invite Embassy staff, but they were treated more as guests than as hired waiters. Mrs. Reinhardt had very definite ideas about the Foreign Service, which she has frequently expressed in places like the *Foreign Service Journal* after the Ambassador's death. She was considerably younger than Freddie and they had young children. So the whole atmosphere at the Residence was much more relaxed.

Q: What were the views of the Embassy on the internal political situation in Italy at the time?

SHERMAN: There was a huge problem which was dumped on me as soon as I arrived. It revolved around a center-left coalition. There were a substantial number of officers in the Political section, primarily the more junior ones -- George Lister, Clayton Mudd, Gus Velletri

and others -- who believed that the way to maintain democracy in Italy and to keep the Communists out of power, was to bring the Socialists into the government -- the so called "opening to the left". That strategy had been vigorously opposed by earlier Christian Democratic leaders like DeGasperi, and certainly by the Catholic Church. These groups felt that any contacts with the Socialists should be taboo. The leadership of the CD consisted primarily of conservatives who were unalterably opposed to the "Opening". The debate about the political strategy was an open and wide ranging debate in Italy. Some Embassy staffers supported the "Opening" strategy; others supported the maintenance of a pure CD government. Outerbridge Horsey and Tully Tolbert strongly supported the position that the Socialists be kept out of the government. They did not object to us maintaining contacts with the Socialist Party or reporting on its activities, but our reporting was carefully edited to avoid giving any impression that the Socialists were part of a "democratic" family or that they would assist in the containment of the Communists if they were ever to share governmental powers. Our reporting tended to suggest that the Socialists, if in the government, would assist the Communists in acquiring greater power. Pietro Nenni, the Socialist leader, was viewed as just as much of an enemy as Togliatti, the Communist boss. The Ambassador did not come down on one side or another.

George Lister was our main reporter on the Socialist Party. He had most of the contacts. Whenever he would write his reports, his commentary and approach would be generally favorable and benign towards the Socialists and the center-left points of view. By the time Outerbridge Horsey got finished with his review, the draft report would be substantially altered to alter any favorable references to the Socialists or would include countervailing views. At times, the redrafting was so drastic that George Lister would refuse to be shown as the drafting officer. I would guess that more than half of the reports out of the Embassy therefore would show Outerbridge Horsey as drafting officer. Outer felt very strongly about the US taking a firm stance against the "Opening to the Left".

In retrospect, I would guess that Horsey approved my assignment to Italy because I had had no previous Italian experience and he must have felt that he could control my views and keep me on the "straight and narrow". In fact, that was not the result. I found myself more and more sympathizing with a new center-left strategy. I might not have been as extreme as George, but I was certainly more supportive of that Christian Democratic faction, led by Aldo Moro, who believed that the CD was the party of center moving to the left. That, of course, implied first a closer relationship with the Social Democrats, under Saragat, and eventually to the Socialist Party. Moro and his faction were vigorously opposed by the *Doroteii* (named after the church where that faction first met), led by Flaminio Piccoli and Mario Scelba -- conservatives who did not want any relationships with any part of the Left. The fight among the Christian Democrats was fierce. It was fascinating to observe. I was greatly impressed by Moro, particularly by his performance at a major CD meeting in Naples. He spoke at about 2 a.m. with great passion; it was a major piece of political drama during which Moro expressed his views of the future, his fears, his dreams and hopes. It was oratory at its best. I became a devotee of Moro's and his strategy.

So I too began to have differing views from Outerbridge Horsey and had discussions with him. Of course, he saw current events through a prism of long experience in Italy which went back to the pre-war days; it was difficult therefore to argue with him in a historical context when you

hadn't had the same experience. He had present at the birth of the CD; he had known De Gasperi well. He had strong feelings about the Communists; he was close to the Catholic Church and very sympathetic to its position, which was relatively inflexible.

There was a comparable and simultaneous debate in Washington on this major political issue. The Office of Western European Affairs tended to support the Horsey position; INR, where John DeSciullo was the major Italian analyst, supported the "Opening to the Left" position. There were others in town who agreed with INR. Sometimes, the officers on the Italy desk would "run off the reservation" and show some tilt towards the more liberal position. The Embassy was always concerned with the selection of the Italian desk officer because it wanted to make sure that it had a vigorous defender of the faith in the right place in Washington.

Before the Kennedy visit, Arthur Schlesinger came to Rome to review the political situation. George Lister was his control officer. He took the opportunity to unburden himself on his problems with his bosses during their trip in from the airport. Schlesinger, in his book, noted that Outerbridge Horsey was leading the Embassy down the wrong policy lane. He said that the Kennedy Administration, in general, supported Christian Democratic movements in the world and that it tried to get European support for Frei in Chile, for example. He suggested that Kennedy supported movements that leaned to the left such as worker-priests, etc. I believe, that as result of Schlesinger's visit, Outerbridge Horsey was eventually moved from Italian affairs in 1962 and sent to Czechoslovakia as Ambassador.

Q: If our policy was tilted, did that govern any of our day-to-day activities? Did the US government's internal debate have any effect on our relationships with the Italian government and parties?

SHERMAN: It probably did. We had a complicated arrangement, which included the work of other agencies which followed Italian politics closely, especially CIA. There was a degree of U.S. financial assistance to certain political institutions, but I don't know the details because I was never privy to them or directly involved. That assistance had started, I am sure, before my arrival in Rome and was still going on while I was there.

The basic U.S. objective was to frustrate the Italian Communist Party by any means possible. The debate was not over the broad goal; it was over the means to accomplish the objective. The question was how best to fight the Communists. There was not a more dedicated anti-Communist in the world than George Lister. He was more passionate about that than Horsey was. But he felt that the best means to defeat the Communists was by encouraging the Socialists to split irrevocably from the far left through a center-left coalition. He also thought that the ultra-conservative leadership of the CD should be frustrated. Horsey supported the conservatives and so did some of Horsey's successors. Graham Martin, when he was Ambassador, reinvigorated the old civic committees which had been established to push ultra conservative policies in the CD party. No one went so far as to support the MSI (the crypto-Fascist Party) nor the Monarchist Party. It should be noted that the Communists at this period were receiving almost the same percentage of the vote as the Christian Democrats (mid-20%). They were particularly strong in some local elections and especially in the "Red Belt" -- Tuscany, Romagna. So they were a potent political force in Italy, although quite different from their French and other counterparts.

The Italian Communists leadership consisted of rich, capitalist people. They had TVs, refrigerators, cars; they lived comfortably. When a Sicilian traveled north to Milan, for example, to find a job, he would probably be met and welcomed by a local Communist Party official, who found lodging and a job for him. The Communists would take care of these new "immigrants". That is how they built their power base. They operated a political machine which took great pains to take care of its "grass roots" supporters and potential voters.

The Communist Party did follow the lead of the USSR on foreign policy issues, but it didn't really spend much time on those issues. Italy under a Communist government, would have been just as difficult as Italy was under other governments. Italians usually don't vote *for* a Party or a person; they vote against. If the Communists had been the government, they too would have suffered the anger and complaints of the voters, like the CD did. Anything that went wrong, either for the state or an individual, would have been the government's fault regardless of Party in power. Knowing this predilection, the Communists preferred to be outside the government. There was a wonderful satirical movie made in which the CD members were in a room watching the election returns. The American Ambassador was also in the room. The scene has the returns indicating a Communist victory. Then the set changes to the room occupied by the Communists, who are becoming increasingly disturbed by the possibility of a victory as the CD people were dismayed by the possibility of defeat! It was a wonderful commentary, which not only illustrated the political scene in Italy, but also the Italians' ability to laugh at themselves.

But the intra-Embassy debate was a healthy one; it was out in the open. No one's opinion was being suppressed. Horsey did alter reporting cables because he felt that he was the senior representative of the Embassy, but the disagreements among the staff were well known in Washington.

Some one said that the "Political situation in Italy was desperate, but not serious!". That is the way it was. The political system was crumbling even in the early '60s. Nowhere else in the world could one find 35 governments in 30 years. Governments were always falling. The process worked, but only because band-aids were being applied to it from day to day. There was no coherence. Some policies were agreed on, but there wasn't any political leadership strong enough to wend its way through the bureaucracy, much less change its culture. Government was viewed as an impediment, not as an avenue for change. The bureaucracy was an employer and a large one at that. The political system generated confusion, not clarity or national goals. The government was always in shambles. Even in those days, everyone was aware of the *bustarello* - the little white envelope stuffed with money that was handed to one official or another.

The economic system, on the other hand, was booming. The "Italian miracle" was in full swing in the '60s. Everything was great. People lived better and better and were full of optimism, even for Italians. Everybody had a job and felt secure. The South, which as always was the "economic basket case", was being helped by emigration to the North. Newspapers were flourishing giving great opportunities for public debates.

Q: Let me ask you about Vice President Johnson's visits.

SHERMAN: There were two Johnson visits. The first was in 1962 on a stop in a long journey. He and Mrs. Johnson and Lynda Bird were in Rome rather briefly. My responsibility was to take the party to the Vatican for an audience with the Pope. Lynda was, at the time, in love with some Lieutenant (JG), who was stationed in Naples. She was 18 or 19 at the time. Bill Crockett was the State Department's honcho on that trip. I remember that because at the time, Johnson's foreign policy advisor, who was a Foreign service officer was leaving and the Ambassador and Jack Herfurt, the Administrative Counselor were pushing me to be his replacement. That was the first time I met Crockett. The visit went off without any major hitches that I can remember, although Johnson acted as he did on all trips. That was the trip on which he decided he wanted to buy some Italian neckties. Outerbridge Horsey was sent across the street to bring back to the hotel a sample of 500 neck-ties. Johnson would select ten and pay half the price asked for by the shop-keeper. I can still see Outer sitting in the hotel suite's waiting room, saying: "I am just not going to do that!. I am just not going to do that!". But he had little choice.

The second visit came after the Pope died in April, 1963. This time, the Vice President came without his family, although he had a large delegation along, including Jim Farley, an Afro-American clergyman, a Congressman, etc. He stayed at the newly opened *Cavaliere Hilton*. The hotel gave him -- very aptly -- the "Petronius Suite" which was on the top floor. Jack Valenti, in his normal officious persona, ran around checking everything -- the soap, the Cutty Sark bottle and all the other pet demands that went with a Johnson visit. Johnson went into the bathroom and read the USIA Bulletin there which featured his picture on the cover. He couldn't stand any pictures of himself; it was always the photographer's fault. In this case, in addition, it was also USIA's fault for using his picture. He demanded that all the copies of the Bulletin be destroyed and be replaced with an edition using a line drawing of himself that pleased him. And so it was done.

Vatican ceremonies are interminable. They go on forever -- four, six hours. There was Johnson sitting in his white tie and tails, without any staff or entourage around him. He was surrounded by other world officials and diplomats with whom he had nothing in common. I have still have pictures of him, looking around fiercely, obviously very unhappy and uncomfortable. Finally, the ceremony ended and Johnson returned to the hotel for a club sandwich. The sandwich had too much mayonnaise on it which gave him indigestion. But he had to make a call on Italian President Segni. The State Department had not sent an interpreter, for reasons that I still can not fathom. So I was chosen and became the official interpreter for a meeting between the President of Italy and the Vice-President of the United States. It was not an easy chore and I faced the prospect with a great deal of trepidation. But the meeting went off all right.

It was right after that meeting that I also interpreted for Johnson while he wandered the streets of Rome, shaking "flesh". We stopped in Trastevere, in a store where he bargained for a rubber raft for one of his daughters. The shop-keeper kept saying: "*Questi sono pressi fixe*" ("These are fixed prices"). I kept pointing out that this was the Vice President of the United States and asking that she make a deal. She would not give a lira! Of course, Johnson didn't pay for any of these purchases anyway. There was a "bag man" along.

I still have a tape recording, made by USIA man, of that walk during which Johnson repeated how important the Italian immigrants were to the United States and how he had appointed one to

a Cabinet post. Of course, as luck would have it, the first people we met were German tourists, and I don't speak German. But Johnson persevered on, handing out Senate gallery passes and ball point pens with his signature on them. One of the local people came up to me to inquire who the VIP was -- he thought it might be Mr. Hilton. I translated that as well. Finally, we wound up back at the Hilton, only to run into Mary McGrory who happened to be in Rome on vacation -- she is a great Italophile. Doris Fleeson's daughter, Doris Anthony, was a press attaché at the Embassy and she was there as well. Johnson turned to me and whispered; "You have done good! Now tell me who that is that just greeted me and asked to speak to me". I told him that was Mary McGrory. So he turned to McGrory and said: "Hello, Mary. Good to see you!". It was an amusing day!.

It was a busy month because Johnson came at about the same time as Humphrey visited and just before the Chief Justice, Earl Warren came. Warren came as head of a delegation that included Mike Mansfield, Charles Englehardt (the minerals king), and Rabbi Lewis Finkelstein. That delegation was the official US representation for the coronation of Pope Paul VI. Immediately thereafter, President John Kennedy arrived. So within a three week period, the Embassy hosted the President, the Vice-President and the Chief Justice and some other well known politicians, all of whom wanted to see the Pope, which made the groups my responsibility.

Kennedy waited in Milan until the coronation ceremonies were completed so that he wouldn't interfere with the Warren delegation. So we had Johnson, followed almost immediately by Warren, who was followed immediately by Kennedy. President Kennedy was in Rome for three days. The first two days were devoted to US-Italy bilateral issues. The third day was reserved for the Vatican. As I mentioned, plans for a Kennedy-Pope John XXIII had been worked out earlier through non-State Department channels. But by the time the visit came, there was a new Pope. So the visit did not go as smoothly as might have otherwise. First of all, there was a big battle between the State Department and the Vatican Protocol staff concerning who would attend the audience. The White House wanted to have a large group present, but didn't want to list every one as members of the official party because that would not be good public relations-wise. The Vatican, on the other hand, was equally determined that only people listed as official members of the presidential party, would be permitted to attend. Furthermore, the Vatican Chief of Protocol wanted to call on the President before the audience. I tried to arrange that, but Kennedy would have no part of it. The Chief of Protocol could see the Secretary of State if he wanted, but that wasn't satisfactory. So the Chief of Protocol's nose was out of joint. When we arrived at the *Cortile San Damaso* where the entrance to the Pope's offices were, we were met by a mob scene, with everybody in Rome seemingly trying to get into the elevators. The protocol people were trying to clear a path for Kennedy. Finally we ran into the last hurdle which were the Swiss guards who were under instructions to let in only the members of the official party. The head of the Secret Service, who was more Catholic than the Pope, got very upset and was furious with me, wanting to know what I was going to do about this mess. At that point I saw Archbishop Dell'aqua hurrying through the crowd so that he could participate in the audience. I grabbed his cassock and told him that we had a problem. I also grabbed Angier Biddle Duke, who was the U.S. Chief of Protocol and I got the two to talk about who was to be let in. The Swiss guard, who had been so steadfast in his refusal to let anyone in not listed, was finally subdued and the whole group was allowed to enter into the chamber. Only Evelyn Lincoln was blocked because she was told that her costume did not meet standards; her blouse was too see-through. The Swiss guard

would not let her in. She finally had to borrow a jacket from one of the newspaper people and that passed muster.

In the meantime, the Swiss Guard was still furious with me for having found a way to get the non-listed people into the audience. They kept looking at the newspapermen who were in their usual scruffy duds; they shook their heads in great disapproval of an Papal audience's dress code. The newspaper people were being equally pugnacious and ignoring the Swiss Guard's comments entirely. It was a circus! There had been no opportunity to brief the President about Vatican protocol or about how an audience was conducted. Finally someone decided that it would be wise if I could ride with Kennedy to the Vatican to brief him in the limousine. So I dutifully showed up at the Villa Taverna -- the Ambassadorial Residence where the President was staying. Kennedy and Dean Rusk came out and got into the limousine. I got in and sat on a jump seat.

I immediately found out that the President didn't want to talk about Vatican protocol; he wanted to be briefed about Italian politics. He had met with most of the political leaders the night before at the Quirinale, including Togliatti, the Communist leader. Mary Jane and I had been invited to mingle with the guests after dinner in the garden. Kennedy had some Language Service interpreters with him, so that the Embassy staff didn't have to fill in this time. He met and talked with the party leaders then; he met and shook hands with Togliatti. It was a situation that couldn't be helped. the host for the dinner and the party afterwards was the President of Italy; he could not exclude the Communists.

In any case, on the ride to the Vatican, Kennedy wanted to talk about Italian politics. So that is what we talked about. Periodically he would turn his head towards the window and wave to the crowd. The first time he did that, I stopped talking. Kennedy said: "Don't stop talking; I can listen and wave at the same time!". Then he said he only needed to be told one minute before arrival at the Vatican so he could comb his hair. And that I did. When we got out of the car, I tried to mend fences as best I could and introduced the Vatican Chief of Protocol to the President. I had earlier suggested that if he did meet the Cardinal, the President might wish to express his regrets that he hadn't been able to see the Cardinal on the previous day. Kennedy's reply was that he would leave regrets to the Secretary of State.

I should also mention that in that ride to the Vatican, Dean Rusk raised the issue of Vatican recognition, saying that he felt the time had come for the United States to recognize the Vatican. He thought that the domestic political objections would be minor. Kennedy disagreed, noting that Harry Truman, a Baptist, could not obtain agreement to recognition and that he, Kennedy, as the first Catholic President, wouldn't have a chance of succeeding.

That caravan going to the Vatican must have been a spectacle. There must have been twenty cars and trucks. It was, of course, a big deal since Kennedy had been the first President to call on the Pope. The meeting with the Pope was somewhat smaller than the audience, but included, as best I can remember, was Arthur Schlesinger, John Roche, Sorenson, O'Donnell -- all of the White House staff -- and Dean Rusk and the Charge, Frances Williamson (the Ambassador was ill and was in the military hospital in Wiesbaden). But the conversations were just between the President and the Pope. I was not present during that meeting.

We did have a small incident on our way to the Vatican. One man broke through the ranks of the police keeping the people on the sidewalks and ran to the limousine and threw an envelope into it. There was a note in it, asking the President for some favor or another. The Secret Service were horrified, as you can imagine. The crowd was fair-sized. Kennedy was extraordinarily popular in Rome.

Q: Earlier, you mentioned that at the beginning of your tour in Rome, you received a poor efficiency rating. Tell us a little about that and what consequences it had on your career?

SHERMAN: Bill Fraleigh was the Political Counselor, as I mentioned earlier. We never had any public arguments or disagreements, but I always had the feeling that he was irritated that only I and the Ambassador were privy to US communications with the Vatican and to any reporting on the Holy See. He was cut out of work that one of his subordinates was doing and that didn't make him very happy. Also as time went on, my political reporting on the DC were sent to Washington in preference to his commentaries. Being in competition with one's boss is not anything that I would choose to do, but on several occasions I would be directed by the DCM to write a report in a political event, only to find out later that Fraleigh had done the same thing. In most instances, the DCM would choose my draft. The DCM had a high regard for my work, which pleased me, but made my relationships with the Political Counselor even more tenuous. Before the end of my first two years in Rome, the DCM died during an emergency operation.

When it came to efficiency report time, I found myself facing a very negative report. I was supposed to have been a procrastinator; that is, I had not been responsive to his requests for reports. I must admit that it did happen on one occasion because I thought his request had been unreasonable and a waste of time. He had asked for a report on the election of the Mayor of Rome; that was not an "event" in Italian politics and had no consequences whatsoever beyond the Rome municipality. It would have been of zero interest to Washington and I was busy on other matters at the time. The whole tone of the efficiency report was harsh, which was very unusual for the times because in those days, efficiency reports were written in subtle and delicate tones so that you had to read between the lines and understand the code words if you really wanted to find out what a supervisor thought of a particular employee. I was accused of cutting him out of information, didn't invite him to representational functions and all sorts of other slights and criticisms. I thought it was a most unfair and biased report. For example, I really didn't host any representational events because my contacts with the DC leadership was primarily during office hours. I may have had an occasional cup of coffee late at night at the Piazza Navona, but the Christian Democrats would seldom come to dinner at our house because they really didn't feel obliged to socialize with Americans. They were the party in power and didn't have to find occasions to make contacts with the Embassy, as, for example, the Socialists did. Pietro Nenni, the Socialist leader, would be delighted to accept a dinner invitation from one of my colleagues; he had to be "on the make" and all the Socialists were delighted to have contacts with the American Embassy.

So his terrible efficiency report was written by Bill Fraleigh. We had an Inspection Team in Rome at that time. In those days, Inspectors spent considerable amount of time talking to each officer and staff employee, making personal evaluations of all staff members. One of the Inspectors spent considerable amount of time with me probing about my relationships with

Fraleigh. He had seen the report; I had not. From my responses, he pieced together the real situation and wrote a separate efficiency report that challenged all the criticisms that Fraleigh had made. The Inspector not only challenged Fraleigh's assertions, but indicated that they were just plain wrong and that they stemmed from a situation over which I had no control and for which I should not be held responsible. That Inspector's intervention negated Fraleigh's report and negated any adverse effect his report might have had on my career. Furthermore, when the Ambassador heard from the Inspection team what they had found, he also became involved and he took the opportunity to write a separate note, noting how satisfied he was with my work on Vatican matters since I had taken him to see the Pope, although I did not attend the private meeting he had with His Holiness Paul VI. When the two of them came out of the Pope's office, the Ambassador started to introduce me. The Pope said that that was not necessary since he and his staff knew me very well and that the Vatican had always found me very helpful. The Ambassador reported that incident in his comments on my work and that was also very helpful. hatchet job

The only other time that I found the efficiency rating used as a weapon was in the days when they weren't available to the rated officer at all. They were never shown to an employee, even when you came home to Washington for consultation or assignment. Someone in Personnel would give you an oral thumb nail description of what the ratings said, but you were not permitted to read them yourself. This happened to me after my first tour in Yokohama. I barely knew what an efficiency rating was. My rating had been written by the Executive Officer of the Consulate General. I don't know what that person had against me except that I was assigned to live in a house that he wanted to have himself. I couldn't think of any other reasons why my efficiency rating was so full of venomous comments. I was accused of not knowing much about my work and not doing it well. In fact, when efficiency reports finally were made available to employees, my counselor in Personnel noted that such a report would not have been acceptable under the new standards and would have been returned to the drafting officer for rewrite. It was just overly biased and prejudicial without any supporting evidence. I suspect that that efficiency report did have an impact on my promotional opportunities because most of the people who entered the Foreign Service at the same time as I did received their first promotion much sooner than I did.

In neither situation, did I write a rebuttal. In the first place, in those days they were not permitted. Furthermore, I have never seen a circumstance in which rebuttals have had any beneficial effect on promotion or assignment panels; on the contrary, it has been my experience that rebuttals tended to aggravate an officer's standing rather than aid it.

Q: Did the Kennedy visit have any consequences for US policy towards the Vatican?

SHERMAN: Most of the possible consequences were already on track by the time of the visit. Relations were no longer as remote and as glacial as they had been when Pius XII was the Pope. The separateness of the Vatican as a secular state, which Pius XII had guarded so jealously, was beginning to crumble. Although important American people, officials as well as private, were always received by all Popes, from John XXIII on, no Pope had any particular difficulty having Embassy staff come to the Vatican to discuss matters of mutual interest with members of his staff. The Kennedy administration was quite circumspect about its relations with the Vatican,

concerned that it be criticized for being too close, for obvious reasons. But it was anxious to maintain a dialogue with the Vatican. Major efforts were made by both sides to stress the parallelism of policy between Pope John XXIII, with his opening to the world and trying to modernize the Church, and President Kennedy and his "New Frontier". These parallel trends were already underway when Kennedy visited, but his call on Pope Paul VI highlighted the two policy tracks. It was the symbolism of the presentation made by the Cardinal Secretary of State who, after the meeting with the Pope, in a separate ceremony at the North American College gave Kennedy the gifts that he would have received had John XXIII still been alive. One of those gifts was a signed copy of the *Pacem in Terris*, the encyclical which was the highlight of John XXIII's papacy.

Q: I gather that President Kennedy's assassination and funeral caused quite a stir in Rome. Can you describe that period?

SHERMAN: It was a fascinating period, which were particularly interesting to me because of my job as liaison to the Vatican. As I mentioned, Kennedy's popularity in Italy was extraordinary. The Italians are usually pretty blasé about political leaders -- their own as well as foreign. But the crowds who witnessed Kennedy's visit were enormous. When he was assassinated, the Italians took it as a personal tragedy. The taxi cab drivers, most of whom belonged to the Communist Party, parked a cab in front of the Chancery, decorated with a large funeral wreath, as a symbol of their sorrow. People stood in line for hours waiting to come into the Chancery to sign the condolence book. Every senior Italian official came to pay condolences.

It was the general custom that when a head of state dies, the Italian government would sponsor a memorial service usually at *Santa Maria Degli Angeli* -- the little Michelangelo church near the Termini railroad station. It became quickly clear to me that that church could not possibly hold the crowd that wanted to attend, both Italian and American. During this period, the Ecumenical Council was holding one of its sessions. That added to the throng that wanted to pay its respects. So I called the Vatican to inquire whether it would be possible to use one of the major basilicas for the service. The Vatican volunteered *Saint John Lateran*, which was the Pope's church in his capacity as Bishop of Rome. It was a big church that could accommodate a large crowd. When I mentioned the new site to the Italian government people, there was some rumbling because the bureaucracy was concerned about the precedent. I pointed out that Michelangelo's church was very small and that the crowd would be quite large. Finally, they and we went to *Saint John Lateran* which like most Italian churches, had no installed seating, but was very large. We discussed the necessity to rent some chairs, but were told that the Vatican had an office, the *Floreria Apostolica*, which handled such problems. It would bring the chairs and drape the church and whatever else had to be done to make it suitable for a funeral ceremony. We then realized that the main altar was at the end of the nave, far removed and not visible by anyone standing in the second half of the church. But there was a second altar, which stood at the center of the transept. That was the Papal altar which was reserved for the exclusive use of the Pontiff. I asked whether it would be possible for that altar to be used for the Kennedy's ceremonies. That furrowed many brows. My friend, Monsignor Cardinale, said that he thought it might be possible to issue a Papal Bull, which was required if the papal altar was to be used. That Bull would be posted so that all would know that the Pope had personally approved the use of the altar. And that is what was done.

We had been discussing the ceremony with the American Cardinals who were in Rome for the Ecumenical Council. Cardinal Spellman was the senior American ecclesiastical official. He was the one who would conduct the Mass. All the American Cardinals were in Rome at the time, including Cushing, who as Archbishop of Boston had, of course, a special relationship to the Kennedys. He was chosen to deliver the homily. The rest of the cast was to include members of the North American College and Monsignor Dante, the great liturgy expert, who had taught all the Cardinals when they were students at the College and who tended to treat them as if they were still his students. The Vatican's protocol people were there to make sure that everybody dressed and behaved appropriately. A Mass of this kind can get very complicated and it really required considerable expertise to make sure that all went according to script.

In any case, the preparations for the ceremony required me to be in frequent contact with Cardinal Spellman. At sometime during this period, I got a call from the Cardinal who expressed great surprise that the Pope had released the use of the altar to him. He sounded almost overwhelmed. I expressed great surprise and congratulated him on his honor. He did not know nor did I ever tell him that the arrangements had been worked out between the Vatican and some functionary at the American Embassy.

The Embassy staff had been working around the clock, putting black borders on all the Embassy's envelopes with magic markers, getting the condolence books ready (we must have gone through 9 or 10 books, each of which held 10,000 signatures) and doing all the other myriad of tasks that take place when a President dies. We had a huge set of regulations -- the Combined Federal Regulations -- that governed our practices; I think that probably has been changed by now.

But in any case, the ceremonies went off very smoothly. In attendance at the Mass must have been at least 300 Cardinals. They of course were the "Big Wigs" and sat wherever they wished. The *Floreria* kept bringing more and more chairs. The whole church was people packed in like sardines from wall to wall. It was incredible; I had never seen a crowd like that in a church in Italy.

In addition to making the basilica available for the ceremony, the Vatican sent official condolences. I should note that I was never fully apprized of the "back-channel" communications that took place between the Vatican and the White House. Pierre Salinger certainly was involved and perhaps even the principal connection. I was aware that such communications did take place, but was never fully cognizant of their contents. I used to hear rumors or get small hints by Monsignor Cardinale, who was the Vatican representative in the communications.

GEORGE G. HIGGINS
Second Vatican Council
Holy See (1962-1965)

Monsignor Higgins was born and raised in Chicago and educated at Catholic University. A major figure in labor and progressive moments in the Catholic Church in the US and abroad throughout his lifetime, he was awarded the nation's Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Clinton. Monsignor Higgins died in 2002. Monsignor Higgins was interviewed by Morris Weisz in 1994.

HIGGINS: Another example comes to my mind of how things have changed. While I was in Europe, I went to Holland, briefly, just to look around. At that time, as you may recall, Holland was completely ghetto-ized. The Socialists had their own papers. The Catholics had their own papers, even their own radio stations. The Protestants had their own papers. The Communists had their own papers. And they all had separate unions. It was a matter almost of excommunication for a Catholic to belong to anything except a Catholic trade union movement. I had, at one time, the document in which that was laid out. I lost it unfortunately, and I've never been able to find another copy. But, I do recall that it was signed by all the bishops of Holland, including one by the name of Bernard Alfrink, who was a very young bishop, probably an auxiliary. I found out, later, when I went to the Vatican Council that Alfrink was one of the great liberals in the council, and today, of course, the ghetto-ized culture of Holland is completely gone, absolutely completely gone. There are no more Catholic organizations of any kind. All of that structured ghetto-ization is completely broken down. I would think that of all the countries in Europe, maybe of all the countries in the world, the breakdown in the ghetto-ized Catholic culture has gone the furthest in Holland, whereas it was the tightest in those days. That's how fast things have changed.

The only thing I could compare it with would be French Canada. The first time I went to French Canada, the so-called Christian trade unions there were very conservative. They were very clerical -- I think they all had a chaplain. -- and completely separated from the other unions in Canada. Today that's all gone. The former so-called Christian unions, former Christian Trade Unions of French Canada, as far as I can see, are now the most radical of all the unions. The influence of the Church is gone. There is no such thing as a chaplain. They wouldn't allow a chaplain to get anywhere near them. The same kind of cultural transformation [has occurred] in French Canada that took place in Holland, where you had a kind of in-bred ghetto-ized church, aggravated by the fact that it was still highly agricultural [with lots of] small towns. That's all gone. And of the two places that I know in the world, the most rapid cultural change in the Church since the Second Vatican Council involving also the labor movement are in those two [places] -- Holland and French Canada. I cite them, [even though] they have nothing to do with your question, because they are examples of how things have changed.

...

Q: Now, what I would appreciate and what I think our project would be very interested in is the sequence of events within the Church and, as far as you can comment on it, outside the Church which led to the almost secularization of the Catholic trade union movement from the point of view of these ICFTU-oriented unions. Those of us serving for the [U.S.] Government saw a change gradually take place, partly because of their attitude towards capitalism and partly because of the developments that you have seen.

HIGGINS: Well, the most radical change, of course, came long after the period we're talking about. It came with the Second Vatican Council. That was the major turning point in the history of Catholicism in the last hundred or two hundred years. It was a very radical change.

Q: This would have been about when?

HIGGINS: 1962 to 1965.

Q: And you spent, by the way, the whole time there?

HIGGINS: I was there for that, yes. There were four sessions, [one] every fall -- 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965. [The Council] ended in 1965 and developed 16 or 18 major documents. The total impact of the Council, not only of the documents themselves, but of the event itself, was a major, major change in the history of world Catholicism. There have been dozens and dozens of books written on that, but *that* came *after* the period we were talking about, when I was in Germany.

The changes before the Council that might have led up to it, I would be hard to put to trace them back to their origins. Part of change, I think, had something to do with the war -- the realization on the part of everyone that they could not go back to what they had before the Second World War, and that if there had been a united labor movement under Hitler, they might have done better. I think that was in the back of the minds of some people. [There was] a general realization that everybody was involved now in a new world. They had to take a new look at everything, because we had gone through this terrible war and gone through the Holocaust and everything that went with that. I think that had some bearing on it. But, it took time. I don't recall, when I was in Germany, that there was any bitter feeling between the groups. There were differences, of course. There was some resentment on the part of some of the Catholics in the Christian trade union movement that the Socialists had a kind of imperial attitude, that they were the dominant movement and "tough luck for you fellows, you're not involved in it." [There was] also, I won't say resentment, but some bewilderment that the Americans, when they came to Europe, didn't understand the situation at all, because it wasn't in their experience. We had never had sectarian unions in the United States, so that it was not uncommon for American trade unionists to come over and rather absent-mindedly almost take the side of the Socialists, because they were the dominant union. "What is this business of sectarianism?" They didn't understand it at all. They had no cultural or historical memory to go on. That was very common. There was some resentment on the part of some of the people that I recall talking to in those days.

But, as I said, my major conclusion was that it would be better for everybody concerned if they could have a united movement and I was fairly optimistic that they would. They do now, of course, and have had for some time. But you asked me to trace the origins of that?.

Q: Right.

HIGGINS: I don't think there was anything in church documents that did it. There was no major change, say, between 1930 and 1949, in Church documents that made that more possible. It was more, I think, the culture of the times. The official church documents, the last one before 1949

was in 1931, *Quadragesimo Anno*. That was still rather tough on socialism. There was no break-through, there. So, it didn't come out of official documents. I think it came out of the experience of people, and I can't help but think that the war had a lot to do with it. They had suffered together in the war; they had seen, I think, that it didn't make any sense to be divided, if you were going to have an enemy like Hitler. The general mood of the time, I think, was "Let's see if we can't work together for the good of the country and this new world we're going into." But, beyond that, I would have to go back and meditate for hours to try to figure out what the reasons were. It's very clear after 1962, after the Council, that is easy to measure, because the changes of the Council were so dramatic, that there's no question that that had a major, major impact. But the uniting of the labor movement in Germany came along before that, of course.

Q: And the continued separation in other countries. I'm going to ask you, later on, about the degree to which you had comments on France, Italy and other countries, from traveling there because the separation continued in these other countries.

The personality of John the XXIII. . . ?

HIGGINS: Well, that was much after our period. See, he didn't become the Pope until the late 1950s.

Q: Yes. Well, I'm saying, did his personality affect the creation of Vatican II?

HIGGINS: Oh, of course.

Q: That's the point.

HIGGINS: It would have been impossible without him, and he put his stamp on it, in a very indirect way. He never interfered in the Council or seldom interfered with it. He was seldom in the Council. They say that he observed it on TV. I don't know whether he did or not. But he was very light-handed. His opinion was, "It's time to get the bishops of the world together and let them talk and let them get to know one another. The more freedom the better." So he allowed almost unlimited freedom in the Council, even though, as the President, he could have exercised control, if he wanted to. But he exercised very little control. He clearly left the impression, by his personality and by his whole mode of operation, that he wanted freedom. When he intervened, it was usually on the side of freedom. Occasionally he would intervene to make sure that what he thought was a legitimate point of view was getting a fair hearing. There's no doubt he had enormous influence. But, of course, he died after the first session, and the Council then went on without him. So, it wasn't only the Pope [that made the Council successful, but also the work done within] the Council itself.

I've had a very clear impression -- It has nothing to do with our specific subject, but I've said this many times to other people. -- that what made the Council a success was it lasted four years. It took four years, well, four sessions, and many sessions in between, of course, with committees. It took a long time for 3,000 or 2,500 bishops from all the cultures of the world to develop their own dynamics. If that Council had lasted only one session, I think it would have been a failure, and we wouldn't be talking about it today. It would have been just a passing event, forgotten by

now. But it developed its own inner dynamics because for four years, bishops from all over the world -- and there were theologians and other advisors -- built up their own understanding of the dynamics of this organization. Very important, I think.

Q: Yes, I saw that you covered that in the book.

HIGGINS: Yes, I think it's very important.

Q: But as for the final documents of Vatican II, what were the origin and the sort of decisions with respect to labor, and how did they affect individual countries, so far as you know?

HIGGINS: There was very little specifically on labor. The major document that touches upon our field was the one on *The Church and the Modern World*. The first part of that document is philosophical and religious; the second part applies it to the family, to economics, to politics, etcetera. The section on economics is not startlingly new. The only specific reference that I recall to labor is a strong insistence on the freedom of trade unions, [i.e.,] free from government control. There was some feeling on the part of a few of the consultants and delegates to go easy on Spain, but they went the opposite way. There's a very strong statement that unions should be free and independent, but there was no extended treatment of unions. But it was the general atmosphere that affected it, not the specifics -- the opening to the world, the need for dialogue and inter-religious cooperation, which was a very marked change in the Church. All of those things added up to more than the specific statements. You won't find anything startlingly new in the document about labor or about any other specific question, but you'll find a lot that's startlingly new in the *total atmosphere*.

Q: How were you selected to be going to Rome?

HIGGINS: Well, they had a number of people, dozens and dozens of people, who were so-called *periti* experts or consultants. How I was chosen, I'm not sure.

...

HIGGINS: Well, the Latin word, *periti*. It means experts.

...

HIGGINS: There were many, many theologians and others, some of them much more influential than others. I had no great influence on the Council. But there were some distinguished theologians who had enormous influence in drafting documents.

Q: Any lay people involved?

HIGGINS: Yes. Oh, yes. Not too many. Not as many as there should have been, but there were, men and women. But I would think if we had another Council in five years from now, ten years from now, twenty, there would be many more lay people. It would be a Council brought up to date. But I don't know how I was selected. Some friend of mine in Rome probably put my name in, but I really don't know. I was there not only for the four sessions of the Council but for the two years preceding it, the so-called preparatory stages when commissions were meeting. So to me, it was the greatest experience of my life. Nothing is even comparable to it, because it was

the greatest single event in the history of the Church in the last hundred, two hundred years, without any question -- maybe in the last five hundred years.

Q: I hope we can go into the impact of those revolutionary events on the individual countries and how the Church, in the labor field at least, interpreted or misinterpreted what came out of the Vatican II in individual countries in which activities were so different.

HIGGINS: Well, I wouldn't be able to say very much about that, because I don't know that much about the individual countries. I've cited the case of Holland. That's a very clear example of where the Council resulted -- and they have gone from one extreme to the other -- in a complete breakdown of the former cultural structures of the country, *complete*.

So today anyone who would suggest a Christian trade union in Holland would probably be laughed at. Whereas, before the Council, it was almost a matter of excommunication for a Catholic to belong to any union that wasn't a Catholic union, and, as far as I can see from reading about Holland, you read a Catholic newspaper, you went to a Catholic doctor . . .

Q: Had a Catholic sports organization.

HIGGINS: And the socialists did the same thing.

Q: Absolutely.

HIGGINS: It was just completely structured. *That* is completely gone.

Q: Do you have any explanation as to why that is completely gone in a country like Holland and yet the remnants of it remain in a country like Austria?

HIGGINS: No, I really don't. That would take a cultural anthropologist and historian.

But, there's been a tremendous change in Latin America through liberation theology, of course, and that came after the Council. Before the Council, there was none of that. The changes in the labor movement probably have not been all that radical.

On the general question of Latin America, the changes came from the Council. There was a brand new involvement of the Church. It goes under the general heading of "liberation theology," which means different things to different people. It was a conscious decision on the part of at least some Church leaders to reverse history, which had involved the Church too often in the past with the upper class, sometimes with dictatorial governments, to go to the poor. That's an oversimplification of what liberation theology is, but that came out of the council.

DOUGLAS G. HARTLEY
Consular/Economic Officer
Milan (1964-1967)

Aide to the Ambassador
Rome (1967-1968)

Douglas G. Hartley was born in March 1934 in London, England. He entered the Foreign Service in 1956, wherein he served in countries including Denmark, Austria, Yugoslavia, Italy, Greece, England, and Brazil. He was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy on January 22, 1998.

Q: Well, then you left there in '67.

HARTLEY: I was asked to come to the embassy in Rome to be the ambassador's aide. Apparently I was one of two candidates. The other one was Ken Hartung, who we all know became more or less the head of the CDR, the Freedom of Information people at the State Department, after his retirement. Ken was the administrative officer in Genoa at the time. I only found out later that he had been considered first, and I was considered, and I was chosen. We, by the way, had lived in an apartment in Milan, a very large apartment on the Via Leopardi, which was pretty close to the central park. Milan is not a great place for kids. It was a very urban type of city. There wasn't much that kids really could do there.

Q: Most Italian cities really aren't designed for children. There aren't many parks.

HARTLEY: And this park was close to us. But between us and the parks, there were two very busy main arteries. To cross them was a risk. But then when the poor children got to the park, if they tried to do anything kids like to do, like getting into the mud, somebody would - and I'll never forget - "non ti sporca, cara! - Don't get yourself dirty, dear!" So these Italian kids were not permitted to indulge in the kind of things that little kids should be indulging in. So that was a problem. And then we also had this dog, an cocker spaniel, Bessie. They felt that the dog was not proper, untrained, shouldn't be in the apartment, etc. I remember having an argument with the portinaia (the concierge), one of these typically Italian formidable female concierges. She was complaining about our dog yet again, how the dog was dirty and how we weren't brushing it properly and all of that. The dog was with me. I angrily denied her assertions then I looked down and saw that Bessie had just peed all over her floor. She looked at me and then looked at the dog. The dog looked at me, and then that was it. She won the round.

Anyway, getting back to the transfer, I drove down to Rome. My aunt, a longtime resident of Rome, had found us an apartment there in Via Bruno Buozzi in Rome near the Parioli district. I was, in one way, happy to get to Rome because I have family in Rome. My father's sister, my aunt, had married an Italian many years before. They have four sons and I had always been quite close to the family. That was nice. We left Milan in early November and stayed in Rome until July 1968, which would have been the expiration of my tour in Milan.

I was totally in awe of the embassy. You must have gone to that embassy. It is palatial. The ambassador's office is enormous. It's the size of a tennis court. I found it quite overwhelming, the whole place. Going there and sitting in the alcove in this enormous office. This, by the way is a part of my career which was not one of my strong points, but I'll go through it anyway. The DCM was a guy named Frank Meloy. Somebody described him as the original "iron hand in a velvet glove." It was a very good description of Meloy. He was very polished, very debonair, suave - a diplomat of the old school. But tough as nails underneath, I thought. Years later, Meloy was assassinated in Lebanon. The ambassador's secretary was Betty Foster, who had been there for years. The ambassador was the aforementioned Frederick Reinhardt. My job was extremely tedious and I also felt like an outsider, even though I had old friends there serving with me, like Goodie Cooke and Charlie Stout. The hours were long. I usually didn't get back to my family much before eight o'clock at night. I was constantly getting up in the middle of the night to read EXDIS telegrams. Reinhardt was the type who liked to sit around in his office for hours doodling over the cables, then he wanted a clarification on this or that, so basically you sat around twiddling your thumbs for quite a bit of the time, which I found extremely irksome. I remember - and this would have been about a month after I got there - Betty Foster got the phone and she asked me to pick it up. I picked it up and the guy on the other end apparently thought I was the ambassador. He said (Hartley uses a mock British accent.) "Freddie, it's Constantine here. I'm afraid I have a bit of a problem." It was King Constantine. He had just arrived in Italy, having fled the junta from Greece. He had stayed on for a while following the colonel's coup in April 1967, then decided to leave. So what did he do upon arrival but call his old friend, Freddie Reinhardt?

The most interesting thing, the most nerve-wracking thing, was the sudden visit of President Lyndon B. Johnson to Rome on December 23rd. This is a story in itself. I could go on and on about this.

Q: I think presidential visits are well worth talking about.

HARTLEY: We became aware of the fact that the Secret Service was in town. Italian police contacts mentioned that they thought the Secret Service was in town. Reinhart was pretty upset. He said, "Why the hell didn't somebody tell me about this?" The next thing we knew, Harry Shlaudeman, who was in the Secretariat, came in and I was there and had breakfast with him and the ambassador. He explained that Johnson, who was in Vietnam at the time visiting his troops, had decided on the spur of the moment that he wanted to go to the Pope so he could get a blessing for our boys. It would be seen as a good thing if he went and touched base with the Pope. This would have been just prior to Christmas in 1967. So the whole place was of course thrown into turmoil. We had just about a week to prepare for this thing. The next thing, an advance man called Foley--Frank Foley, I think--came in. He was an old Democratic politico, a friend of Humphrey's. He came in and he was sitting in my office with me at the embassy. Three armored limousines were flying from the States. They got them to Torrejon Air Force Base in Spain and then they were going to be airlifted to Rome. In any event, they never arrived because they got fogged in in Spain. And then the U.S. military helicopters that were also at Torrejon--which were meant to arrive at the airport twenty-four hours before Johnson was due to arrive--didn't actually get there until an hour before president arrived on Air Force One. So there was a tremendous amount of confusion going on. They also refused to allow Italians to pilot the helicopters. The

U.S. military pilots were quite unfamiliar with the area. So we were going around trying to collect maps to show them how to get the helicopters to Saragat's place in the country and then helicopter directly from there to the Pope in the Vatican. While AF-1 was still en route from Vietnam, the ambassador had been on the phone with Johnson's entourage trying to explain that Johnson must, if he were to visit the Pope, also visit the president of Italy. He didn't want to bother with the president of Italy. He said "I don't want to see the president of Italy. I going here to see the Pope and I want to see the Pope." That's what happened. Finally, Freddy Reinhardt argued him into seeing that "You've simply got to see the president of Italy. It would be a grave breach of etiquette not to see the president of Italy and just go and see the Pope. The Vatican is in Italy even though it's independent and autonomous. It is, after all, located in Rome. As a courtesy you simply have to see the president." What, I think, may have been decided there and then was - if this fellow insists I see the president, "Okay, I'll go see the president, but I don't want to see him in Rome." For some reason, I don't know why, probably some security threat. Anyway, I stayed at the embassy, dealing with various things that came up--problems, of which there were thousands. The president duly got into the airport, duly got his helicopters, they found Saragat's place, had the meeting with him, and then headed for the Vatican. At the Vatican, all the cardinals were gathered together where helicopters were meant to land, but they unfortunately, landed in the wrong place. I wasn't there, fortunately. Goodie Cooke was there. He had an unforgettable tale of all these ancient cardinals gathering up all their robes and trying to rush to the place where the helicopters landed. According to him, the Secret Service insisted in going in to see the Pope for the private interview with the president. Goodie had to almost get into fisticuffs to prevent them from going in to be in on the conversation. Finally, I think Goodie won!

I also think that Johnson decided then and there to replace Reinhardt as ambassador, because, just about twenty-four hours after Johnson left and the Reinhardts went on a two week vacation on one of the islands, we got a telegram requesting the Italian government's agreement (preliminary clearance) for the appointment of Gardner Ackley, the chairman of Johnson's Council of Economic Advisors, as the new ambassador. Even though the Reinhardts had been in Rome for six years, the news was totally unexpected. We couldn't help but think it might have had something to do with the fact that Reinhardt had been so adamant about this business of seeing the president.

Q: It sounds like a Johnson thing.

HARTLEY: He probably got on the airplane and said "Who is this guy Reinhardt! I've got my friend Gardner Ackley, who speaks Italian." In any event, I saw the Reinhardts off and, then, in March, Meloy decided to reinstall Ron Woods, who had been the aide in my place, while I went into the political section as number two in political/military, working with Bob Gordon. I was there until the end of my tour, which was July, 1968. I still don't know--I don't think, in retrospect, that I was particularly good at the aide job, I certainly didn't enjoy it!

GEORGE F. WARD, Jr.
Consular Officer

Genoa (1974-1976)

**Political Officer
Rome (1976-1979)**

Ambassador George F. Ward, Jr. was born on April 9, 1945 in Jamaica, in the borough of Queens in New York City. He attended the University of Rochester and served in the US Marine Corps from 1965 to 1969. He entered the Foreign Service in 1969, wherein he served in countries including Italy, Germany, and Namibia. He was interviewed on April 23, 2001 by Charles Stuart Kennedy.

Q: Did Vatican or Church affairs impact on you?

WARD: At the time, we had a special envoy to the Vatican who had a separate office; it wasn't yet Embassy Vatican. We had a succession of representatives. Until the end of the Ford administration, it was Henry Cabot Lodge, and then former-mayor Wagner of New York took over. The career person at the Vatican was Peter Sarros. He worked fairly closely with the embassy. Under Carter, the envoy became an ambassador. There was some controversy about that. Because the ambassador to the Vatican wasn't regularly in Rome, Peter relied heavily on Ambassador Gardner to host distinguished visitors. In turn, Peter helped us with requests by VIPs for Papal audiences.

Q: Did you see the Church as a major political player?

WARD: No, although individual Christian Democratic Party leaders were devout Catholics. Aldo Moro was kidnaped at a church. He went to Mass every morning. Aldo Moro was the leader of the largest faction on the left in the Christian Democratic Party.

Q: I know down in Naples in the Mezzogiorno, I would go to church services, usually commemorations of this or that, and I would often find myself standing next to the representatives of the Communist Party. We all showed up and heard the Mass.

WARD: One of my memories of Italian churches on Sunday were the women going into the church and the men standing outside talking about soccer and smoking cigarettes. It's curious. The church played a significant social role, but a limited religious one.

**PETER S. BRIDGES
Deputy Chief of Mission
Rome (1981-1984)**

Ambassador Bridges was born in New Orleans and raised in Chicago. He attended Dartmouth College and Columbia University and served in the US Army in France. He entered the Foreign Service in 1957 and held positions in Panama, Moscow, Italy, and served as Ambassador to Somalia. He was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 2003.

Q: What was the situation in Poland in 1980?

BRIDGES: Those were the first days when Solidarity was showing its strength. I left the Office of East European Affairs in the early autumn of 1981, and it was in December 1981 that Jaruzelski declared martial law. In the summer of 1981 there was a particular concern that the Soviets might invade Poland as they had Hungary and Czechoslovakia. I didn't think it was going to happen. The intelligence was inconclusive; it was clear as I recall that the Soviets were making preparations in case they had to do it. But I didn't think they were going to do that, and I recall that I used to get a phone call every day from a network correspondent, and I consistently told her that I don't think the Russians are coming, and I was right.

In June 1981 Cardinal Wyszynski, the head of the Catholic church in Poland, died and the question immediately arose, because Poland was going to give him a big funeral, how should we be represented? Our ambassador in Warsaw was Frank Meehan, a very capable career officer, and he would of course attend the funeral. But maybe we should do something more. We wanted to go in step with our NATO allies, and so we put the question to them and basically they decided that they would make this a European Community question; what the EC decided to do would go for all of them. But they couldn't decide for some time. So we decided that no matter what the Europeans or Canadians did, we would send a delegation and there was interest in the Congress in our doing that. So we sent a delegation and the heads were Clement Zablocki, the Polish-American Congressman who headed the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and William Bloomfield, the ranking Republican on the committee, from Detroit, Michigan. We also included Cardinal Krol, the archbishop of Philadelphia, and the head of the largest Polish-American organization, and William Wilson, who was then Reagan's personal representative to the Vatican. I went along as the bag carrier. It was interesting; we flew out of Dulles and Cardinal Krol asked me if I had thought of writing some kind of arrival statement, and I said that one of my officers had drafted a statement which I didn't think was too good, and Cardinal Krol said, "Well, fork it over, let me see it." So I forked it over, and he shared it with the two Congressmen and we came up with a pretty good statement, and Cardinal Krol then translated it into Polish; his Polish was good. Whereas the head of the Polish-American Congress spoke good Chicago Polish but not in literary style. So we had a statement in Polish when we got off the plane in Warsaw; we flew in from London, where the Air Force had provided us a small jet to fly to Warsaw, so we had this American Air Force plane in Warsaw with "United States of America" on the side of the plane. There was Polish TV waiting to interview us, and the Cardinal walked up to the microphone and read the arrival statement and it was carried on prime-time Warsaw news, and that began a very interesting visit. The funeral was held in Independence Square in the center of Warsaw. They had built a big dais in the center of the square, and at the altar there must have been 30 high churchmen from various countries. It was probably the biggest assembly of churchmen one was likely to see outside of the Vatican. There we were with our fairly high-level delegation, while the Europeans never had decided what to do; as I recall they were represented by their ambassadors. So we had the highest-ranking delegation. The funeral Mass took place in the early afternoon and a huge thunderhead built up and you could hear thunder rumbling, it was a dramatic scene. I thought, *dear God, what happens if it rains?* But it didn't rain. At the end of the Mass the people walked to the Cathedral. The Cardinal was interred in the crypt and the clergyman who presided over that ceremony was the Cardinal Archbishop of Philadelphia.

At some point Lech Walesa, the head of Solidarity, said he would be happy to meet the American delegation. So Frank Meehan arranged for us to have a meeting at the ambassador's residence. And that was an interesting meeting, too. I don't know how many Americans in our embassy in Warsaw had met this man before, but what I remember most about it was that Walesa kept talking about the obvious fact that Americans were going to invest big in the Polish economy. Our delegation member Bill Wilson was a man I have no great respect for, considering what he did later - he flew secretly to Libya to see Qadhafi, in a private plane belonging to an Italian company, which was probably in itself a violation of law; he flew to Bern to intercede with the Swiss on behalf of Mark Rich, who had been convicted of income tax evasion in the United States, and he also tried to importune the U.S. Customs Service on behalf of Archbishop Marcinkus of the Vatican. But in any case on this occasion, in June 1981 in Warsaw, Walesa had gone on at some length about how it was inevitable that Americans were going to be investing in Poland. Wilson said, "Well, how is that? Is it because you're so free of strikes?" Solidarity was leading strikes against industry every other week, it seemed. "Is it because your independence is secure?" And of course nobody knew whether the Soviets were going to invade next week. Wilson had about three or four sound reasons as to why reasonable Western businessmen would think long and hard about why they would invest. It wasn't Walesa's brightest moment, I imagine.

Q: Well, looking at the Italian scene, where were you getting your best information? Parliamentarians, or the press?

Italy's role in the world was concerned, we were learning most from our friends in the Italian Foreign Ministry and in other ministries. We also saw a wide range of politicians and journalists. I had been not more than a year in Rome when Charlie Stout called me from Bern. Charlie and I had been fellow political officers in Rome in the late '60s. He was an energetic and wise officer who at the time was following the left of the Italian center, mainly the Socialists and the Social Democratic Party. I think Charlie was on good terms with every Socialist and Social Democratic deputy. Anyway, now he was DCM in Bern under the first ambassadress appointed by Mr. Reagan. Basically she was way out of line, and Charlie said he had to tell her that. And she said "Get out." So Charlie called me one day and said, "Just want you to know I'm out of a job pretty soon." And I said, "Charlie, I've got an idea." Robert Frowick, who was the counselor for political affairs in Rome, had asked to have his tour of duty curtailed. So I said, "Charlie, would you think about coming here as political counselor?" And he agreed, and we had then an even better team with Rabb as ambassador, me as DCM, Charlie as political counselor, and Bill Whitman, who as I mentioned before, was our excellent minister-counselor for economic and commercial affairs.

Q: We had a lot of trouble with our political appointees in Switzerland, pound for pound I think. How did you find dealing with the Italian press? Was this a problem?

BRIDGES: I probably didn't see as much of Italian journalists as I used to between 1966 and 1971. But I still kept up contacts with the men I had known earlier, prominent journalists like Bruno Tedeschi and Arrigo Levi. I had contacts all over the place, it's hard to say whether I was concentrating on any particular group. The Secretary General of the Foreign Ministry, the number three in the Ministry, was Franco Malfatti, a very fine man who had played a very

positive role at the end of the German occupation of Rome, in 1943 and 1944, when he worked very closely with the OSS mission inside occupied Rome. I had the occasion to mention that in print the other day, when I did a review of a new book by Robert Cass on the campaign for Rome. He mentioned Malfatti, and I wrote that I had had the honor of knowing Malfatti. So while the ambassador would see the foreign minister and deputy ministers, I would see Malfatti or his assistant Luigi Amaduzzi, a very fine Italian diplomat who was later their ambassador to the U.K.

Q: We had our representation at the Vatican. Was the Vatican, in retrospect, a player?

BRIDGES: In Italian politics, I think so, indirectly, without question. The Christian Democratic Party was after all a largely Catholic party, but the Church certainly didn't play the role in Italian politics the way it had in the immediate postwar years. By the time I arrived in Rome in 1981 the latest of the personal representatives of U.S. presidents to the Holy See was William Wilson; he was fairly active as a Catholic layman and a member of the Order of Malta. Mr. Wilson very much wanted to be a real ambassador. He told me once that Mr. Reagan, whose private financial advisor he had once been, had wanted to make him ambassador to Mexico but that he had a large ranch in Mexico, and that somehow it was decided that it was just as well that he not go there. So he took this sort of quasi-ambassadorial job in Rome. He would look at Max Rabb, and Max Rabb had a real embassy, his own communications, his own political and economic and security officers, and so forth and so on and Bill Wilson wanted all that. It was very clear to me that Mr. Wilson in person brought about the establishment of U.S. diplomatic relations with the Holy See, and not because the situation required it. It was said at the time that the American Catholic hierarchy did not want to see American diplomatic relations with the Vatican, fearing that it would bring about a larger Vatican fist over the American Catholic church, something which perhaps has eventuated since the establishment of full diplomatic relations. I seldom got to go over to the Vatican. One time before we had an embassy there, we were handling communications from Washington for our Vatican office. We got a cable one day with instructions for Wilson to go and see the Vatican Substitute Secretary of State and say something about establishment of diplomatic relations. So I called Wilson's office and I found that he had gone on vacation. He had one assistant, and he had also let the assistant go on vacation. So I called the Italian desk officer in the Department, and said, "Look, there ain't nobody over there, do you want me to carry out the instructions?" And he said, "Yeah." So I went over to see the Substitute Secretary of State. That happened, I think, twice. Eventually Mr. Wilson got his embassy and after that I was never in the Vatican except occasionally.

ALAN FLANIGAN
Director, Bureau of Western European Affairs
Washington, DC (1981-1983)

Alan Flanigan was born in Indiana in 1938. He graduated from Tufts University in 1960 and served in the U.S. Navy from 1960 to 1966 as a lieutenant. After entering the Foreign Service in 1966, his assignments abroad have included Lima, Izmir, Ankara and Lisbon, with an ambassadorship to El Salvador.

Q: And in 1980 you did move on. What did you do then?

FLANIGAN: I moved over to the Office of Western European Affairs where I was the deputy director. Western European Affairs is smaller than it sounds: Spain, Portugal, France, Italy, the Vatican, and Malta.

Q: You were deputy director for two years and then director for a year or so.

FLANIGAN: Yes. I was deputy director for, about a year and a half each I'd say. Jack Maresca was the director when I went to the office. In '81 Van Galbraith was named ambassador to France, and he asked Jack to be his deputy chief of mission. I then served as director of the office until '83.

Q: Even though as I recall they were in very technical functions.

FLANIGAN: Yes. I can't recall the exact portfolios, but regardless it was an issue of principle as far as we were concerned, and certainly one we spent a lot of time dealing with. Of course the French and Italians also considered it an issue of principle and thought we were crazy. During those years we also continued to be concerned about the evolution of Portugal. Portugal, as you say, was on the track to democracy. The transition from the Salazar dictatorship to democracy was not smooth however. The extreme left almost seized power. By 1980 it was fairly stable, but it was still a relatively undeveloped country trying to resolve some of the economic and social consequences of the simultaneous change of government and end of empire. The Spaniards were still working on trying to stabilize democracy in the post-Franco period. Both Spain and Portugal were fairl tentative at that point in their approaches to democracy. Ultimately quite successful in both cases, but it took some time. We were an interested party. The involvement that we had in any of those countries was certainly less than the countries I had served in before - Peru, and Turkey. Although we were friends and we were engaged in these countries, it wasn't the same kind of relationship and therefore, it was what I would have to call much more of a normal bilateral relationship, whereas the others were abnormal in the sense that we were much more engaged than we normally would have been.

Q: And involved in problems that essentially engaged us rather than observing development that was not really our problem.

FLANIGAN: Also, by the way, it was during the time I was in Western European affairs that we established diplomatic relations with the Vatican.

Q: And sent our first accredited ambassador.

FLANIGAN: That's right. We had always had a president's special envoy, well not always had but for a few years before that we had a president's special envoy to the Vatican who functioned in a very similar role, but it wasn't an embassy and the staff was very limited. After Ronald Reagan was elected, one of his kitchen cabinet friends, William Wilson, became the special

envoy and then managed through his efforts with the president and members of Congress to get it changed.

Q: Because that did require legislation and it was some what controversial.

FLANIGAN: It was still controversial. I'm not sure why. Well, grew up as a Protestant in the middle west; so I think I understand.

Q: Separation of church and state - the role of the Holy See.

FLANIGAN: But the fact of the matter is the Vatican is an institution that has a world view. Along with a handful of other countries in the world, the Vatican has a competent diplomatic corps. It is an active participant on the world stage and our interests often coincide. It is in my view very useful to have a relationship with the Vatican.

Q: And we saw as our primary reason for that contact exchanging views about things all over the world which gave our ambassador to the Vatican there some justification for thinking themselves somewhat unique and special, a dimension to cover all U.S. foreign policy no matter how remote from the Vatican.

FLANIGAN: The role of the president's special envoy to the Vatican had changed over the years. It varied from individual to individual. Some of the more recent incumbents had assumed a wider role I think, and certainly Bill Wilson himself did. In the end he managed to get himself into trouble because of unauthorized contacts with Libya.

Q: I want to come back to France for a minute, but many of these countries except for the Vatican and Malta are members of NATO, members now of the European union, but this was a time when our bilateral relationship was still pretty important. We were not trying to conduct a common coordinated European foreign policy. The role of the commission of the EEU was not as important as it has become.

FLANIGAN: No, it certainly was very different. Let's start with Italy. Italy, of course, considered itself as a potential major player and it was determined to be treated in an even-handed fashion. That meant that it wanted to be treated like France or Germany or Great Britain was from the U.S. perspective. To validate their equal role the Italians would always try to be the first to visit a new secretary of state. It was just one of the things they felt they had to do to establish their credentials as a major player. It was a very involved relationship in that sense. They always had people coming to visit. They were much more aggressive in trying to keep the relationship active than say France which felt comfortable being less than our closest friend. It knew that it had its own position in the world. It had a desire to maintain a good relationship with the United States and from a security point of view it wanted to do that, but it also was very proud of having gone its own way with regard to NATO, so there was always a little tension in the relationship, but it was a fairly solid relationship. The tension was there because we disagreed from time to time. The French didn't feel the need for demonstration of our affection and esteem. The Italians did. The Spaniards were not yet in NATO. I recall, as a matter of fact, one of the more interesting moments in my tour in Western European Affairs was coming in to

the Department on a Saturday afternoon, I think it was, for a brief ceremony where the Spanish Foreign Minister deposited the instrument of ratification of their accession to NATO.

Q: Let's talk about Italy just a little bit more. Italy is not a permanent member of the Security Council. It's not one of the four powers that had a special responsibility with regards to let's say Germany or the development of Western Europe, France, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany. Italy from my recollection always wanted to be at the table of the core group of countries and resented when they weren't able to do that. Did they in the period you were involved blame us or their European partners for sort of trying to keep them out? If we tried to keep them out on occasion, why did we do that?

FLANIGAN: I think they by and large blamed us because they saw us as the arbiter of who is in and who is out. That was largely true but not completely. The other members of the group, each for its own reason preferred to limit the participants to four. We were easily the most ready to include the Italians. Italy was a major player but it was not as important economically or politically as the others, the ones you mentioned, and it didn't have the tradition, the history, that brought it into that small group, so we did have a difficult time from time to time. We had a regularized series of meetings with France and Germany and England which sometimes excluded Italy. When the Italians found out about it, of course, they were always very upset. Why did we do it? Partly history, partly because it may have taken the Italians some time to establish themselves as a major player. They did have a chronically unstable government, and that didn't help them in this process. Also their economy was very slow to get to the point where it became as strong as it is now. I think from the point of view of the Italians, they've matured both politically and economically, and they probably feel more comfortable in their role now, and they are probably excluded less than they once were.

Q: Was lack of trust that we didn't believe they could keep confidence or that the Communist party would come into one of these weak governments?

FLANIGAN: I think some of that is simply because there were so many governments that came and went. There might have been a sense of you don't know who you are going to be dealing with tomorrow, so that was part of the issue. I don't think there was a lack of confidence in individual Italians or that; just the uncertainty about tomorrow. And as I said, we deferred to the other countries on this one.

Q: Of course, there was a desire for whatever reason of keeping those participating to as small a group as possible for ease of interchange.

FLANIGAN: Always. It's easier, and I think the Europeans themselves I know they would have been very reluctant to expand because once you start; where do you end. Italy obviously was the next stage. Not long after that you could see that Spain was going to become a major player.

Q: You mentioned that France at that time had a somewhat delicate relationship with the United States primarily because of a different perception of the world and experience with other parts of the world, history and so on. Were there bilateral problems during this period that we had with

France or was it largely the external area where we sometimes had differences and maybe always didn't communicate fully or effectively?

FLANIGAN: I think the bilateral problems were normally quite manageable. They were largely commercial relations and the desire of France to sell things to countries that we would rather that they not sell to, sophisticated equipment, those kinds of problems, but they often had to do with third countries and they weren't bilateral in the larger sense.

Q: We really didn't talk about this either in terms of Peru or Turkey. Maybe you'd want to comment on how effective these Western European embassies or other embassies were from your experience basically on the desk. I assume they were all professional and knew their way around Washington, or did some of them need a lot of help and assistance from you?

FLANIGAN: The French, the Italians were really very good. The Spaniards were good; The Portuguese were somewhat weaker, but they weren't bad. They knew their way around town; they were doing their job. If you put them on a scale, I would have to rank them in that order.

Q: Malta was small.

FLANIGAN: Malta was small. They had a couple of people. An ambassador was accredited here and in New York.

Q: The Vatican, you mentioned you were involved when diplomatic relations were formally established. The Vatican really had an office here before that; it didn't change much.

FLANIGAN: That's right. The Nuncio really didn't change much. The Department had already been dealing with the office of the Nuncio.

Q: But for us in Rome or in The Vatican, things did change once we established an Embassy there compared with essentially having a part time visiting special envoy and then maybe one officer in our embassy in Rome.

FLANIGAN: Yes. We obviously had a lot more access to the Vatican hierarchy, the bureaucracy. We were able to exchange views more freely, and I think it was useful from time to time in dealing with some issues where we had mutual interest. It did change. The Vatican was not willing to deal with us in an extra-legal basis if you will. It wanted that relationship.

Q: You mentioned that Deputy Secretary Warren Christopher, on occasion, called you to ask questions about Turkey and you had a lot to do with him and the Counselor Matthew Nimetz. Was there a seventh floor senior State Department interest in Western European countries, or was it more a willingness to see people as they visited or to visit their capitals but there wasn't quite the policy or problem orientation in those cases?

FLANIGAN: Less involvement I would say except for NATO or through the Group of Seven, those kinds of things obviously you get seventh floor involvement, but on a day to day basis generally speaking there were not issues that got the seventh floor principals involved. Now, the

threat of a Communist joining the government in France, yes, the under secretary would be interested or perhaps the secretary, but not generally speaking.

Q: This was perhaps your first significant supervisory experience in the Foreign Service, or had you had some before?

FLANIGAN: It was my first supervisory experience of any significance. I was deputy principal officer in Izmir and answered to the principal officer; I had that. Otherwise, no, this was really the first.

Q: You had desk officers for France and Italy and Spain and Portugal?

FLANIGAN: We had two for Spain, two for Portugal, two for France, and two for Italy.

Q: And a half for Malta?

FLANIGAN: Actually France and Malta were together.

Q: Did you have somebody for the Vatican too?

FLANIGAN: No, one of the Italian desk officers did that.

Q: Anything else we should cover about this period in Western European affairs?

PETER K. MURPHY
Deputy Chief of Mission
Holy See (1984-1988)

Peter K. Murphy was born in Boston, Massachusetts in 1936. He received a bachelor's degree from Boston College in 1959 and served in the U.S. Army from 1959-1960. Mr. Murphy joined the Foreign Service in 1962. His career included positions in France, Argentina, Italy, and Germany. He was interviewed on April 4, 1994 by William D. Morgan.

Q: Mr. Peter K. Murphy, of Massachusetts, is a retired Senior Foreign Service Officer (Minister Counselor) whose career encompasses three assignments in France, three in Italy, Argentina, Germany, the Holy See as well as in the United States. Mr. Murphy retired from the United States Foreign Service in 1991 and is now employed with a private firm - Stanley Associates, Inc. of Alexandria, Virginia. Mr. Murphy lives in Boston and works in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Peter, it is good to welcome you on this lovely spring day.

MURPHY: Thank you, Bill.

Q: We are here to record some of your memories of your days in the Foreign Service of our nation. Let's start first with your explanation of what brought you to the Foreign Service.

MURPHY: Well...for that - we should go back a bit in time. I'm originally from the Boston area. I was born in Medford, Massachusetts - a suburb of Boston - and was raised and educated in the nearby town of Winchester. Strange as it may seem, throughout my grammar school years - and continuing right through high school and college - I had an interest in foreign lands, cultures and peoples. When I was in the fifth grade of grammar school - together with two school chums - I joined the International Friendship League on Mount Vernon Street in Boston. Through this organization I was put in contact with students my own age around the world. I recall writing regularly to a fellow in Tokyo - who later turned out to be a rather noted Japanese baseball player. A young man I also wrote to in Le Havre, France became a lifelong friend - as is an Italian lawyer I corresponded with for years in Rome. I have visited both of these friends over the years - and know them and their families well.

I guess you could say that my interest in "lands beyond the sea" was also manifest in my decision to leave Boston College - in Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts - at the end of my sophomore year to enter a Catholic missionary order - the Maryknoll Fathers. I remained as a seminarian at the Maryknoll Seminary (The Venard) in Clarks Summit, Pennsylvania for only one year before concluding that I had no real vocation to the priesthood. I have, however, no regret whatsoever at having spent that year of study in Pennsylvania. I learned a lot - and also met interesting men from around the country - some of whom have remained life-long friends. My studies in Clarks Summit were geared to overseas living; life among other peoples and cultures. This part of my studies fascinated me - more so than the heavy dose of Latin - although I am sure that the concentrated study of the Latin language assisted me with my French, Italian, Spanish and German in later Foreign Service life!

A key catalyst to my interest in foreign affairs and cultures was Dorothea Wool. Dorothea Wool was a Foreign Service Officer from the Boston area...the first FSO I had ever met. Her cousin, Clifton Keane, was our next door neighbor in Winchester, Massachusetts. From time to time, Dorothea returned to the Boston area on her Home Leave. During those periods when she was visiting her family in Winchester, she spoke at length to me about her work in our embassies Indonesia, India, and Franceand other exotic places. I was perhaps in the seventh or eighth grade at the time - a most impressionable age, Bill! So - - it was through Miss Wool that I first became interested in the Foreign Service as a possible career choice. When I graduated from Boston College with a Bachelor of Arts degree in English literature, I made application to the Department of State. The whole process seemed very complicated to me at the time but our then Senator - John F. Kennedy - was most helpful sending me the necessary information to make application to enter the State Department. I recall that he sent me a follow-up letter of encouragement after my application was made.

During the long waiting period to enter the Foreign Service, I did a variety of things. For a few months I was a "*sales management trainee*" with DuPont Paint Company. Following this experience (which quickly convinced me that I wanted nothing at all to do with sales of any sort!!) I became a substitute teacher of French and Latin in Lexington, Winchester and Medford, Massachusetts High Schools. These were "filler" jobs until the date arrived for me to embark on

a five month trip to Europe. In order to make this trip, I was obliged to receive the permission of my local Selective Service Board to leave the country - and promise that I would enter military service upon my return! To tell the truth, Bill - this first trip to Europe was like a dream come true for me! To earn the funds for such a voyage, I worked for three months in the summer as a bartender in an exclusive club on Cape Cod (Oyster Harbors Club in Osterville) and saved every penny for my great adventure. I also spent many hours during that long, hot summer on Cape Cod planning my "trip of a lifetime." I booked passage (for \$175) Third Class from New York to Southampton, UK on the *SS Liberte* of the French Line (*Compagnie Generale Transatlantique*which no longer exists - alas!) Off I went with \$1,200 in my pocket - a fortune in those days! I guess I thought of myself as a reincarnation of Richard Haliburton - whose travel books I had devoured as a child. Aboard ship I had with me a newfangled European railway ticket which was called a Eurail Pass. Prior to leaving Boston, I saw an add in the New York Times and purchased what turned out to be the third Eurailpass ever issued - - for a total of \$125 - for a three month validity. (They surely lost money on me!!) The crossing of the Atlantic was an adventure in itself: new food (wine with every meal - can you imagine the impression for a young guy from Boston!), new friends, many students - both American and foreign. Very little sleeping was accomplished on the crossing - - but there were lots of parties and even more dancing. (I was not very good -- and never improved much in that field!)

I shall never forget my impressions of arriving in Southampton at 4:00 AM in the cold, damp fog of an October morning and climbing into a tender to go ashore - (too few passengers were disembarking at that port to permit a formal call inside the port at quay-side.) My first steps onto the soil of the "Old World" remains vividly implanted in my mind even to this day! I recall the kindness of the British customs officers who offered me and my four companions from the ship a mug of hot English tea - which tasted so good that early in the morning after a week of little sleep on the ship! The views of the English countryside - of Eaton (where the "battles of the Empire were won on those playing fields")- and farmlands - and the quaint English villages and houses with thatched roofs which raced past our window as our train rushed towards London! To me - this was really traveling!! Today's travel by jet aircraft - while admittedly far easier and swifter - does not lend itself to the adventure of actually traversing the miles to a foreign land. I spent a lot of time exploring London, several weeks at Jesus College at Oxford University - where I took a literature course - and also visited family friends in Kings Lynn in Norfolk. Every day was a new adventure - from being treated by the English Heath System at no charge! -- to visiting the Boston "Stump" (as the tower of the Cathedral at Boston is called) and the ruins of old Castle Rising in Norfolk - - and the Abbey and Shrine at Walsingham - - and the unforgettable Christmas Carol Service I attended at Kings College at Cambridge. All these memories of my first taste of life in a foreign land became an intimate part of my being...and convinced me - (if I needed more convincing) that the Foreign Service was for me!

From England I crossed the English Channel (by ferry, of course! There was no Chunnel in those days!). I visited my pen-friend in Le Havre for a week. I was received as a member of his family - - in spite of the fact that his mother - a noted French artist - had died three weeks previously. I visited the city of Le Havre and was struck at how much of it was destroyed in World War II - - and especially how ugly the reconstructed city was! Henri Michel Guerbette and his friends showed me much of the beautiful province of Normandy - from Etretat, Fecamp to Bayeux and Caen. Everything was a wonder to me - - including the newly constructed Pont de Tocqueville

over the Seine. From Le Havre I went to explore the wonders of Paris, Amsterdam, Germany - skied in Garmish Partenkirchen in the Bavarian Alps. I saw the beauty and experienced the mystery of Vienna, which, in 1959, still had Soviet troops, stationed in the city mounting an honor guard at an imposing monument to their fallen colleagues in World War II. Then - on to Italy which fast became my first love - and remains such to this day. I began in Venice and, in the brilliant sunshine of late November - explored every nook and cranny of that fascinating city. I took the "vaporetto" everywhere - including the island of Murano and also out to the Lido of Venice. After all - I didn't want to miss the scene of "Death in Venice". From Venice - to Florence - where I explored that city by foot for four days. Then I took the train to Rome and arrived at the Stazione Termini (Mussolini's grand construction) about midnight on the first day of what happened to be the first day of a State Visit by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. The city was at its most glorious and fully decked out in American and Italian flags. I easily found a cab driver near the station. The driver agreed to give me a midnight tour of the cityfor a pack of Marlboro cigarettes! All the historic Roman monuments were lit for Eisenhower's visit and they sparkled in the soft rain. I remember driving into St. Peter's Square and viewing Michelangelo's masterpiece for the first time in the shimmering light through the falling rain. To me - just being there in that historic city was like a dream come true but I also recall the acute sadness I felt at not being able to share my happiness and wonder with members of my family - or good friends.

After seeing the Roman Forum and other sites of the city, I arrived at my hotel - - a student hostel called the *Palazzo Salviati* - located on the banks of the Tiber near the Vatican and the Castel S. Angelo. The *palazzo* had formerly been used by Mussolini as a training school for officers - and later was turned into a student hostel. I remained in Rome for three unforgettable weeks and, given my curious nature, I don't think I missed too much!! Again - I want to emphasize my one constant regret at the time - - that I was in Rome alone and could not share my experience. I did try - by writing home often - but it was never the same. Whoever wrote that *joy must be shared to be fully enjoyed*, was right on the mark!

On a sun-filled Roman November morning, I stood in St. Peter's Square with hundreds of other onlookers as President Eisenhower arrived for his historic meeting with Pope John XXIII. Little did I know it that day, but years later I would work closely (both in Rome and again in Bonn) with the President's interpreter for the meeting with the Pope that morning at the Vatican - - General Vernon A. Walters.

Q: Things still were different than Paris - - in a smaller post?.

MURPHY: Yes Milan is a smaller post. I learned a lot;, we enjoyed our life in Milan, a place full of cultural amenities. The people at the post all worked together very well; everyone helped each other out in difficult situations. You know how it is in a small post. You become very friendly -- we still remain friendly with many of the officers assigned with us to Milan. As a matter of fact, last night I had dinner with someone who served at the post with me.

That was the time of, well let's see the interesting people at the post. Bradford Bishop comes to mind. I don't know if you remember Brad Bishop.

Q: The name I indeed remember. The man who disappeared after the murder of his family.

MURPHY: That's right. He murdered his entire family while on assignment in Washington following his posting in Milan.

Q: He has never been found.

MURPHY: Very strange. Here we have a Foreign Service Officer, a Yale graduate, very bright - with excellent career prospects. He was an Economic Officer in Milan. He had a wife and two children. He was the only son of a wealthy widowed mother - who came to see them often in Italy. His children were a bit older than ours but, on one occasion, we all went skiing together for a week in Bormio - north of Milan, near Sondrio. Aside from being short tempered - and very critical of his wife, who came from a "less fortunate" background than he, Brad appeared to be a nice fellow. We were all shocked to hear of the tragic killing of all his family members - including his mother - a few years later in Washington. I recall inviting Annette and Brad to dinner, sometime towards the end of our tour in Milan - together with another couple - the French Consul General in Milan and his wife - Mr. et Mme. P. Amanrich. Strange as it may sound - six or seven years later this French Consul General also murdered his entire family! Following his Milan assignment, he was named Ambassador to the Holy See by President Pompidou. I recall that he, too, was a very intelligent - and most ambitious diplomatic officer. His wife, as I remember, was from a "good French family from the 16eme Arr. in Paris" which had lost most of their money - and she was thus forced to take a secretarial job - in the *Quai d'Orsay*. There she met her future husband. He was overjoyed with his appointment to the Vatican. As you are aware, Bill, this appointment is perhaps the most prestigious in the French diplomatic service. However, the joy did not last that long in Rome! In less than two years - immediately following the election of President Valery Giscard d'Estaing - Amanrich was recalled to Paris. It was reported that he was crushed after his relatively short tour at the Vatican. Following his return to Paris, he "walked the halls" of the *Quai d'Orsay* for the next six months, during which time he turned down ambassadorships to several nations that he considered beneath him and his professional qualifications. After all, the ambassadorship to the Holy See for a French diplomat is a top assignment. Amanrich's predecessors were some of the most influential and noted men in France. After more than six months without an assignment in Paris, ...one evening while watching the TV news, Amanrich shot and killed his wife and children; went to an apartment on an upper floor in the same Paris apartment building and shot his mother-in-law. He then drove around the city all night and, in the early hours of the morning, gave himself up to the police. A few weeks later, he hanged himself in his prison cell.

Although we cannot be absolutely certain that Brad Bishop killed his family, all evidence points to the fact that it was he. It is an unbelievable coincidence that we had these two couples to dinner together in Milan years before these tragic events.

Q: Let's see. You have served in Milan along with them, and you also were involved in the Vatican.

MURPHY: That's right, Bill. A strange coincidence indeed, wouldn't you say?

Q: Where did you go after Milan?

Q: Shopping for a place to live? To die, actually?

MURPHY: Exactly. The Shah was very ill at that point - cancer. Prince Ranier was most receptive to the request and said that they could all reside in Monaco. He did lecture me at length on the errors of Washington in the whole Iranian mess - and thought the U. S. Government had no moral character to have turned its collective back on the Shah in the manner in which we did. The Pahlavi family never did make it to Monaco - but went instead to Mexico - always seeking medical attention. It is ironic in a way that months later - when the Shah was about dead - I personally gave the Consul General in Mexico City (Vern McAninch) verbal authorization to issue Non Immigrant Visas for the Shah and his wife when he had to be rushed to the United States for urgent medical treatment. I recall that it was late in the evening and - as sometimes happened in the Assistant Secretary's office - I was still at my desk! Mac called to say that a private plane was about to depart Mexico for the United States with the royal couple aboard. He asked for permission to issue temporary visas - and I'll tell you that it didn't take me a second before telling him to go right ahead! He hesitated a bit - noting that I had not consulted any political types - but I just assured him that there would be no problem - and if there happened to be some flack - I would take the heat!! I was so ashamed at the way our government had treated this family that I could not but agree to let them into the country. I never did hear any objections to my action that evening!

After the request that I approach Prince Ranier in the case of the Shah and his family - I was simply amazed to have the same situation repeated once again in 1985 while I was serving at our Embassy to the Holy See - - the Vatican.

Q: At the Vatican, assigned to the...?

MURPHY: Assigned to the Holy See. I was called again by Secretary of State's office and asked if I would once again "ask my friend in Monaco" if he would be willing to take a political family in exile. This time it was a bit more difficult as the dictator in question was none other than "Baby Doc" Duvalier of Haiti, his wife, and children. You'll recall, Bill, that our government forcibly put Duvalier and his family aboard a military aircraft in Port-au-Prince and flew them to France. They were "dumped" at a hotel near Megeve and we gave "our solemn promise" to the French Government that we would have a place of permanent exile" within two weeks - - if only they would accept the family for a short period of time". Well - - as you recall - the weeks went by - and our government had great difficulty finding a place to accept the former Haitian leader. I went once again to see Prince Ranier - - who was most forceful in his negative reply regarding "Baby Doc" himself. He said that the wife and children could live in Monaco until they found a permanent residence in Europe or in Africa - "but under no conditions will I accept that good-for-nothing husband."

Q: The family could stay as refugees, sort of.

MURPHY: Yes - as refugees, but "Baby Doc" Duvalier would never be allowed into the country. Amazingly enough - the story of "Baby Doc" and his family does not stop with Prince Ranier's refusal of refuge for the husband. I returned to Rome and almost immediately received another urgent message asking me to put pressure on the Vatican to pressure the Prince-Bishop of the nearest diocese to the Principality of Andorra to allow the Duvalier family to take up residence in that Principality. As you may know, Bill, Andorra is ruled jointly by the President of the French Republic together with the Prince-Bishop of the nearest Spanish diocese (I forget the name of that diocese). When I went to the Vatican's Secretariat of State (their State Department) with this request from Washington. I was told that the Vatican had already received a negative reply from the Bishop in question.....posed by the French some weeks before! The good Bishop was presently on holiday on Mallorca - and did not want to be disturbed. I suggested someone in Embassy Madrid go to the island and try to persuade him in person. The bishop never did give his permission - although President Francois Mitterrand had already agreed to the request. (*You see - the French REALLY wanted him out of France!*).

Q: We did our first part with Peter about three or so months ago, and got about half way through his career. Now comes the really fascinating part. We will pick up roughly where he was about to be assigned to Kingston, Jamaica, from Genoa, Italy. The Kingston assignment didn't materialize but something quite interesting did.

So, Peter, why don't you start there, and at least get us filled in so that we can tie it in with part 1.

MURPHY: Right. In July of 1984, I was about to leave Genoa, Italy, where I had been assigned the previous four years, to take up a new assignment as Consul General in Kingston, Jamaica. I had received this assignment by cable from the Office of Personnel at least six months prior to that time. Both Jackie and I had mentally and physically prepared ourselves for an assignment in Jamaica. One week before we, my family and I, were to depart Genoa, I received a call from Ambassador William A. Wilson from Rome. He was at that time our Ambassador to the Holy Seein fact - the first American Ambassador to the Holy See having been appointed and confirmed by the Senate only a month or so before he called. Our government had, a few months prior to that time, established formal diplomatic relations with the Holy See and Wilson, who was a very close friend of President Ronald Reagan and his personal representative to the Vatican up to that period...

Q: The very first one after the establishment of diplomatic relations?

MURPHY: Yes, Bill Wilson was the very first Ambassador. I believe that there were several reasons Washington decided at that time to establish diplomatic relations with the Vatican. The struggle against Communism was undoubtedly one of the major reasons for the move - as the Church and the U.S. were one in their condemnation of the communist system of government. Also - Washington had evidently learned much about theocracies - from our Iranian experience! Our government was now - at long last - starting to see and understand the influence of moral teachings and religious thought on political events. From speaking with colleagues in Washington, I know that some were a bit surprised when the Vatican used its good offices to recover deceased American servicemen's remains in Iran following a disastrous attempt by the

Carter White House to free our people held captive in our Embassy in Tehran. Another obvious reason for the move to establish relations with the Holy See was the unease produced within the National Security Council as well as at the State Department over the Vatican's public disagreement with some of the fundamental proposals and actual projects of the Reagan government - including, first and foremost, its Strategic Defense Initiative. The alarming spread of the effects of Liberation Theology in parts of Latin America was also a contributing factor to this equation. In effect - the reasons our government had for such a move in 1983/84 were far more solid in the eyes of the Congress - as well as a majority of the American people than on previous occasions when the proposal was raised in public. The reaction to the announcement of the establishment of an Embassy was a far cry from that which greeted President Harry Truman when he announced his intention to seek confirmation of General Mark Clark - "Liberator of Rome" - as the first American Ambassador to the Holy See!

Strange as it may seem, I did not know Bill Wilson well when he telephoned me in Genoa to ask if I would consider accepting a posting as Minister (Deputy Chief of Mission) of the Embassy to the Holy See. I had met Wilson only twice before at receptions or dinners in Italy. I met Bill and his wife Betty at the Portofino home of Amintore Fanfani - the former Prime Minister of Italy and his wife - Maria Pia Fanfani. When I had met with Bill Wilson, I had always found him to be a very pleasant man although I cannot say that I knew him all that much about him - except that he was a Californian and close friend of President Reagan. I knew of his position (which I found fascinating!) and I knew his closeness to the President. I did not realize, at the time, that Bill was the chief of the "kitchen cabinet" and that most of the Cabinet Secretaries were somehow beholden to him for their positions. In any event, there was no one in the top echelons of the Reagan Administration Bill Wilson did not know....as I soon discovered.

I thought it very kind of him to call me in Genoa.....and really thought the purpose of his call was to wish me well in my new assignment. But after a few minutes, he asked me if I would like to come to Rome as his Deputy Chief of Mission.

Q: How large was the Mission, Peter?

MURPHY: The mission at that time consisted of three officers, plus three secretaries, and one Italian security guard. That was the extent of the Mission! The three officers were the Ambassador, the Deputy Chief of Mission, and a Political Officer.

Q: And its function was solely to represent our government at the Vatican?

MURPHY: Yes, Bill Actually - the United States government in 1984 established formal diplomatic relations with the Holy See - and NOT the Vatican. The term "Holy See" is the cause of much confusion. Some ask - "What is this thing called the Holy See?" It is the supreme organ of government of the Roman Catholic Church - and its temporal and territorial seat is the State of Vatican City. Often it is difficult to tell quite where the Holy See ends and the Vatican City begins - and some say that this confusion is by design The Holy See is an entity "*sui generis*" - - (so styled by the Treaty of Vienna) which, under international law and practice, has an international personality of its own which permits it to enter into treaties and agreements with nations with the equivalence of a state, and to send and receive Ambassadors in this same

capacity. The State of Vatican City (Stato della Citta' del Vaticano) was first established in 1929 with agreements (the Lateran Treaties) between the Italian government (Mussolini of course leading the Italian government at that time) and the Holy See (negotiations were conducted by the Secretary of State - Eugenio Cardinal Pacelli - the future Pope Pius XII). The State of Vatican City is, of course, all that remains of the Papal States - which for centuries prior to the unification of the Italian Republic covered most of central Italy - from Bologna to Naples. The Papal States were the seat of the temporal power of the Roman Pontiffs up until the fall of the city of Rome in 1849 when Giuseppe Garibaldi united Italy into one country. The United States maintained consular - and then diplomatic relations - with the Papal States. The last Minister-Resident (as they were styled in those days) to the Papal States was Mr. Rufus King. Mr. King, my immediate predecessor at the Holy See, served as Minister-Resident to the Papal States from 1863 to 1868 when the Congress refused to appropriate additional funds to allow for the continuation of the mission. Thus - Mr. King left Rome 117 years before my arrival at the Vatican! Opposition to diplomatic relations with the Holy See at the time arose not only from the usual constitutional concerns about the separation of Church and State and but also from fears concerning the direct effect of such relations within our nation - such as - the "take over" of the United States of America by Rome resulting from Papal exercise of undue influence on the U. S. Government! In effect, the US government did not "break relations" with the Papal government back in 1868 - - but simply let the relations lapse for lack of funding!! The action of our government was considered - justly so in my opinion! - a most inelegant and undiplomatic way of closing a diplomatic mission. This is especially true when one considers that the Papal government fully supported the North against the South during our Civil War! See how we reward our friends - Bill!!

Even after the fall of Rome - and the unification of Italy as a country for the first time in its history - the international juridical powers of the Holy See which were equivalent to those of a State, were still recognized by most of the western European and Latin American nations. This is evidenced by the fact that several diplomatic missions remained in the city of Rome - fully accredited to the Holy See - even after the fall of the City and the unification of the country.....and the absorption of all Papal territory into the Italian State. You must remember that this was years before the establishment of the State of Vatican City - and the settlement of the "Roman Question" - as the problem was styled in the international political arena. During the entire period from the Fall of Rome - until the signing of the Lateran Treaties in 1929 - the Roman Pontiff never left the Apostolic Palaces of the Vatican. It was thus that the Pope took on yet another title - "Prisoner of the Vatican".

Q: Were those countries which continued to recognize the Holy See Catholic?

MURPHY: Several of them were, Bill. Several of them had large Catholic populations, but also England, for example, had a legation to the Holy See during that period. It was obvious that these nations felt that it was beneficial to have diplomatic representation in Rome to pass on information received - and to have the Vatican understand what their own nation was attempting to do in the area of foreign policy - with the hopes that the Vatican would lend its considerable support.

So.....in extending official diplomatic recognition to the Holy See in 1984, the United States government joined 120 other nations of the world. As I said previously, these diplomatic missions were not only from Catholic nations - but there were fairly large Embassies from, for example, Japan, Syria, Egypt, Algeria, Indonesia, Yugoslavia, Korea,...and, believe it or not, one of the largest missions was that of the Ayatollah Khomeini's Iran. I suppose the Ayatollah considered his embassy rather like sending an ambassador to another "theocracy"!!

Q: This is, as a United States diplomatic Mission, totally independent of our Embassy to the Italian Republic?

MURPHY: Yes. It is completely independent of our Embassy to Rome. We have nothing to do officially with the Embassy..... although all our administration support comes from the Embassy. By that I mean our classified communications; financial support; personnel support in general, all administrative support.

Q: Communications, general services?

MURPHY: Exactly.

As a matter of interest, Bill - perhaps I should point out that the Vatican City does have its own administrative, legislative, and judicial organizations. It has a civil Court system - and even its own jail. I've only heard of minor criminals being kept in their jail and during my tour of duty, there were no prisoners. The Turk who shot Pope John Paul II in St. Peter's Square during a Papal ceremony, actually committed his crime within the State of Vatican City - as the Piazza of St. Peters is Vatican territory. However - the Vatican quickly seeded jurisdiction to the Italian government in this case. The Vatican has its own national flag and monetary system - based, of course, on the Italian Lira as well as a national anthem written by Guinoud. The State also issues passports - tourist, official and diplomatic. All cardinals of the Sacred College of Cardinals (the supreme body of advisors to the Pope) automatically are granted Vatican citizenship - and a Vatican passport - upon their elevation to the rank of cardinal. As far as I know, this fact has never been challenged in the American legal system whenever a new American cardinal has been named by Rome. There have been instances, however, when Papal Nuncios (ambassadors) - of American nationality - have had their US citizenship's challenged in US courts based upon their being the official representative of a foreign nation. This question arose in the mid '50s. One such case involved the Apostolic Delegate (an American cleric) in London in the early part of this century. Interestingly - the United States did not, at that time, recognize the Holy See as a State. Perhaps the case was thrown out due to the fact that the American in question was only an Apostolic Delegate (personal representative of the Pope to the Church in a country) as opposed to a Papal Nuncio (an Ambassador of the Pope to a foreign nation - and also his representative to the local Church).

Q: Thus - Peter - the Vatican is an independent state?

MURPHY: Yes. It is an independent state - and recognized as such by over 170 nations today (1996).

Q: The Holy See's ambassadors are not called "ambassadors", are they? Are they not called Papal Nuncios?

MURPHY: Yes, ambassadors of the Holy See are called Papal Nuncios ("nuncio - from the Latin meaning "to announce"). According to the Treaty of Vienna, a Papal Nuncio is the *de facto* dean of the diplomatic corps in most of western Europe and most of Latin America. If the nation is nominally Catholic in religion, the Nuncio is Dean of the Diplomatic Corps. This is, I should think, a matter of courtesy to the Pope's personal representative. It is not the case in non-Catholic countries. For example, in the United States, the papal representative is called the Pro Nuncio, the "Pro" indicating that he (*there are no female Papal Nuncios....yet!*) is not Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

Q: And normally a Dean is dean by reason of length of service in that nation?

MURPHY: Yes. Length of service determines deanship.

Q: Before we get into some of your personal encounters in Rome, let's finish up the assignment process. How did you actually...?

MURPHY: I mentioned that Ambassador Bill Wilson asked me to meet him and his wife in Florence for an interview.

Q: He had no Deputy Chief of Mission at the time?

MURPHY: Ambassador Wilson had had a DCM....a fellow by the name of Donald Planty. Don had been assigned to Rome for a very short period of time. There was a personality conflict between the two men and various newspaper articles involving Wilson and Swiss bankers precipitated Don Planty's departure from the post. Wilson suspected Planty had leaked information to the press. Thus, Wilson told me was looking for another Deputy Chief of Mission. I never believed for one moment that Don Planty had cause to leak information. Mr. Wilson was a very suspicious person and took immediate like or dislike to a person. (Example: he suspected that my secretary - Mrs. Kelly, had also been involved in the press leak with Mr. Planty. Before leaving Rome shortly after my arrival he demanded that I get rid of Mrs. Kelly - stating "I shall not return to the Embassy if she is still working here".) I, of course, was rather upset to hear the reason Don Planty left the post after a few months! Due to the nature of the assignment, however, I pleased to think that Bill Wilson would think of me and want me to go to Rome to work with him. Don's abrupt departure, however, did, in fact, worry me! When Bill actually proposed the job to me, I thought him terribly naive - especially given the fact that my assignment to Jamaica was made months in advance. It is just not done, as you well know, to break an assignment in two or three days and go on to another one! Bill simply called the White House and told the office of personnel that he wanted me assigned to the Vatican.....simple as that!

Q: What gave Mr. Wilson the ability to do this?

MURPHY: His power base was considerable - as you shall see! In fact, I have never worked with anyone before or since who had such connections directly with the President of the United

States. At the time of the formation of the first Reagan administration, Bill Wilson was the *de facto* leader of the “kitchen cabinet”. He assisted the President-Elect in choosing most of the Cabinet members. The President and Bill Wilson had known each other for many years; Bill helped Reagan purchase his ranch in California; he held Reagan’s financial portfolio during the entire presidency. In addition - and most importantly - Bill’s wife Betty was perhaps Nancy Reagan’s closest “best friend”. Incidentally, Betty Wilson was also Chairman of the Board of Pennzoil Corporation!. So - the Wilsons came from the wealthy class of Californians who rallied around President Reagan and worked many, many months for his election to the Presidency. As opposed to many of the California group of “Friends of the President” I met during my years in Rome, Bill and Betty were distinguished and represented the nation with both dignity and intelligence. I cannot say the same of several of the other members of the “California friends of the Reagans” I met over the years in Rome!

Q: With that kind of base, I would have speculated he would have ended up in a more powerful position..... with all due respect to the Vatican.

MURPHY: William Wilson is a convert to Catholicism, a former Episcopalian, and as some converts from one faith to another - more “Catholic than the Pope”. For him to be - initially - Personal Representative of the President of the United States to the Pope, following in the footsteps of Myron C. Taylor and Henry Cabot Lodge and Robert Wagner and finally - the First American Ambassador to the Holy See - was to Bill a very great honor and a key position in today’s world. I recall Bill telling me one time how President Reagan became convinced to open diplomatic relations with the Holy See: At the conclusion of the Queen of England’s State Visit to Canada in either 1982 or 1983, Queen Elizabeth II and her spouse, Prince Philip, called at San Francisco aboard the Royal Yacht *H.M.S. Britannia*. There she entertained President and Mrs. Reagan at a formal dinner - during which time the subject of diplomatic relations with the Vatican arose in conversation between the President and the Queen. The Queen, according to Bill Wilson, told Reagan that she was delighted that the United Kingdom had raised their relations from that of Legation status to that of a full-fledged Embassy some years before. The Queen provided the reasons she felt such an Embassy was important to her government and the benefits the British felt they gained by being there in Rome. Bill said that this conversation clinched it for President Reagan - who was always influenced by anything English! The President made this decision to recognize the Vatican in spite of the strong opposition of his wife Nancy who was opposed to the entire project. This was, according to Bill Wilson, one of the very few times that Reagan acted in opposition to the wishes of his politically active wife!

I know that Bill Wilson saw his new position as a “worldwide or global position”. I shall explain this in more detail later. The Mission at the Vatican is, in fact, rather like our Mission to the United Nations in New York. The influence of the Holy See throughout the world is considerable. Whether you agree with this influence or not, it is a fact of political life!! This influence exists - and millions upon millions of people follow the policies set by the Holy See. Diplomacy is, of course, not just a one-way street. While we were trying to influence the Holy See, the Holy See was trying to place its stamp on United States policies. A few such instances come to mind: the activity of the Holy See on the international debt problem of Third-World nations; the political situation in Lebanon - and the entire problem of the Middle East; pressing for assistance in improving human rights for members of the oppressed Catholic Church in various parts of the

Soviet Union and Eastern European nations - as well as in China - with the problems of the nationalistic "Patriotic Catholic Church".

Q: Albeit, without an army, the Vatican still has power.

MURPHY: Exactly. Everyone remembers that famous quip of Stalin: "*How many divisions does the Pope have?*"

When working with the Holy See on matters involving world-wide political situations, one has the feeling that one is dealing with "diplomacy" at its finest. The Vatican has had many centuries of experience in diplomacy - and the Vatican is never in a rush; like the Chinese, there always seems to be time to wait, say, for a change of government or a political figure! The art of diplomacy is usually defined as the attempt to gain one's objectives by rather skillful manipulation of one's opponents - through strategies which those opponents often do not even comprehend until they are accomplished. I think that diplomacy tends to be especially ineffective in situations where ideology rules (Iran, Bosnia, Northern Ireland, Algeria, Cuba, the former Soviet Union) - - - where contending parties have beliefs which they consider matters of principle and about which they have passionate convictions. Without a doubt - practicing the art of diplomacy in such situations demands great skill - and not a little patience! Over many centuries, the Holy See has frequently had to resort to such diplomatic maneuvers simply because it lacked the military and political power necessary to obtain its objectives by any kind of force. Thus, the Vatican - of necessity - became expert in the true art of diplomacy and for this reason, a diplomatic posting to the Holy See is normally considered to be the highlight of a diplomat's career. I know for a fact that most European diplomats - as well as African, Middle Eastern and Latin American diplomats - are of this opinion. At the time of my appointment, no living American career diplomat had had that unique full-time "Roman" experience as we had no Embassy at the Vatican. There had been a couple of officers who were assigned to assist Henry Cabot Lodge and Bob Wagner - when they served as Personal Representatives of the President in Rome but with the personal title of Ambassador. As the Representatives came most infrequently to Rome, the officers had little to do and usually worked at Embassy Rome for most of the time. For these reasons and, admittedly, the prospect of living and working in the Eternal City, I was really delighted to be appointed the Deputy Chief of Mission at the new Embassy of the United States to the Holy See. I saw the job as one full of opportunity: for my country, for humanity in general (if we could ever convince the Holy See to recognize Israel!) - and also for myself and my family. I was very pleased that my boys would have the opportunity to continue to live in Rome for a while. From Genoa, both of them had attended schools in Rome.

My appointment to the Vatican came about in the following manner. When Bill Wilson asked me to come to Rome, I attempted to explain to him as kindly and as diplomatically as I knew how that I already had an *onward assignment* - and that within the State Department at least, things just were not done that way!! Once you are assigned to a post, you go - unless a major catastrophe intervenes. I told Bill I would really love to help establish our new Embassy and thought it would be a great challenge. I told him that throughout my career I had always been very much in favor of establishing relations with the Holy See - - although in my college days I actually wrote a paper against the establishment of such an embassy! (The follies of youth!)

Bill thought it best that we meet in person, so - without any preconceived notions that my assignment to Jamaica would ever be changed - Jackie and I got in the car, and Bill and Betty got in theirs, and we met somewhere in the outskirts of Florence. We spent a delightful weekend together. At the end of the weekend, Bill told me that he had already called the White House and that he had also spoken with George Shultz, then Secretary of State. We shouldn't have any problem with this thing, said he! And - lo and behold! - there were no problems!! The next morning in the office in Genoa I received a cable from the Office of Personnel. I was called by Henry (Hank) Cohen - then director of Foreign Service Personnel in Washington (whom I had known years ago in Paris.) Hank asked if I was crazy contemplating going to work for Bill Wilson - and taking such a small post where the grade of the job didn't even equate to my present Foreign Service rank!? I insisted that I would like the job; that I thought it was important - and I was told "*Good luck! You'll need it - working with that guy*" ! A cable then arrived in Genoa from Washington changing my assignment from Kingston, Jamaica to the Vaticanand that is how it came about that I was assigned to the Holy See! I know that many of my colleagues will never believe a word of this - but it is the absolute truth of how the change of my assignment came about! Never did I pressure anyone for the job - in fact, I had no idea that the job even existed!! I will confess, however, that I was simply delighted I got it!

Q: Was this assignment a "direct transfer"?

MURPHY: It was a "very direct transfer", Bill ! I recall that Bill Wilson and I met at the end of July 1984 in Florence to discuss the position - and I was actually in Rome - in place at the Embassy - the first week of August of that year! Such a speedy transfer is almost unheard of in the annals of the Foreign Service. What was Rome like that first month - or so? You can just imagine the heat of Rome in August, Bill.all the Romans at the beaches and the few tourists (German, American and British!) in the sun filled deserted city. I arrived in Rome alone, because Jackie and the boys had to stay in Genoa to finish the packing of our household.

It must have been about the 10th of August when I drove into the Eternal City from Genoa to take up my new position. I spent a day and a half with Bill Wilson at the "temporary" Chancery, which was at that time located in a small two-bedroom apartment in Piazza Citta' Leonina, just outside St. Peter's Square. The building was one of several in the city of Rome owned by the Vatican. It was very tight quarters. One of my first tasks was to start looking for adequate quarters for the Chancery, residences for the staff and also space for the Marine Security Guard contingent which was scheduled to arrive in Rome any day.

Bill Wilson outlined to me what went on in the office and gave me the names of a few of his contacts at the Vatican. Of course, I had previously met and known Cardinal William Baum, former archbishop of Washington, and his secretary, Msgr. James Gillen - who proved most helpful as I got up to speed in Rome. At the beginning of our second day together in the office, Bill said, "Well, Peter Betty and I are leaving Rome for about a month and a half. We're going to California. So you'll be in charge - of course." I was absolutely floored. Here it was - the month of August in Rome....not a soul about; only the ever-present cats in the Forum and Coliseum!! I had no idea where the offices of the Vatican's Secretariat of State were located; I had no identification to get into Vatican City; I had been introduced to no one connected with the

Vatican.... the Foreign Minister or any of my colleagues in the diplomatic corps. In effect - I was left to sink or swim!!.

Q: You hadn't made your diplomatic "calls".

MURPHY: No. There was no one I could ask in Washington - or even at the post - how one proceeds. No one had any experience official dealings with the Vatican. Thank God for Mirella Giacalone and Wanda DiAngelos - two local Americans who had worked in the office before the mission was raised to the status of an Embassy. They were very helpful in helping me find my way! I couldn't have begun to function without their assistance - and guidance

Q: Was there anyone at our Embassy to Italy? Was there anybody there that followed this and could help you?

MURPHY: All my friends at Embassy Rome were very kind, of course - having been colleagues during my Genoa tour. John Holmes, Bob Blackburn, Charlie Stout - - and even Maxwell (Max) Rabb. Of course, they didn't know much about the Vatican. In fact - there was a detectable undercurrent of animosity directed against our fledgling Embassy emanating from Embassy Rome. This stemmed directly from the rivalry between Max Rabb and Bill Wilson - but also extended to the Embassy's Political Section where it was felt that the Embassy to the Holy See was unnecessary and should never have been established.

Q: It took a piece of the turf away?

MURPHY: Not simply a piece of the turf, but, ideologically, several officers- including the then-Political Councilor Charles Stout - did not think the United States government should have recognized the Holy See. It was the old "Church-State" constitutional conflict. I did all I could to unify the two diplomatic missions. I attended Embassy Rome staff meetings from time to time - to give an overview of what we were doing at the Vatican. I also spoke to all newcomers to the Embassy at regular Welcome Meetings - to explain what we did - and how we could be of assistance to them or their visiting relatives who wanted to visit the Vatican.

Q: I thought we were loyal servants of the Administration and the Presidency.

MURPHY: Well, in spite of professional loyalty, everyone has their own individual ideas on such a prickly subject. I certainly found this to be very true in my dealings with all entities of the U.S. government, both overseas and in Washington, during my years at the Vatican. In fact - it was quite a revelation to me. . I never had a job in the Foreign Service like mine at the Vatican. I frequently encountered animosity towards the post itself - from the American public, from members of Congressional delegations and, especially, from my colleagues back in the State Department. During my first year at the post, we averaged at least 8 - 10 hate letters a week. At first, Bill Wilson felt obliged to reply- with a four or page reply!! I convinced him eventually that it was a waste of time and paper.

My first year was very active because there was so much to do to get a new Embassy up and running as an embassy should! For example, in the administrative realm: looking for a new

Chancery, gathering a staff. We had a Political Officer assigned to the post - Louis J. Nigro. Thank God for Lou - he spoke fluent Italian and French and was intimately knowledgeable about Italian and Vatican history. In fact - Lou is now back at the Vatican (1996) in my old job - working for Ambassador Raymond L. Flynn - the former Mayor of Boston whom I briefed for five hours before he took up his post in Rome during President Clinton's Administration!

Our Administrative Officer - Jim Griffin - was very helpful in setting up the post. He had a very delicate job - attempting to get from Embassy Rome all that Ambassador Wilson demanded - - and he demanded a lot!! Bill Barnes came from Genoa to set up our United States Information Service operation. As Charles Wick (Director of USIA under Reagan) was a personal friend of Bill Wilson's - Bill Barnes had no difficulty in getting everything he needed from Washington to duplicate Embassy Rome's USIA set up!! I began getting to know my colleagues in the other 120 embassies at the Vatican. Not much on a protocol level had really been done at this new post - in fact, during my call on the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps to the Holy See - the Ambassador of the Ivory Coast - he greeted me with " I am most pleased to meet the first American diplomat to the Vatican. I sincerely welcome you - and your nation". I later discovered that Ambassador Wilson had never made a formal call on the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps - a major *faux pas* in a place where they are so hung up on protocol!

Q: How long had the Mission been there before you arrived?

MURPHY: The mission had been there four months.....but up to that point, not much had been done by the Embassy in the way of protocol. As you are well aware, Bill - the smaller the State, the greater the protocol. The Vatican is very, very protocol conscious. This is even true for most of the diplomats assigned there. Because of the fact that for a European, or Latin American, or even an African, an assignment to the Holy See is perhaps about the pinnacle of their career. An example: while I was in Rome, the French Ambassador to the Holy See went on to become the Under Secretary for Political Affairs in Paris and his successor was the former French Foreign Minister. The Colombian Ambassador was formerly President of his country for seven years - while the Belgian Ambassador (Baron Alexandre Paternotte de la Vallee) was the third in the line of his family to hold the position of Ambassador to the Holy See. The German Ambassador's (Mr. Peter Hermes) previous assignment was as German Ambassador to Washington. Thus - we were dealing with diplomats who knew a thing or two; they had many years of service in their nations diplomatic corps and were very proud of their present postings.

Q: Advice that Wilson might have gotten when he first got on board from our Embassy to Italy wasn't there for the reasons you stated, so he was sort of on his own, I gather?

MURPHY: Ambassador Wilson was on his own although he had a wide circle of friends in Rome as he had held the position of *Personal Representative of the President to the Vatican* for at least three years prior to the raising of the office to the status of full diplomatic mission. Therefore, he did know a lot of people on the social and political circuits. He knew a lot of the movers and shakers in Rome, and he did know people within the diplomatic corps to the Holy See as well as to the Republic of Italy. He knew, much to the consternation of our Ambassador to Italy, many of the leading Italian politicians far too well!

Q: Who as our Ambassador to Italy at this time?

MURPHY: At that time it was Maxwell M. Rabb. Relations between both Embassies were at times rather rocky. The reason for this was mainly because of rivalry over friendship with the President - as well as the division of “perks” to each ambassador and his entourage!.. But you will understand, Bill, such a situation exists in most places where we have two or three ambassadors in residence - Brussels - Vienna, etc. I noticed that all of my colleagues in Rome, no matter whether they were from the Japanese, Egyptian, French, or British Embassies to the Holy See - they all had similar difficulties with their Embassy to the Italian Republic.

Q: Ideology aside, it was simple ego?

MURPHY: Ego, of course, entered into the equation!.

Q: Let's put some dates on your actual tour to this DCM assignment to the Vatican.

MURPHY: I was there in Rome from August of 1984 to September of 1988.

Q: So it was four years?

MURPHY: Yes - a four year tour of duty - first with Ambassador William A. Wilson and then with Ambassador Frank Shakespeare.

Q: Now you are Chargé?

MURPHY: Okay - Let's get back to the narrative. So I had to begin “at the beginning” - *in principio* - as it were!! I really had to start to build an embassy, because many of the ordinary functions of an embassy were not in place. For example, I opened some of the file cabinets - and what did I find: classified and unclassified reports mixed together - and in unlocked cabinets! It was completely understandable; there were no guards and no one who knew the practices of a normal embassy. So -it was really a job of setting everything up - establishing precedent - from soup to nuts.

Q: But your support staff, the two other officers and your secretary?

MURPHY: I did have a marvelous support staff and they worked very, very hard.

Q: They'd been around in the Foreign Service?

MURPHY: The two secretaries were “dependents” or U. S. government employees at Embassy Rome.

Within a few days of Ambassador Wilson's departure to the United States, I received a call from the Department of State and the newly appointed Under Secretary for Political Affairs, Michael Armacost, came on the phone. Armacost told me that he was new to the job and had most recently been Ambassador to the Philippines. He wanted to make his first official trip in his new

position to Europe - and wanted to include the Vatican as a stop. People in Washington quite often do this: decided to go to Europe in the middle of August when everyone is on holiday! In any event, Armacost came to Rome and called on the Vatican's "Foreign Minister" - Archbishop Achille Silvestrini.. (Vatican title: Secretary of the Council for the Public Affairs of the Church - *Consiglio per gli Affari Pubblici della Chiesa*) ...the first official call of an American Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs at the Vatican. Prior to the visit, Armacost told me that he wanted to discuss several political matters of importance in which he felt the Church could assist in influencing various governments around the world to our position. He mentioned especially the situation in the Philippines... with which he was quite familiar.

Q: With the Vatican, though? He knew the role?

MURPHY: I'd say Armacost was well aware of the role and influence of the Vatican and the Church, its influence in various parts of the world. It was a most successful visit. I recall going to lunch with Armacost following our morning of meetings at the Vatican. We spent two hours on a hot August afternoon discussing the potential of our small embassy. He was excited about the fact that we now had a new source of information which he predicted would become invaluable in the future. We also discussed the "ideal" American ambassador for the Vatican post. I told him - as I subsequently told others from Washington - that in my opinion the best possible ambassador would be a career Protestant or Jew. I realize that, for political reasons within our government, such an appointment may never be made by the White House. In spite of this, however, I feel strongly that we should take a lesson from other nations. England, Germany, Canada, Mexico, South Africa - for example - send their best people to Rome; religion does not enter the equation and thus the post is treated as any other post in the world . I fear that the White House will feel obliged to give the assignment to a "favorite Catholic" who has helped with the election of the President. This is so unfair and such a waste of a valid diplomatic post which has so much to offer our nation in furthering our "national interests abroad".

Diplomatic relations between our two nations seem to be here to stay. The situation has not endangered our Constitution or the international operations of the Catholic Church. It is a most delicate post - and the person directing our relations there in Rome should be fully aware of this fact. There is a large gray area of our responsibilities: for example our Embassy never should become involved in internal Church matters. Our political reporting on Liberation Theology was, for me, one of these shady areas - where Washington viewed it as a plan of social change in Third Country nations while the Vatican saw it as an application of faith and social action which - in some instances - got out of hand. I am sure you recall the problems in Central and Latin America which began with priests and nuns organizing themselves into what were called "base communities". These groups were direct targets of right wing governments that viewed them as subversives,

Q: You had a backup? All embassies had backups in the State Department. You had a "country desk"? A Vatican desk?

MURPHY: Oh, yes, we had a "Vatican Desk Officer" at the State Department who was very good at his job. He was a focal point in Washington for our Embassy; coordinated policy papers; communications between various Washington agencies of government and assisted with visits

from officials in Washington - Congressional, White House, State. Whenever we had visitors to Rome, a very difficult logistical situation was created. This was especially true when the President, Vice President, Secretary of State or other high ranking government official was involved. The problem was simply the fact that the visitors wanted to call on Italian government officials - as well as the Pope - thus involving very close coordination and cooperation between the two U. S. Embassies in Rome as well as the Vatican and Italian Foreign Office. The Italian government was quite used to this logistical problem - but it drove us and some of our colleagues at Embassy Rome mad!! Of course, Advance Teams from the White House NEVER understood this problem. The main difficulty was in pinning down the Prefect of the Apostolic Palace to set a time - and even date sometimes - for a Papal audience. Sometimes we received a confirmation *the very day before an official visit!!* You can imagine, Bill, how this threw the "Italian program" into confusion!! Official Italian calls had to be rescheduled, - so did luncheons and dinners and receptions; motorcades had to be re-routed through the streets of Rome! Admittedly, the Pope is one man, there is no Vice Pope! Since there were, at the time, 120 embassies to the Vatican, the problem was monumental! All these nations had Presidents, Ministers and Legislators - all of whom wanted to be received by the Pope. You can be assured that ours was not the only embassy having similar scheduling problems! We were always most relieved when our official party left Rome!!

Q: But there is a Secretary of State at the Vatican or someone who deals with foreign affairs?

MURPHY: Yes there is. This would be the position of "Cardinal Secretary of State" who functions as the Papal Prime Minister. Cardinal Agostino Casaroli held the position the entire time I served at the Vatican. Then - as I have previously mentioned - there is an archbishop whose position equates to that of our Secretary of State - or Foreign Minister. During my service there, the "Foreign Minister" was Archbishop Achille Silvestrini - a very pleasant and competent man who is today (1996) holds the position of Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation for the Oriental Church.

Q: So all of the Missions, all of the Embassies.....are they all "embassies"?

MURPHY: All of the diplomatic missions accredited to the Holy See are all Embassies these days. The last "Legation" was that of the United Kingdom - but that mission was raised to embassy status over ten years ago.

Q: And they had someone that they are told to deal with. This is - your office contact?

MURPHY: An interesting point, Bill, When I first started to be introduced to various officials in the Vatican, I discovered that most of my official work was with the officers (all priests...no lay persons!) within specific section of the Secretariat of State - which deals with foreign governments. On almost a daily basis I would visit the offices of the Secretariat regarding mainly political matters involving our direct or indirect interests - throughout the world. These offices were located on the third floor (Loggia) of the Papal Palace (Palazzo Apostolico) - a truly magnificent building with over 1,000 rooms built throughout the ages.

Q: This is in the Vatican City itself?

MURPHY: Yes..and is located to the right of Bernini's colonnade in St. Peter' Square - within the confines of the State of Vatican City. The entrance to the Secretariat of State offices is located within the Papal Palace and decorated with frescoes of Raffaello, Michelangelo and other noted artists. What a place to work! It must be the most beautiful office building in the entire world! The Vatican has "American Desk Officers" just as we do in the State Department. These men (they are always men - and priests, as I mentioned previously!) are usually responsible for more than one country. The Vatican diplomatic corps is quite small - no more than 200 clerics in total. They are, as a general rule, quite expert at their jobs - but, like in any country, once in a while you do find a dud! I remember, for example, that the American Desk Officer during my time in Rome knew very little about the United States. In addition, he spoke not a word of English! In order to further his education - and help him do a better job - I offered him a USIS International Visitor's Program grant which would have allowed him to travel with an interpreter throughout the USA for a six week period. He refused the offer - saying that " That would be impossible as I must to spend my vacation with "mia Mama!". When I told Archbishop Silvestrini, his boss, his reaction to my offer, Silvestrini rolled his eyes and said " What can we do!". I know that the Pro-Nuncio in Washington - Archbishop (now Cardinal) Pio Laghi - never utilized this desk officer for much!

Communications within the Vatican - and from the Nunciatures abroad - is remarkable. I was always amazed at the detail information regarding complex political situations which was known within the Vatican. Their communications, however, are certainly not as speedy as ours. In fact, on several occasions - in matters involving the life or death in certain countries - I authorized the sending of Vatican communications through our system - resulting in the saving of several lives. To have relied on the Vatican communication system would have resulted in disaster on several occasions. In effect, the Vatican utilizes the local postal system - sending their official classified correspondence in the old-fashioned five-letter groupings and in Latin - to be decoded at the local Nunciature!

Q: You could call the Vatican's Department of State and tell them that our Under Secretary for Political Affairs - Armacost - is coming to Rome and here's what he would like to do..... and a program evolved.

MURPHY: Exactly. We would propose a program to Washington and have it approved. Then we would attempt to arrange the program at the Vatican - and not just with the Secretariat of State but with any of the several international offices connected directly with the Vatican - or with some religious congregation - i.e. Jesuits, Benedictines, Dominicans, Oblates, etc. High ranking visits from Washington were always more complicated to plan. These always involved the sending of an initial Diplomatic Note explaining the President of the United States (for example) was coming to Italy and would like to be received by the Holy Father and the Cardinal Secretary of State. The Vatican protocol office always insisted in knowing what "kind" of visit it would be: we never had a "State Visit" during my time at the Vatican but simple "working visits". (The difference is minor - but a State Visit at the Vatican involves much more protocol- including a meeting between the Chief of State with the entire diplomatic corps in full dress as well as a return call on the visiting Chief of State by the Cardinal Secretary of State to his "temporary

residence in Rome” - - and this means NOT the residence of his ambassador to the Italian Republic.!!)

Prior to a Presidential or Vice Presidential visit - of course - the famous Advance Teams arrived in Rome - and wanted to examine every square inch of ground that the illustrious visitor would visit. The major sticking point for me was the fact that the Secret Service and security officers always wanted to view the Papal Library - where the actual meeting would take place. The Vatican, naturally, refused such a request stating it was the Pope’s personal office and was always in use. The disagreements over this refusal were, at times, fierce!! The Secret Service never did manage to visit the Papal Library prior to a Presidential visit - but this certainly was not for lack of trying!! In arranging a high level visit to the Vatican, we would also have to deal with the Regent of the Papal Palace, named Archbishop (now Cardinal) Dino Monduzzi. This gentleman was responsible for every moment of the Papal daily schedule. He served, in effect, as sort a Papal *bouncer!* Monduzzi arranged all Papal audiences and ceremonies in which the pontiff participated. He also accompanied the Pope on his travels throughout the world - and all this without speaking a single word of a foreign language!! Monduzzi was a real character - with whom I enjoyed working very much! He could be tough as nails - but was really great person once you got to know him. In complex situations during an official visit, his language (always in Italian!) was sometimes beyond belief for a high official of the Papal Household! I got on well with him and consider him a good friend.

Q: These officials are all Italians?

MURPHY: They were mostly Italians within the immediate entourage of the Pope --- but, of course, there were some Poles as well.....members of the *Polish “Mafia”* at the Vatican - as they were known.

Archbishop Monduzzi was all powerful within the Vatican. He is the keeper of the papal door, the papal schedule - and his word is final He would direct all the State visits. You can just imagine the problem he experiences with scheduling the Pope’s day! There is only one Pope - and every President, King, Prince, Prime Minister, Cabinet Minister in the world asks to be received at the Vatican when passing through Rome.

Q: And the Pope during this period of your service in Rome, just to make sure the readers remember, was John Paul II?

MURPHY: Yes, Pope John Paul II. His full title, for the record, is: Bishop of Rome, Vicar of Jesus Christ, Successor of the Prince of the Apostles, Sovereign Pontiff of the Universal Church, Patriarch of the West, Primate of Italy, Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Province of Rome, Sovereign of the State of Vatican City - Servant of the Servants of God. Karol Wojtyla; born in Wadowice (Krakow), Poland on May 18, 1920.

Q: But a lot of your scheduling of people and all that you go through that you have just described - - didn't necessarily involve the Pope. Not everyone saw the Pope, did they?.

MURPHY: No - not at all. Let's go back to Mike Armacost's visits for a moment - in August of 1984, shortly after my arrival in Rome. Armacost did not actually see the Pope during his visit to Rome. He came to Rome in the month of August - when the Pope is traditionally in residence at his summer villa at Castel Gandolfo. This Papal retreat - some 25 miles southwest of Rome - is located in the mountains, near Lake Albano. The property is considered *extra-territorial* by the Italian government under the terms of the 1929 Lateran Treaties - as are several large buildings within the city of Rome which house Vatican offices. It is really quite necessary for the Pope - *or anyone, for that matter!* - to leave the city of Rome during part of the hot summer months because weather is so oppressive. While at Castel Gandolfo the Pope does not normally receive political figures in Audience during his summer "break". The Holy Father usually remains in residence at his villa from July through September each year. It is interesting to note that Castel Gandolfo comprises an area approximately four times the territory of the Vatican City itself! The property includes not only the Papal villa but a world-renowned Observatory operated by the Jesuits; a large experimental farm - with cattle from the King Ranch in Texas. The milk and cheese produced at this farm are sold in the Vatican Commissary within Vatican City to which diplomats are admitted. Its world renowned formal gardens overlooking beautiful Lake Albano as well as another large separate villa and extensive Roman ruins are also included in the property. It was at Castel Gandolfo that Pius XII housed thousands of Italian Jews during the closing months of World War II.

Back to our story - when Under Secretary for Political Affairs Michael Armacost visited in August, he was received at the Vatican by the Secretary of State, Agostino Cardinal Casaroli, as well as by the Foreign Minister, Archbishop Achille Silvestrini. The meetings, which I attended with Mr. Armacost, were a revelation to me as they were my first real experience in dealing with the Vatican as an American diplomat.

Q: Maybe we could use this visit as sort of an example of your four years, although you had many other, obviously maybe more dramatic ones, but the subjects of the things you discussed and reported to Washington. This would be of interest to any reader - don't you think?

MURPHY: Sure, Bill. Most definitely. The Philippines, as one would imagine, was a major subject of discussion during our meetings. The timing of this visit was prior to the so-called "re-election" of President Fernando Marcos of the Philippines. Tension was building in the country. The presidential electoral period was about to begin and opposition to Marcos was growing daily. There was division within the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in the Philippines; some bishops were Marcos supporters and others violently against him. As you are aware, the Catholic Church has great influence in the Philippines due to the fact that most Filipinos are nominally Roman Catholic. The Marcos government, and especially the wife of the President, Imelda Marcos, had aligned itself with various members of the hierarchy, the Catholic hierarchy, in the Philippines. For this reason, there was division within the Episcopal Conference - the conference of the Catholic bishops of the Philippines. More than half of them were supporting the Marcos regime, and others were opposed to the re-election of Marcos to the presidency. Armacost was most interested in the subject of the Philippines as his last assignment was as our Ambassador in Manila.

Q: This type of open, democratic division among bishop , which some of us looking at the Vatican don't always see as readily as we see in other governments, does in fact exist?

MURPHY: It certainly does exist and Cardinal Casaroli explained it to Armacost in a very concise manner. Several books have been written about Cardinal Casaroli and his years of service to the Holy See. The cardinal is a Vatican diplomat *par excellence*. One must read between the lines of every sentence he utters. Casaroli has often been called "*Eminienza Prudenza*" - simply because he never wants to commit himself to any one position. He gave Armacost a very good picture of the situation in the Philippines and of the difficulties that the Vatican saw in trying to deal with Marcos, his wife - and the bishops of that nation. Although Casaroli's criticism of Marcos was implied - it was never direct. When we met with (Foreign Minister) Archbishop Silvestrini, he was a bit more concrete in his statements about the situation. He was a younger man, and he was much more blunt in his criticism of the Marcos government and especially of some of the military leaders. We also discussed the Middle East - especially the situation in Lebanon and received valuable information passed to the Vatican by the Syrian ambassador. The direct effects of *Liberation Theology* on right-wing Latin American governments was also a subject of our conversation. Nicaragua - and its Sandinista government, of course, was discussed in detail as it was such a hot topic in those days.

Following our visit to the Secretariat, I had the opportunity of having a long talk with Mr. Armacost. He was really fascinated with the potential of our small mission for gathering intelligence on situations around the world. He was impressed by the Vatican's intimate knowledge of what was going on in Manila. From his service in that country, he knew the Papal Nuncio in Manila very well and he was intimately familiar with the entire political situation. He sized up the Nuncio as a strong backer of Marcos (which later proved to be exact) and knew that the reports coming to the Vatican from the Nuncio were all very pro-Marcos in tone. However, the Vatican depends not only on its diplomats - who are very few in the world - but also on other sources of information within a country - including local bishops and lay leaders as well as missionaries.

Q: How many Vatican diplomats are here in Washington, for example?

MURPHY: Here in Washington at the moment there are four official Vatican diplomats plus a local staff of Americans working in the Papal Nunciature on Massachusetts Avenue - just across from the Vice President's Residence. Washington is one of the largest - and most active - Papal Nunciatures in the world.

Q: Which is small by our standards!

MURPHY: Relatively, Bill. All Vatican missions are small but I should think that, because of the size of the Church in the United States as well as the position of the USA in the world, this is the reason their mission is one of their largest. Within the Nunciature in Washington, I would estimate that are about 35 people.

Q: And, again, your responsibility in Rome was like that of all our embassies....just basically to inform the home office, in this case the Vatican, what's going on.

MURPHY: That's right. The Vatican has, in addition to its Nunciatures abroad, a great resource which we don't have and which no other secular government I know has as a resource. Within the set-up in Rome, there exists various "Congregations" - which we could equate to ministries. Most of these have to do with the daily operation of the church - Clergy, Oriental Churches, Sacraments, Religious, Saints, etc.

There is, for example, a Congregation titled "*Propaganda Fide*," or the "Propagation of the Faith". This large office supervises all the missionary activity of the Church world-wide. It is headquartered in Piazza di Spagna in Rome - just next to the Spanish Embassy to the Holy See. Within this Congregation worked some 300 men and women. The Congregation is divided into "country desks" - similar to our State Department "desks" - but Propaganda Fide only concentrates only on the Third World - the non-Christian missionary lands. This arm of the Vatican deals simply with the evangelization of undeveloped - or non-Christianized - lands.

At this point I believe I should point out the difference between the "Foreign Policy" of the Holy See - and our own "Foreign Policy". All diplomats - of no matter what nation - are aware of the fact that every government has its own particular *national interests*. What are those of the Vatican? How can this tiny State have interests - similar to those of China, Korea...or the United States of America?? The Holy See's national interests are indeed quite unique in today's world. The Holy See's "*raison d'être*" is entirely spiritual - the spread of the Gospel of Jesus Christ! The Holy See has no materialistic national interests: the Vatican simply wishes to spread the message of Christ's peace and love throughout the globe. In doing so - it must sometimes use methods akin to those used by "normal" States. A main player in the Vatican's national interests is via the work of the *Congregation of Propaganda Fide*.

The information gathered by these missionaries who work for and report to *Propaganda Fide* is absolutely mind-boggling. For a foreign diplomat, it is without a doubt a gold mine of information! I, for example, would visit the Congregation frequently and discuss local situations - say - with the cleric responsible for affairs in Angola. In a few moments, I would have the latest information on what the missionaries located out in the boondocks of Angola had reported back to the Rome. Such information, as you can well imagine Bill, was invaluable at the time - when we had no diplomatic relations with Angola - and a Civil War was in progress. I received valuable information on several other areas of the world - where we were lacking such information.

Such extraordinary information was to be found not only at *Propaganda Fide* but also, for example, at the Congregation for the Oriental Church - which supervised the Eastern churches - as opposed to the more familiar Latin Church. These churches were based mainly in the Middle East - Lebanon, Libya, Syria, Egypt as well as in India (the Siro-Malabar rite). Others of these Churches were in Ukraine, northern Poland and in Russia. These offices held updated information which often touched on political situations in the volatile Middle East - or Eastern Europe.....at a time when Communism was about to fail in that part of the world. Cuba, too, was also a frequent subject of our conversations.

Q: These Eastern Catholics have a religious allegiance to the Rome versus Constantinople or other popes?

MURPHY: That's right. They are distinct from the Orthodox Church where the nominal head is the Patriarch in Istanbul. These Eastern Catholic Churches are in full communion with Rome. The Church I worked most closely with while I was in Rome was with the Ukrainian Church. For years under Communism there was a very active underground Catholic Church in Ukraine. All of the clergy and hierarchy of that church fell under the authority of the Congregation of the Oriental Church in Rome. I tell you all this, Bill, just to give you a flavor of the vast resources for valuable information available in Rome - but involving peoples and societies around the globe. I should note other valuable sources of information for our Embassy - which are in no way connected with the Vatican's Secretariat of State. These would be the various religious congregations (male and female) based in Rome: the Jesuits, the Dominicans, the Franciscans, the Benedictines, the White Fathers of Africa, the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, the Passionists, the Trappists, the Divine Word Missionaries, the Maryknoll priests, the Christian Brothers and several others. All of these religious orders have headquarters in Rome - and in each headquarters there are clerics responsible for following the daily activity of their members worldwide. The information available in Rome is massive - if only you have the time to cultivate the direct sources! It was most difficult for our small mission to keep up with all the work. In point of fact, our political reporting (judged by cable traffic) to Washington far exceeded in volume that of the Embassy to the Republic of Italy and the constituent posts around the country!!

Q: Peter, let me interrupt this by confirming something. You, as an American diplomat, were one of our rarely assigned officers - sent to a very special type of diplomatic mission.

MURPHY: That's right - as I've mentioned before, it was a very special kind of an assignment! I think that you can tell that by what I have related thus far.

Q: The Vatican practically doesn't exist in any other form. We have country-to-country relationships. We are, as diplomats, trained to "do things". But what you brought up here, I think, is of particular interest, Peter. Not only is it all of that, something quite unique, that you are describing to us, but we probably have no other "oral history" relating to our relations with the Vatican and all that it means. We still have a few stories left, I'm sure, but explicitly - other sources of information from the host government? For example, the Embassy in Rome has all kinds of people pouring through its doors. It has things that come in through the consular route. It has things that come in through the business route. It has power pressures of all sorts that had their voices from the United States coming in through the Embassy in Rome, and expressing themselves, influencing, whatever.

In the Vatican, they have theirs too - I presume. They happen to be a different set. For example, you've mentioned the Orders, the ecclesiastical structure, even some rather esoteric-named groups. The Episcopal Conference of Bishops, for example, the American...?

MURPHY: The United States Conference of Bishops. It is a grouping of all Catholic bishops of the United States.

Q: Exactly. That is a source of information, independent of your mission, independent of our mission to the Vatican, that is supplying all kinds of information, political perhaps although basically ecclesiastical. How did you, for example, deal with some of these other sources from the United States.

MURPHY: That's a very interesting point, Bill,as well as a very delicate point.

I mentioned at the beginning of this interview that this mission was unique and also that I found for the first year of my stay in Rome much opposition to the mission from the American public (in the form of crank letters!) as well as from various offices in Washington. You well remember the outcry in our nation back in the late '50s when President Harry Truman proposed General Mark C. Clark (known in Italy as the *Liberator of Rome*) as Ambassador to the Vatican! I believe I am correct in saying that this was in the mid or late '50s. So great- and immediate - was the public opposition, that Truman was obliged to rescind his nomination within a few short weeks of its announcement. It was never presented to the Congress for confirmation.

Q: It wasn't just Protestant, Catholic or anything? It was a true feeling that....

MURPHY: Well, I'm not so sure of that, Bill. I believe that the main opposition was mainly inspired by fundamental Protestantism - of the Paul Blanchard variety or the organization entitled Americans United for the Separation of Church and State. There was a bias in the nation, to be sure - but the fact must be faced that serious minded Constitutional scholars have believed that such a move on the part of our government was indeed a violation of the separation of Church and State - - i.e. the recognition of one religion over another - as well as touching on the matter of the First Amendment to the Constitution. The Congress at the time was in no mood to approve sending an Ambassador to the Holy See at that time.

Q: That's what I meant. It was religious perhaps, as well, but....

MURPHY: When, in 1984, President Ronald Reagan decided to open our new Embassy, the various opposing organizations - such as the Americans United for the Separation of Church and State and various Southern Baptist organizations testified before the Congressional committees explaining their opposition to this new diplomatic tie with the Holy See. The opposition was not entirely from the part of non-Catholics. Believe it or not, it also came from some Catholic bishops. I recall vividly at a reception which included various American bishops on their "*ad limina*" ("*to the thresh- hold*" - i.e. to the thresh-hold of St. Peter's tomb in Rome) visits to Rome which all Catholic bishops are required to make to Rome every five years. An American bishop from the Mid-West came up to me and said, "*Would you tell me what you people are doing here? Why don't you close up your shop and go home? You're interfering with the communications between the American hierarchy and the Vatican.*" In addition to thinking him extremely rude, I thought that there must be many people like him in the United States who think that the Embassy is there in Rome to somehow influence the Vatican in its dealings with the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. I assure you, Bill that nothing could be further from the truth!! During my four plus years of service at the Vatican, several topics were always out of bounds for discussion between officials of the Vatican and our Embassy. Sometimes the line is quite fine: During the Reagan years, when we at the Embassy were attempting to convince the Vatican on

the necessity of somehow coming out with a public statement approving our *Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)* - we had to be very careful not to appear to be lobbying the Vatican against the Peace Pastoral being written by the American Bishops Conference at the time. Caution had to be exercised that no member of our staff criticized to the Vatican the actions of any American citizen - Cardinal or layman. As a result, the entire Embassy staff was very, very careful in our relationships with members of the American hierarchy - both those in the United States as well as those stationed at the Vatican itself.

Q: This is your time, Peter : this wasn't at Harry Truman's time? This was thirty years later?

MURPHY: Yes. I'd like now, Bill, to quote something which would be most appropriate to include in this historic recording. Before arriving at the Vatican, I received firm instructions from Washington which were similar to those given to all diplomats before coming to Rome at the time of the existence of our Legation to the Papal States. The original of these instructions was provided to my predecessors by President James K. Polk. They were directives that were actually written to the first United States Minister to the Holy See in about 1845.

“There is one consideration which you ought always to keep in view in your intercourse with the Papal authorities. All denominations of Christians stand on the same footing in this country, and every man enjoys the inestimable right of worshiping his God according to the dictates of his own conscience. Your efforts, therefore, will be devoted exclusively to the cultivation of the most friendly civil relations with the Papal government. You will carefully avoid even the appearance of interfering with ecclesiastical questions whether these relate to the United States or any other church of the world. It might be proper to make these views known on some suitable occasion to the Papal government so that there may be no mistake or misunderstanding on this subject.”

And I can assure, Bill, that all officers assigned to the American Embassy to the Holy See follow these directives scrupulously. Upon the arrival of a new officer at post, I made it a point to review the perimeters of our mission. I believe that this gives you the flavor of our Embassy at the Holy See - is quite unique, to say the least!

Q: Did you have any kind of explicit guidelines.....if that's the way to put it?

MURPHY: In all honesty, no, Bill, but I made the guidelines. I directed all officers assigned to the Holy See to read what President Polk had directed years earlier because I felt that such an admonition was still valid today. Many of our colleagues within the State Department, and in the CIA, NSC, the White House, etc., were opposed to our being in Rome. I would constantly receive calls of complaint from the public as well as a few from “official Washington”. In spite of the fact that we were a very small mission, I was in constant telephone and cable contact with Washington. I found it interesting that in a telephonic conversation with State, USIA, NSC - or whoever - within the first two or three minutes, I could tell whether my interlocutor was in favor of this Mission or completely opposed to its existence. In the early days of my stay, I received several Congressional Delegations. Addressing them, I almost felt like the State Department spokesman in defending the reasons for our being there, and explaining that “No, we did not

interfere with the appointment of bishops in the United States". nor did we interfere with the Congregation of Bishops in their selection of men, American clerics, to become bishops of various dioceses, or indeed recommend those to be nominated to receive the red hat of the Cardinal! Within the first couple of months of my arrival, I remember addressing a huge (over 130 people) Congressional delegation - in St. Peter's Square - prior to a Papal audience!! Several of the above questions arose during this briefing - - held outdoors since our small Chancery at the time was not large enough to receive all the delegation members.

Q: But the Department of State got similar queries and could answer them the same way that you did?

MURPHY: Oh yes, they did...and rather frequently at that - particularly in 1984-85.

Q: One more question going back to the American connection of the Church, the Conference of American Bishops. Did you get flack from them?

MURPHY: Once in a while we would. Objections came mostly from bishops from the backwoods - Middle America - who had little understanding of the true purpose of our Embassy. These men even had difficulty understanding the whole set-up at the Vatican itself!

Q: The Vatican should have been able to handle that. They should control their bishops.

MURPHY: Bill - most of these American bishops - especially the ones who had never studied in Rome as young men - had no idea, not a clue, as to how the Vatican functioned. They were just like an ordinary American in the street. The Vatican is indeed a very complex organization (...some would use another term - Machiavellian !) and rather difficult for the ordinary person to understand. There is history - and precedent - attached to the most minute problem or question. The Church has its own way of doing things. As history has proved, it is not always correct in its decisions - see Galileo Gallilei!! To confuse everyone even more: the official diplomatic language of the Vatican is - - not Latin - - and not Italian - but French! Every Diplomatic Note we received was written in French. In addition, our daily work was conducted with Vatican officials of all nationalities; French, British, Irish, Italians, Japanese, Poles, Indians, priests from Latin America and Asia. I would say that to be most effective at the Vatican one should be conversant in, at a minimum, French, Spanish and Italian.

Q: What about their official diplomatic communications between "posts".

:

MURPHY: The Vatican's communications, their One Time Pad, utilizes the Latin language. All of the messages are in Latin. It's unbelievable, but I have had confirmation that sensitive messages - which are sent in code - are in Latin to this day!

Q: It's like sending it in Navajo, because nobody can read it.

Let me quote one of our dear American priests, and I'm sure you've heard of Father Andrew Greeley, who is a sociologist and writes very interesting materials. To quote from his book, which I enjoyed very much, is that "American Catholics are devout Catholics despite the

Catholic Church." There is an independence -- the American spirit perhaps. Like the bishop out in Iowa or wherever he was - is maybe more American than he is understanding of his own Church.

MURPHY: Bill, that's one point I should comment on. Our fellow Americans' practice of Catholicism was a subject I had to deal with great care on an almost daily basis...so I am quite attuned to the pitfalls! In Rome I frequently met American priests, laymen, noted political figures who brought up the subject of the Catholic Church in the United States. I would be obliged to gently redirect the conversation. Why - I recall, at the end of a Private Audience regarding sensitive political matters, one distinguished American General started telling the Pope about the terrible pastor he had in his parish in the Northern Virginia area!! I was aghast...but the Pope took it in stride, telling him not to worry....the priest couldn't last forever! Another time I recall a Cabinet member asking how I could go about facilitating the issuance of an annulment of her marriage in the Sacred Roman Rota - the Vatican's marriage tribunal! I let this lady know in no uncertain terms that such matters were far from the scope of our mission at the Vatican and that her local bishop back home would be the person to contact in this matter.

Q: Peter, back to you.

MURPHY: To continue, Bill, on the same theme: one of the most delicate tasks we had was in our dealings with the American clerics assigned to the Holy See. The highest ranking was William Cardinal Baum, the former Cardinal Archbishop of Washington, DC, who was at that time the Prefect of the Congregation for Catholic Education - meaning his office had jurisdiction over Catholic education throughout the world - from kindergarten through university. (I am not sure how many Catholic educational institutions actually followed the directives of the Congregation, however!). There were other clerics, for example, Archbishop Justin Rigali, (present Archbishop of St. Louis, Missouri) who was President of the Pontifical Diplomatic Academy. Justin was the first American to hold this distinguished position. Msgr. James Harvey was the head of the English Language Section of the Secretariat of State - i.e. he was responsible for all of the Holy Father's addresses in English, including those made in his journeys around the world plus any written materials signed by the Pope. He is now (1998) Prefect of the Apostolic Palace - and perhaps the most influential American stationed at the Vatican.

Q: So there were Americans as your counterparts?

MURPHY: That's correct..... Americans who were working for a foreign government (The Holy See) to which I was accredited. My relations with them were naturally very friendly. These men were most helpful and they fully understood the mission of our Embassy. I had to be constantly on guard in dealing with these men - because of the double-loyalty conflict! This was especially true when dealing with clerics assigned within the Secretariat of State (Foreign Office) - where, they say, all employees are bound by an oath of secrecy!! All of us at the Embassy had to be very circumspect in dealing with them.

Q: Not unlike, perhaps, Americans assigned to the United Nations Secretariat.

MURPHY: Exactly.

Q: They're American, BUT....

MURPHY: Yes - - BUT!.... However, I am very grateful to many of them as several of these men really did help me a lot in establishing the Embassy in the early years. I can, however, think of a few who were pains in the ass!

As you can well imagine, Bill, if I had a problem at the Vatican, I really couldn't call anyone at State to ask for advice! No one before me had experienced such an assignment.

Q: You were welcomed by these people at the Vatican?

MURPHY: Jackie and I were made most welcome. I had known Cardinal William Wakefield Baum - the former Cardinal Archbishop of Washington, DC prior to my arrival in Rome. Then there was Archbishop Paul C. Marcinkus of whom I am certain you have read, Bill. If only time permitted, I could speak at length about Archbishop Marcinkus - a man much maligned in the Vatican and by the world press. He is truly a good person - and I do not believe for one moment that he was guilty of any underhanded operations at the Vatican Bank. In sum - he was placed in a job by his friend, Pope Paul VI, which was out of his competence as a cleric. I am positive that the Pope did not have any idea of the complexities of the position either. So often this is the case with clerics: they understand nothing of money - expect how to spend and collect it!! I got to know all these people assigned to the Vatican very well. I must mention Msgr. (now Bishop) William Murphy of Boston. Bill is a very close friend and was at the Vatican for years in the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. In addition he was the Rector of Villa Stritch - the residence for American priests working at the Vatican. On more than one occasion, Bill was extremely helpful to our Embassy in its fledgling days!

Q: The financial advisor..... But these Americans were not of the group that resented your being there or questioned your being there?

MURPHY: Not at all. I believe that they were truly delighted their government had finally decided to join the rest of the world !

Q: Why don't we now, Peter, go....

MURPHY: Bill, could I go on just on to briefly outline some of the main political events which occurred while I was at the Vatican. I should think that the reader would be interested in some of these events.

Q: That was my question, exactly. Beyond the Philippines, what other events occurred?

MURPHY: I'll briefly cover the period from 1984 to 1988. This will just give you a flavor of some of the important issues we dealt with on a daily basis. Our work there consisted purely of diplomatic work; only political work.

Q: And with the world?

MURPHY: And with the world. Political and representation. That's all we did in Rome. Naturally we got involved in a few consular matters, I'll mention them later, but the bulk of the work was political.

Q: You did have just one exception, though, that you mentioned yourself. United States Information Agency What kind of a role did USIA play since it's diplomatic and representation?

MURPHY: The reason USIA was there, as I believe I mentioned before, was because of Ambassador Bill Wilson's great friendship with Mr. Charles Wick. This is the noted President Reagan-Wick-Wilson combination! I met both Mr. & Mrs. Wick on two or three occasions. He had the well-deserved reputation of a madman while his wife was charming - and quite bright. You'll remember that Charlie Wick was responsible for that extravaganza "Let Poland be Poland"..... starring Frank Sinatra!!

Q: Wick was head of USIA at that time?

MURPHY: That's right. I did not agree when Bill Wilson wanted to establish a USIS office - nor when he wanted the Embassy to provide consular services to Vatican City natives! But of course - when dealing with Bill Wilson - objections did not count!! He as a very determined man - who usually gets what he wants. Bill once told me that a good manager never gets ulcers - he gives them!! I did manage to squash the idea of consular services, after many months of discussion, - as the Vatican does not accept the accreditation of consular officials. However, with regard to a USIS office, I did eventually come to change my mind after seeing the success of the venture.

Q: What function did it serve?

MURPHY: William J. A. (Bill) Barnes, a seasoned officer and fluent Italian speaker, was assigned by the United States Information Agency (USIA) from Genoa to Rome. I had worked with Bill in Genoa and knew of his many fine qualities and thought he would be just right for the Vatican USIS job. So Bill came to Rome a few months after I was in Rome. He set up a USIS library at the office and soon started establishing liaison with the nine Pontifical Universities in Rome. If you can imagine, Bill, at those universities (which had never been visited by anyone from USIS/Rome) there were over 27,000 students..... three-fourths of whom, I would guess, come from Third World nations. These are the best and the brightest in the Third World. Most are clerics..... naturally. (There are an awful lot of priests and seminarians in Rome. It is no wonder the Italians have a reputation for being anti-clerical - - they never see any of them work - - and most look pretty well fed!!) We set up lectures of distinguished American scholars and even participated in the International Visitor Program of the Agency. This is, in my opinion, one of the best of all USIA's many programs: we identified future leaders (in our case....leaders at the Vatican) and they received a free trip to the USA to investigate whatever segment of our society interested them. As you know, Bill, many world leaders have benefited by this program - starting with Lady Margaret (Maggie) Thatcher - the former Prime Minister of Great Britain!!

Q: So the educational portion of USIA did produce.

MURPHY: It really did. And then....

Q: The press?

MURPHY: Oh, the press, naturally. Whenever, for example, we were pushing the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) or another major Administration initiative, we relied heavily on Bill Barnes' expertise in this area. We did have quite a job to attempt to "sell" SDI at the Vatican in view of the widespread opposition to the expansion of military might and nuclear power even for self defense .

Q: SDI?

MURPHY: Yes, the Strategic Defense Initiative of the Reagan administration. I will mention this again in a minute. But another of the most important USIS functions was liaison with Vatican Radio and the Vatican's media organs. The Vatican Radio broadcast 24 hours a day in 65 languages. It is reputed to be the most powerful radio in the world.

Q: VOA aside?

MURPHY: VOA aside. And our collaboration and cooperation with the Vatican radio was very close. On occasion, we utilized the network to pass messages in various parts of the world.....humanitarian-type messages which could be passed in no other manner.

Q: And your man came on board and produced well.

MURPHY: Yes, Bill Barnes is one of the best USIS officers I have ever met.

Now I'll try to relate some of the political events that took place during my tenure at the Vatican from 1984 to 1988. I would say on top of the list would be the subject of Vatican-Israeli diplomatic relations.

Q: Which have been established now; the Vatican and Israel have recently established relations! Your work has come to fruition?

MURPHY: Yes. I am really most pleased at the way things worked out. During the early part of my tour in Rome, the Congress of the United States passed a *Sense of the Congress Resolution* urging the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Holy See and the state of Israel. The Vatican, of course, saw this as gross interference in the internal affairs of a foreign nation.

Q: We do not hesitate!

MURPHY: Never! In addition, at the Embassy, we were visited quite often by delegations of rabbis and prominent members of the Jewish community from the United States..... leaders of the American Jewish community. Their main objective was to pressure us to pressure the Holy See to open talks with Israel relating to diplomatic recognition of the State of Israel. Throughout my tour, I was in very close contact with the officer of the Israeli Embassy to the Republic of

Italy, who was assigned as the unofficial liaison between Israel and the Vatican. This officer was the conduit through which the Vatican communicated with the Israeli government. He was a very clever diplomat, very cultured. His wife was Italian and he spoke the language fluently. He understood both the political situation as well as the historical context of the difficulties of Christians speaking with Jews. This was very important - - and understood by so few..sometimes even within the Vatican!

Q: And what this underscores, Peter, in spades, is the fact that you represent the United States, that you and your Ambassador boss do not represent the Catholic Church or Catholics, and Mr. Polk's words, even though he only used the word "Christian" to talk about the religious people, it included everybody.

MURPHY: Exactly. It did indeed included everybody. In my mind, Bill, the establishment of full diplomatic relations between Israel and the Holy See was a most important event - in fact perhaps it is the most important event in fostering peace and understanding among two peoples in the past 2,000 years! While in Rome dealing with this question on a periodic basis, I frequently thought of the reasons and origins of the Holocaust - and anti-Semitism throughout the ages. The Church was often present - fostering such feelings. Thus - I worked very diligently toward this end of bringing the two countries together. Washington was sometimes skeptical of our motives! For example, I frequently visited the Grand Rabbi in Rome - whose synagogue was visited by John Paul II. (I, too, was invited to be present at this event - but as I considered it a purely religious visit, declined the Rabbi's invitation. I had a hell of a time convincing Ambassador Max Rabb that he should not attend the event - but, in the end, was successful!)

Vatican- Israeli diplomatic relations were, I felt, more than a relationship between two foreign countries. I felt that this was truly a relationship between peoples clouded by a 2000 year history of animosity against Jewish people in Western Europe, Eastern Europe, and throughout the world, in fact. The times have changed - thank God! At Second Vatican Council, which now is celebrating its twenty-fifth anniversary, this question was at last addressed directly by the Roman Catholic Church. You'll recall that in the forefront of this debate were several distinguished American theologians - John Courtney Murray, Avery Dulles, S.J., etc

I believe that today we see the fruit of a lot of hard work in the recognition of the state of Israel by the Holy See. During my time in Rome, this was a very contentious problem. People at the Vatican often did want to speak of the subject openly. The situation was complicated by the fact that we had people of all nationalities in official positions within the Vatican..... foreigners of all sorts,- - Poles, British, Irish, Japanese, Indians, Americans, Italians, French. They all arrived with their political and cultural baggage. You cannot divorce one from the other, as you well know, Bill. A good case in point follows: One fine Roman morning about 10:30 Bill Wilson and I went to the Palazzo San Carlo inside Vatican City to meet with a very close personal friend of the Pope, Andrzej Cardinal Deskur. Cardinal Deskur is a Pole who had been the first President of the *Council for Social Communications* after its establishment early on in the reign of John Paul II. (The Vatican was indeed rushing in the 21st Century with the establishment of such an office ! If you can imagine, Bill - this office was the very first Vatican office which was specifically charged with press and media relations!) Deskur was forcibly retired from that position in the early '80s when he suffered a stroke and was confined to a wheelchair. He

continued to live in his Vatican apartment. His handicap did not prevent him, however, from participating in Papal ceremonies or from visiting with the Pope frequently. Deskur, a very intelligent and distinguished gentleman, was a descendent of a French family which had lived in Poland for several generations. Our purpose in visiting the cardinal was to discuss the political situation in Poland and the rise of the independent labor union , Solidarity. Not long into the conversation, the Cardinal turned to the subject of Israel - and the debate over the diplomatic recognition of Israel by the Holy See. Cardinal Deskur insisted that it was "*the Italian clerical Mafia*" who were against establishing diplomatic ties. He claimed that the Holy Father and all Poles - in the Vatican, at least - wanted to extend such diplomatic recognition - but the Italians (presumably in the Secretariat of State) had been holding it up for years.

Towards the end of our hour-long discussion, the Cardinal served coffee and a lovely Polish cake - which, he told us, was left over from the previous evening's dinner with the Holy Father. (This fact proved rather important - - later!) It had been baked by the Polish nuns who cared for the Papal Apartments. It was well known around Rome that Cardinal Deskur dined with the Pope at least once a week. I guess that he had just decided to bring home a "doggie bag" from his dinner the previous evening!

As soon as we returned to the Embassy from our meeting at the Vatican, we naturally sent a full report of our conversation to Washington. Unbelievably, my reporting telegram was leaked to the press - in spite of its classification! (NOTE Action Secstate and INFO Tel Aviv) I was getting ready to go to a formal dinner that same evening, I was called by the State Department director of European Affairs and told that Marvin Kalb, a TV journalist, was about to quote from my telegram on the evening national television news. In addition, the Department had learned that Kalb intended to state that Bill Wilson and I had been formally instructed by both the White House and State Department to President Reagan to push the subject of Israeli recognition at every available opportunity - and especially with Cardinal Deskur! You can imagine our reaction! The evening ended at the Ambassador's residence with both of us on one line speaking with the White House spokesman Ronald Speakes. Much to my discomfort, it was decided that I should be the one - as author of the subject telegram - to call Mr. Kalb just prior to air time in NYC and dissuade him from reading our cable on national television.

Q: Passing the buck?

MURPHY: Exactly! So --- I called New York - and in no time had Mr. Kalb on the line. (It's always amazing to me how fast the communications in - or through - the White House communications facilities work!.) Kalb said, "Oh yes, Mr. Murphy, I recognize your name. I have a story this evening concerning your Embassy at the Vatican and the State of Israel. Yes, I'm going to read something very interesting that you sent from Rome as a result of your meeting at the Vatican with that Polish Cardinal."

Q: "Which I happen to have a copy of."???

MURPHY: Kalb started reading the cable and I knew positively that he had the cable in hand - since the wording was mine! I told him point blank, "Look if you mention that the President or the Secretary of State have instructed us push this subject of diplomatic recognition of Israel at

the Vatican - it will be absolutely false statement. I told him that our government's position is in favor of such relations and that we constantly work toward this end...but we had received no specific instructions concerning the Polish cardinal - Cardinal Deskur. . I added that if he made such a false statement - knowing the Vatican as I do, it would perhaps have the effect of delaying any chance of diplomatic recognition by 50 years! I was thankful that Kalb did not report that on the air. However, he did report our meeting with the Cardinal and, of course, read parts of my telegram..

I'll provide a fine example to the "workings and coordination of the Vatican". The following day, a Sunday, my wife and I attended Mass at the American Church of Santa Susanna in downtown Rome. In the courtyard, following the Mass, coffee and rolls were served. We were joined at coffee by Archbishop John J. Foley, from Philadelphia, who was the head of the Office of Social Communication at the Vatican - and the successor to Cardinal Deskur. Archbishop Foley was new in Rome, having arrived about the time that I did. He was just learning exactly how the Vatican functioned. He came up to me in the courtyard of the church, and said, "Gee, Peter, it's amazing. All kinds of journalists have been calling and asking about your meeting with Cardinal Deskur. And, of course, I just put out a statement saying that he had never met you." I said, "I beg your pardon?" He said, " Well - I called the Cardinal last night and he said he'd never met you or Ambassador Wilson on last Wednesday at his home in Vatican City." I said, "But do you remember last week I told you about being served a Polish dessert which came from the Pope's table? That was at Cardinal Deskur's home in the Vatican - following the meeting Bill Wilson and I had with the Cardinal." "Oh - Yes," said Foley, " I do remember that now! Do you think the Cardinal actually lied to me?" I told the Archbishop that I wouldn't know what you would call it in *Vaticanese*, but I certainly did meet the Cardinal in question! This is quite a good illustration of how difficult it is sometimes to work at the Vatican. Admittedly - Archbishop Foley was new at the job - and was not at all at home working at the Vatican! He had a lot to learn....and fast!

Q: It's a good example of how the U.S. is in the middle of this political issue, has been, and will be.

MURPHY: Exactly. Bill - since we have been speaking a bit about Poland, perhaps this is a good time to bring up the shooting of the Pope in St. Peter's Square, the rise of the unions in Poland and the eventual fall of Communism.

With the election of a Polish Pope in October of 1978, the Soviets soon realized that they had a serious problem on their hands All this happened long before I arrived in Rome, of course, but in the early days of my tour at the Vatican I began to focus on the Kremlin's efforts of disinformation which were directed at blocking the Vatican's efforts to promote human rights in area under Soviet control. It was evident to us that the Soviets saw John Paul II as a direct threat to their values and beliefs - and above all - their power! Their initial reaction - in addition to spreading propaganda injurious to Vatican interests - was to clamp down on Catholic clergy in Lithuania, Ukraine, Latvia as well as in Poland and Hungary and the then Czechoslovakia. From several sources, we at the Embassy noted the general hardening of the Communist authorities in the face of organized religion. This was particularly evident in Ukraine. Several reports of flagrant human rights violations were sent from our Embassy to Washington in 1984 and 1985. I

also saw evidence, during this period, that the Russian Orthodox Church was enlisted in the fight against Rome. This was particularly noticeable in statements emanating from the Moscow Patriarchate and from Russian Orthodox delegations attending international meetings - such as the World Council of Churches in Geneva. The Soviets knew, I believe, that the Catholic clergy in the nations of their empire was not loyal to the communist masters in the same manner that the State-supported Orthodox Church was loyal. The situation was aggravated, in the eyes of the Soviets, by John Paul's triumphant visits to his homeland; the gathering strength of the Solidarity trade union; and especially the manner in which Lech Walesa was received by the Pope at the Vatican on the three occasions he was permitted to visit Rome. Some said that Walesa's reception was akin to that of a head of state. Andrie Gromyko, the old Soviet war-horse Foreign Minister, had visited John XXIII, Paul VI - and also John Paul II in the course of his long career. Following each of his Papal audiences, the announced subjects of discussion were the inevitable problems of human rights and religious freedom in areas of Soviet control. Gromyko, I often heard at the Vatican, had a much more difficult time in deflecting John Paul's questions than he did those of John Paul's predecessors in the job! We kept a very close tab on all contacts or statements by the Holy See which indicated an opening to the Soviets - or to nations in the Soviet camp. For example, the visits of the Soviet Army Chorus to the Vatican; Papal greetings delivered in the Russian language; Soviet university students being received with other European students - but being singled out for special Papal attention; visits of "roving" Soviet Ambassadors to the Secretariat of State, etc. All of this activity - no matter how seemingly insignificant - was duly reported to Washington.

Cooperation between the U. S. government (especially the White House) and the Vatican during my years in Rome was quite remarkable for its closeness and must have been a most worrisome fact of political life for the Soviets. This was due to several factors: the personalities of John Paul II and Ronald Reagan; United States interest in human rights in general and especially in exploiting Solidarity's struggle against General Wojciech Jaruzelski - the Polish leader and - if I might add - the presence of a new American Embassy at the Holy See!! This was concrete evidence that US-Holy See cooperation was flourishing!. I well remember the joy expressed by the Pope when I informed him at Castel Gandolfo that our Congress had voted the sum of Ten Million Dollars to support the struggle of the Solidarity movement in his native land.

Well - I suppose, Bill, that you are about to ask the \$64,000 question: *Who ordered the shooting of the Pope?* That question dominated my four years at the Vatican. I can tell you honestly that I don't know. The Turkish gunman who is spending the rest of his life in an Italian prison for his actions, Mehmet Ali Agca, was caught in the act of attempting to assassinate John Paul II on May 13, 1981 in St. Peter's Square. The actual facts surrounding the attempted assassination of the Pope remain a mystery to this day. I, of course, never asked the Pope about this incident -- but on more than one occasion I discussed the shooting with his personal Polish secretary, Msgr. Stanislaw Dziwisz. One conversation took place just a few days after the Pope paid Ali Agca a visit in the Roman prison. You'll recall, Bill, that the Pope and the Turk met for over an hour at the prison - with no one else present. The room had been de-bugged prior to the meeting - at the Vatican's insistence. No statement was issued after that historic meeting. The Papal secretary told me the Pope did not say one word to him about the meeting - but, as soon as he returned to his study at the Apostolic Palace, he wrote a detailed report in his own hand, sealed it with the Papal ring - and put it in a safe. The Pope, according to Dziwisz, told him that the letter should

not be opened for many years. John Paul II also said: *"If this information were to be made public now, the economies of several nations would be dramatically affected."* The Pope explained no further. We must remember, Bill, the timing of this statement - 1985 - long before the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of Communism throughout Eastern Europe. As you are aware, our government conducted very serious and comprehensive investigation into the Papal assassination attempt, in which I played a part on several occasions. Someday it will make fascinating reading!

I don't believe that I should say any more about this delicate subject at this time.

Perhaps I should address the relations between the Vatican and Philippines during the period of my service in Rome. The most exciting time, in my view, was that shortly after the fraudulent re-election of President Fernando Marcos. I believe that the work accomplished by our small mission in Rome actually prevented bloodshed from spilling in the streets of Manila at that time. I'll try to explain. But - Bill - let me tell you that I am finding it most frustrating to attempt to describe these complex political situations in which I was sometimes intimately involved in ten words - - or less!! (Some day I hope to have time to review all my agendas - which I have kept - and add volumes to this memoir!!) Immediately following Marcos' re-election, the Philippine Bishops Conference issued a letter which explicitly stated that the election was fraudulent and that Marcos was no longer president of the country. Tension in Manila - and throughout the nation was great. The military were put on full alert by Marcos. A general strike was called throughout the country - and the streets were filled with people for days. The agitation was evident and tension was building each hour. Everyone was waiting to see what world opinion - and especially the Vatican would say about the Bishops' action. The situation was even more complicated given the fact that Marcos and his wife were so close to a number of ranking churchmen in the country. The White House had sent Ambassador Phil Habib to assess the situation in Manila. He spoke with all concerned parties. When Phil saw that the Vatican had not given the Philippine bishops its backing, he called me in Rome and asked what the hell was going on! He said that full scale Civil War would break out if the people did not receive outside support soon - and the best support possible would be Papal backing for the Bishops of the country. *"Why hadn't the Pope said anything. The tanks were in the streets now."*

I went immediately to the Foreign Minister, Archbishop Silvestrini, and asked why the Pope had not come out in favor of the bishops. Silvestrini was obviously distraught; at the end of a half hour attempting to explain the impossible, he gathered his papers together and off we went together to see Cardinal Casaroli. This was the one and only time I was ever present in the Secretary of State's working office. Normally in the Vatican one meets in small reception rooms - like in a Rectory or Vicarage at home! We found the Cardinal working at his desk in his shirtsleeves ! I wish I had a camera to record his look of shock when he saw me enter his office with Silvestrini! After an hour discussion, the Cardinal finally admitted, *"I'll tell you what our problem is. There are 112 members of the Episcopal Conference in the Philippines. Thirty-six men were present when this letter of condemnation was written last week. Out of the 36 who were present, only 75% of the 36 voted for the letter. So how can we say that this condemnation of the Marcos government is the will of the Episcopal Conference in the Philippines?"* I told him I fully understood the problem but - in vivid terms - explained the violent civil unrest which would occur in the streets of Manila if the Holy Father did not address the situation in a public and forceful manner within 24 hours. The next day was Sunday. Following the traditional

noontime *Angelus* prayer from his library window in the Apostolic Palace overlooking St. Peter's Square, Pope John Paul II gave a brief talk in which he fully supported the bishops and the people of the Philippines “*in their hour of great need*”. This was a major great turning point in this volatile situation - and what I consider a great success for our small Embassy at the Holy See because from that day the tanks in Manila began to back down - and to return to the military bases! Never in my life did I dream that I would be putting words into a Pope's mouth - but there you are! And....this was not the last time I had a hand in what the Pontiff had to say! I recall once having written to the Vatican requesting a Papal audience for a group of NATO military officers. When we gathered for the audience imagine my surprise to hear most of my letter of request coming back at me in the form of a Papal address to the assembled group!! I guess the English language papal speech writer was rushed that day!!

Q: Please let me interrupt for just a moment. You're telling obviously the stories in which you are personally involved. How often was the Ambassador, whom so far I sense an admiration for and a respect for his background and authoritybut - how often was he playing this role as leader, or were you?

MURPHY: Or the political officer....

Q: Or the one political officer, right?

MURPHY: Yes. The political officer, Louis Nigro at this time and later Craig Kelly, and I normally had one or two meetings at the Vatican each day about various political subjects in which our government was interested.. Each morning, after reading the daily cable traffic from Washington and our posts around the world, we would decide , on which subject it was worth seeking Vatican support or clarification. The Ambassador, William A. Wilson, went occasionally to the Vatican on political matters. He interested himself in “other political matters” at times - that is, political situations which were in no way within the purview of our Embassy!

Q: Instructions?

MURPHY: Oh yes, often official State Department instructions. Especially when Mr. Elliot Abrams (Assistant Secretary for Latin American Affairs) was involved! Often we had two or three sets of instructions each day!! You'll remember that the time frame of our discussion is the late '80s - - and Nicaragua was in the forefront!! President Ortega, Colonel Oliver North, the “Sandinista” government of Nicaragua, their Minister for Education, Rev. Francis Cardinal. Oh yes - - were very involved in this situation - especially because of the Church's great influence in Central and Latin America. Some of the things Abrams wanted us to urge the Holy See to do were simply outrageous!! It took a lot of courage - believe me - to refuse one of his orders! He was a most arrogant young man - who, at that time, was all-powerful in Washington.

Q: He had Central America as I recall.

MURPHY: Yes - and you can just imagine the influence of the Church in Central America.

Q: You mentioned that there was a fellow by the name of Colonel Oliver North somehow involved.

MURPHY: Yes, Colonel North was involved as well in our Central American policy - as you well remember!

Ambassador Wilson certainly did involve himself when crucial events took place. I only worked with him in Rome for a little over a year, because, perhaps you remember, he made an unauthorized trip to see Colonel Muammar Qadhafi in Libya.

Q: I wondered when the name Qadhafi was going to come out.

MURPHY: Yes. Bill Wilson upset the White House by going off to visit the Colonel - at a time when the U. S. government was attempting to ostracize the world's foremost supporter of terrorism from the community of nations. You'll recall that the U. S. goal at the time was to attempt to stop Qadhafi from acting as the Soviet surrogate in subverting other nations. At that point, Washington did not want any Americans - official or plain civilians - visiting Libya - especially following the slaughter carried out by the Libyans at the Rome and Vienna Airports. In effect, the White House judged that Bill Wilson undermined our anti-terrorist policy. For its part, the Department of State flatly denied that Bill Wilson had been authorized to visit Colonel Qadhafi in an attempt to reduce tension. In breaking the "rules of the game" the Ambassador profoundly embarrassed his friend, the President, and - according to the Secretary of State - "brought shame and dishonor on his country.

What - or who - convinced Bill Wilson to make his now-famous trip to see Colonel Qadhafi? There has been much speculation on this subject. Some believed that the President and Bill Casey (CIA Director) cooked it up together. Others believed that the then-Italian Foreign Minister - Giulio Andreotti -convinced Bill that it would be a "coup" for the West - and the United States in particular - if he could make Qadhafi see the errors of his ways and repent!! (Bill and Andreotti had become friends over the years that Bill was in Rome.) I believe this latter theory of the origin of the trip: Andreotti was one of the most duplicitous diplomats I have ever met. There was an angle to his every utterance. I could imagine Bill Wilson being flattered to be taken into the confidence of such an important actor on the world's political stage - at that point in history. Unfortunately....for Bill....the rest is history!!

Q: You had him only for a year, then just for administrative matters, the other three years you had who as Ambassador?

MURPHY: Let's see, the post was vacant and I was Chargé for perhaps ten months following Bill Wilson's abrupt departure. Then Mr. Frank Shakespeare was appointed. Frank Shakespeare came directly from Portugal, where he had been ambassador for a year or so. He had previously been Director of the United States Information Agency (USIA) and president of CBS.

Q: And that was for two years? He was still there when you left Rome.

MURPHY: He was still Ambassador at that time.

Q: So we have two Ambassadors..... and you as Chargé?

MURPHY: I was Chargé for about ten months. You have no idea, Bill, how sought-after the position of Ambassador to the Holy See actually is!! During the “*inter-regnum*” I received several phone calls a week from very prominent personalities - from the business world, the political field, the entertainment field, etc. While I was Chargé of the Embassy, I had telephone calls from the most unlikely people asking questions about the position - about the Residence; the size of the staff,all of the perks connected with the job! Even the Speaker of the House of Representatives - Tip O’Neill - called to ask about the “ambassadorial list” and if I had heard who had the best shot at the job!

Q: What are some of the other major political situations you were working on in Rome, Peter?

MURPHY: Let me just quickly go through this, Bill. Naturally we were very involved in the Solidarity union movement in Poland as I previously mentioned. This subject, given its importance to our nation, took a lot of our time. The collapse of communism not only in Poland but throughout the Soviet empire in Eastern Europe was a major subject of our political reporting for over two years. We met frequently with visitors from every Eastern European nation - with the exception of Albania - which was, at that time, a special case.

Q: As an additional source of information for Washington.....or what?

MURPHY: Yes, of course. We were also active in reporting on human rights violations in all areas of the Soviet Union - especially in Ukraine and Lithuania and Romania. I very frequently held meetings with so-called “underground bishops” from the Ukraine and Lithuania who would come to Rome often disguised as bus drivers for Polish tour groups! These men actually were bishops of the Catholic Church in the Ukraine - but called “underground clergy” simply because they were obliged to concealed their identity from the State. During the workweek, they had ordinary “civilian” jobs in their country. These bishops had no opportunity to speak with our officers at the Embassy in Moscow as American diplomats were restricted in their travel. I doubt if these bishops would have spoken freely and openly with American diplomats back home in the Ukraine - even if our people had been able to travel from Moscow. The situation would have been too dangerous for them - and also for their flock. My meeting in Rome with these Catholic bishops frequently took place during a stroll in the quite beauty of the Vatican gardens - behind the Papal Palace in the Vatican City. There, in this secluded area - and on the territory of the actual mini-State to which I was accredited by our government - there was no possibility of being overheard not of having anyone follow either of us to our meetings.

Q: The cardinal in the Ukraine once spoke to me and Tom Buchanan when we went into his church. Very privately and very secretively on the Cardinal's part. Yes, I know what you mean.

MURPHY: I worked very closely with another American (naturalized) cardinal in Rome, Cardinal Myroslav Ivan Lubachivsky. Lubachivsky’s actual title is “Major Archbishop” of Lvov, (Ukraine) and is the successor to Cardinal Joseph Cesalo Slipji. One of my first official duties upon arrival in Rome was to head the official American delegation at Cardinal Slipji’s funeral -

at the direction of the White House. Cardinal Slipji was for more than 25 years imprisoned in the Soviet gulags and was released following diplomatic pressure applied on the Soviet government by both President John F. Kennedy and Pope John XXIII. The odd title of “Major Archbishop” was dreamed up during the days of Pope Paul VI - in order to help placate the Ukrainians who actually wanted the person holding the position to be named “Patriarch of the Ukraine” - a title that Cardinal Slipji always used - much to the Holy See’s consternation! The Vatican did not want to create another Patriarchate - lest the Orthodox Patriarch be offended. The relations between the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church and the entire Orthodox world has always caused tremendous problems from Rome. In fact - the ecumenical dialogue with the Orthodox seemed to me to be the most difficult undertaken by Rome. It appeared that they were thwarted at every turn. You can get an idea of the difficulties involved when you study the history of the original break with Rome - generations ago - over the “filioque” clause in the Creed!!

During my tour in Rome, Cardinal Lubachivsky was living in exile in the city. I had a lot of contact with him - and his personal secretary Msgr. Ivan Dacko regarding the actual situation back in the Ukraine - including the human rights violations in the country. These men were frequently guests in my home. The sources of information from the Ukraine available to the Cardinal was fantastic. Not only would he receive weekly reports written on the difficulties being experienced by religious groups via Moscow - or even Manchuria and Japan - but the Ukrainian “Diaspora” in Argentina, the United States, England, Australia and other countries would cable information to the Cardinal. Often, we even received video tapes which showed clandestine gatherings of Christians in the forest outside of Kiev! All of this was passed on through our little Embassy - to Washington - where it was much appreciated by various various sectors of the government.

Cardinal Lubachivsky, a naturalized American citizen, was formerly a Ukrainian Greek Catholic Archbishop of Philadelphia. I should record that the Cardinal was very proud of his adoptive land - and never failed to mention his U. S. citizenship in public whenever the occasion arose at a press conference, media interview, etc. I admired him for his bravery as well as the courageous way he stood up to him many critics in the Vatican itself. I attended a world-wide Synod of Ukrainian bishops at the Vatican - over which he presided. For me it was an eye-opener. The cardinal had often lamented over the quality and education of his hierarchy in various nations throughout the world. During the Synod, I sympathized with him!! Many of his bishops had little interest in the conditions in the “Ukrainian homeland”. Their efforts were concentrated on the welfare of the people in their churches in their adoptive countries. After so many years abroad - and away from Ukraine - this was natural. The Cardinal never understood this - no matter how many times we discussed the matter.

His relations with the Vatican were “cool” at best. I recall that a few months after he was elevated to the rank of cardinal, Lubachivsky asked me if I knew how much the cardinals of the Roman Curia received as a “stipend” each month!! He told me that he had received nothing since his elevation to the College of Cardinals - - and he didn’t know who to ask!!.....unbelievable!! I did make a few inquiries on his behalf at the Secretariat of State in the Vatican and, in no uncertain terms, was told that “ That Ukrainian cardinal was not entitled to a cent from the Vatican - given the fact that he has the entire Ukrainian Church to support him!!” I have not seen Lubachivsky since he returned to his newly independent homeland and taken up his rightful

position as spiritual leader of his people in Kiev. I have read, however, that the serious difficulties with the Orthodox Church in the area continue to this day. I saw the same problem - but perhaps to an even more intense degree - in Romania in 1991 when I was sent there by the Department of State on a special mission regarding the adoption of Romanian children by American citizens.

I should touch briefly (.....or this report will NEVER end, Bill!) on the situation in the Middle East and the Holy See's involvement and interests in the region. Our Embassy worked very closely with the Vatican on the various hostage situations - as well as with the office of the Patriarch of Lebanon in helping Washington to better understand the complex political situation in Lebanon.

Q: Lebanon?

MURPHY: Yes....Lebanon. On the hostage situations, our Embassy worked very closely - and well - with the office of the Archbishop of Canterbury and also with World Council of Churches in Geneva.

Q: The Archbishop of Canterbury, if I recall, had his man - Terry Waite.

MURPHY: Indeed! Terry Waite was a frequent visitor to our office in Rome! I could add many chapters to the various books written on the exploits of the famed Terry Waite.

Q: I believe Mr. Anderson did.

MURPHY: Yes. I was, naturally, involved in the Rome end of things which involved Terry Waite. Do you recall the release of a Father Jenco from his captors in Lebanon - after being held for over four years?

Q: Indeed I do. Give us a sample of how you were involved.

MURPHY: Early on in my tour in Rome Mr. Waite came frequently from London to Rome and always visited our Embassy - but - - he would only speak with Ambassador Wilson. I always found Waite to be a very pompous and demanding person - - and I really couldn't understand why he was bothering us all the time!! I asked Bill Wilson why Waite didn't go to the British Embassy for his briefings - as well as for introduction to the key Vatican players in the Middle East. In a round-about fashion, Bill explained that Terry Waite was somehow working "on behalf of - or together with - - or under the auspices of" - our Central Intelligence Agency. William Casey (then Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and close personal friend of Bill Wilson) had somehow authorized Waite access to our communications - at least while he was in Rome!!

In my dealings with Mr. Waite, I never did come to trust the man. I thought he was much too talkative to be provided with sensitive information. I know for a fact that the Vatican felt the same way because the Foreign Minister, Archbishop Silvestrini, told me so on more than one occasion.

Upon Farther Jenco's release in Lebanon - which was reported throughout the world - Mr. Waite just happened to be present - - and took over the situation from the moment of Jenco's release! He orchestrated press conferences; he accompanied Jenco to the U. S Military Hospital in Wiesbaden, Germany. From there, Waite called me in Rome and insisted that the Embassy obtain a private audience for Fr. Jenco "at once" as Fr. Jenco had " a personal message for the Holy Father -- as well as one for the Archbishop of Canterbury, from his captors. The message regarded the fate of the hostages he had left behind in Lebanon - including Terry Anderson." The claim that Father Jenco was carrying a message for the Pope was true; there was no message, however, for the Archbishop of Canterbury - this was all made up by Waite. As a result of this fabrication, however, he and Father Jenco flew by US Military aircraft from Rome to London before returning to Washington.!!

This is rather amusing part of the story of Fr. Jenco's release: when I did call for the requested Audience - on a hot summer Sunday afternoon - I spoke with Msgr. Stanislaw Dziwisz, the Pope's personal secretary, at the Papal summer villa at Castel Gandolfo. Dziwisz told me he couldn't give me an answer at once but would call me later that evening - because "the Pope is in the swimming pool and he didn't want to disturb him"! (How times have changed, huh - Bill!)

Q: That's for sure!! Isn't there also a special connection Waite supposedly had with Oliver North?

MURPHY: You are right, Bill. Terry Waite called from our Embassy to the White House to speak with Colonel North. I presume that Colonel North thought Waite was a good "front man" for his projects involving the Middle East!!

Q: So he was part American in this work with the hostages?

MURPHY: Terry Waite was indeed involved with our government's efforts to release American citizens held captive by terrorists in Lebanon and other countries of the Middle East. The exact extent of his involvement and its purpose - was never revealed or explained to me. It was handled exclusively by Ambassador William Wilson in Rome. The Vatican, however, was suspicious of Waite's activity - - and I frequently discussed this matter with Archbishop Achille Silvestrini - the "Foreign Minister". Silvestrini was convinced that Terry Waite was employed by the CIA.

Q: Wilson, then, was receiving separate instructions, perhaps to which you were not privy?

MURPHY: I presume so, Bill.

To resume the story of Father Jenco's arrival in Rome: I was called back that same evening by the Pope's secretary from Castel Gandolfo - and he told me that the Pope would receive Fr. Jenco - and his family members who had flown to Lebanon to greet him on his release - after the Wednesday General Audience in the Aula Paolo VI - build after Nervi's design.

Q: Let's remind the reader of Father Jenco. He was a Catholic priest, assigned in Beirut and also working for the Vatican?

MURPHY: No. Father Jenco was a missionary working in Beirut. He had nothing to do with the Vatican. He never worked, as far as I know, for the Vatican in any capacity. He was engaged in refugee work in Lebanon.

Q: The refugees that came also to Beirut to be processed. I think I dealt with him. Perhaps it was at Catholic Relief Services when I was serving in Beirut.

MURPHY: I believe Fr. Jenco was held prisoner for about 5 years. For at least half of that time he was held in solitary confinement. Then he was with Terry Anderson, he was with various other prisoners from time to time.

Q: And was released in the normal sequence of events?

MURPHY: I really shouldn't go,.....can't go into the release part of it. But, Father Jenco was released by the terrorists from his terrible ordeal, and he did have this message for the Pope which the terrorists insisted that he deliver directly to the Holy Father as soon as possible following his release. He arrived on US military aircraft from the USAF Hospital in Wiesbaden, Germany - accompanied by Mr. Terry Waite. Naturally the world press was there on the tarmac of the Rome Airport waiting for him. Fr. Jenco was in shock - so Terry Waite spoke on his behalf.

Q: He'd only been out three or four days perhaps.

MURPHY: I had the impression Mr. Waite rather enjoyed speaking to the press!! In fact - after the third Waite press conference in three days, Father Jenco took me aside and - while acknowledging he was in no condition to speak in public (he was really a nervous wreck!!) - asked if I would speak in his stead. Jenco said he had no idea why Terry Waite was traveling with him; and he was told in Beirut by US government officials that Mr. Waite had nothing at all to do with his release. He insisted that Mr. Waite not speak for him to the press.

Q: Waite evidently loved being in the spotlight, didn't he??

MURPHY: Yes. He was very much at home in that role. So - we went to the Vatican to see the Foreign Minister, Archbishop Silvestrini. This was prior to the meeting with the Pope. At the end of our meeting, Mr. Waite pulled out a statement and said to Archbishop Silvestrini, "This is what I propose that Father Jenco read to the press after his audience with the Holy Father. Would you mind looking it over?" He handed the papers to the archbishop. I was floored by his audacity in preparing a statement in Fr. Jenco's name commenting on a meeting which had not yet taken place..... and so was Archbishop Silvestrini. As Terry Waite and Father Jenco left the office, I recall Silvestrini asking me to stay behind and then he asked, "Look - tell me something. For whom does Mr. Waite really work?"

Q: The Archbishop of Canterbury or what?

MURPHY: I had to assure him that as far as I knew his employer was the office of the Archbishop of Canterbury.....but I agreed that the whole situation was indeed very strange.

Another subject, Bill: I want to mention the close working relationship our small embassy had with both delegations.(Argentine and Chilean) working toward the Beagle Channel negotiations. As you perhaps recall, the Holy See was the mediator in this long-standing territorial dispute between Argentina and Chile. The Holy See did a great service in mediating this dispute and brought it to a successful conclusion without additional bloodshed. In fact - the Papal mediation was so successful that both Washington and London subsequently proposed that the Vatican step in as mediator in two other international disagreements. In presenting Washington's requests to the Vatican, however, Cardinal Casaroli, explained to me that Beagle Channel-type mediation was impossible for the Holy See over the long term -- due to the lack of diplomatic personnel in the Vatican as well as the enormous expenses involved. I would like to point out that our government was involved in this issue from the day I arrived at post (8/84) until its successful conclusion two years later. Continuing reports on the progress of the negotiations were sent on a regular basis to State.

Q: The Beagle Channel being a channel at the very bottom of South America?

MURPHY: It is located at the northern border between Argentina and Chile.

Q: And for about six months, whenever I saw Beagle Channel messages, I thought it was a special channel message; you know - sort of like the ROGER CHANNEL!

MURPHY: No - something quite different! When I arrived in Rome in 1984, both Argentina and Chile had separate delegations at the Vatican engaged in full-time negotiations over this problem. This was in addition to their respective embassies to the Holy See. It was very interesting for Washington to be kept up-to-date on the progress of the negotiations - via our small embassy. Several people at State complimented us on our reporting.

Q: And it was resolved largely because of the Vatican's good will?

MURPHY: Yes - - I would say - good will plus plenty of patience! Another issue in which we were directly involved was "SDI" - the Strategic Defense Initiative (a space-based missile defense system) of the Reagan Administration....or Star Wars, if you will! The main reason for our involvement: There had been a high level of interest in the Vatican in S.D.I. issues. The Pontifical Academy of Science - which I previously described - had completed a year-long study of the Administrations initiative - and, according to the media - the verdict was negative!! It was reported in November of 1985 that the Academy was to issue a strong condemnation of our entire SDI initiative. Press speculation abounded: *The Pope Condemns Reagan's Initiatives; Star War Dead!!* You can imagine the direct White House interest in this subject, Bill! We had calls day and night from Washington asking us to confirm if the rumors were indeed true. If true - to somehow convince the Holy See of our defensive point of view. In the end - nothing was ever issued by the Vatican....no paper...no press conference. The Pontifical Academy's report was sent to the Pope and nothing more heard of it. The Embassy never received a copy of the final report and several sources told us that it had been destroyed. Given the political situation of the

time - - and the prospect of the break up of the Soviet Empire - - I believe that John Paul II simply sat on the report!! The same type of educational effort was made in defending the neutron bomb. The Embassy undertook an initiative to explain to Vatican officials just what the weapon was and under what conditions it would be used - if ever. In this connection, the Secretary of Defense Casper W. Weinberger visited the Vatican to explain further the philosophy behind our military strength during that period. He insisted that the United States must be able to deal with the Soviets from a position of strength rather than a position of weakness.

Q: The Pentagon, I presume, was always deeply involved in such matters?

MURPHY: Yes. The White House as well as the Pentagon. I met often directly with the President of the Pontifical Academy, Dr. Carlos Chagas, a Brazilian, in order to follow the progress of the Academy's S.D.I.-related paper. Bill Wilson also worked quite diligently in stemming the tide! He spoke with several influential people at the Vatican - as well as members of the diplomatic corps - expounding our point of view.

Q: Like many academies, whatever, pontifical, - - there is a bunch of bishops doing science, but there is a bunch of nations that are contributing scientific data?

MURPHY: The members are not at all bishops - or even clerics, Bill. Members of the Academy come from several nations - and represent the most distinguished academic institutions in the world: Oxford, University of Paris, University of Tokyo, Moscow University, National Institutes of Health, Harvard, University of Oslo, Georgetown University, UCLA, etc. Several of the scientists were from Eastern Europe - including the then-Soviet Union. The Academy advises the Pope on scientific matters - including, in this instance, nuclear weapons.

Q: And not all members are Catholic ?

MURPHY: No, not at all. Race or creed do not enter into selection process for Academy membership. The Academy members meet in Rome two or three times a year to conduct a "study week" on a different topic each timer. I have no idea how the topic is chosen ----perhaps by the Pope. I know for a fact that he is very interested in the deliberation of the members when they meet in formal sessions. The Pope has on occasion attended meetings - and has made a practice of hosting international meetings at Castel Gandolfo during the summer months. These meetings are open even to non-members of the Papal Academy who are experts in their respective fields.

Q: And the SDI was chosen because it was considered to be, in part, a moral issue?

MURPHY: That's right..... because of the universal destruction involved in such a nuclear-based initiative.

Q: Even though the initiative in principle was stopping destruction.

MURPHY: Yes, deterrent. There is always that fine line....what is morally acceptable and what is not!! "Does the end justify the means?"

Bill, we also got involved very seriously with ecumenical questions. In other words....

Q: Before you start that, let me back up. One more thing on this. There is a science officer at the American Embassy in Rome.

MURPHY: Yes.

Q: That science officer and that science function must have been very much concerned with the issue of the Strategic Defense Initiative..

MURPHY: Right.

Q: But the office of the Science Attaché at the Embassy in Rome has a relationship only with the government of Italy.

MURPHY: That's right.

Q: Were you were given instructions from the White House and the State Department.

MURPHY: Yes, Bill. We had nothing absolutely, substantively, to do with the Embassy in Rome. However, when questions arose involving - say - science: all of our materials were sent to us directly from the Department - or the White House - or where ever. I would, of course, call my colleagues in Embassy Rome if I had a particular question or needed the immediate advice of an expert.

Q: Even though both entities were doing the exact same thing but to two different governments?

MURPHY: Yes. I know it sounds crazy but there was a difference. Our Embassy was had a world-wide charge while Rome was involved only with Italy. I frequently noticed in conversation with my colleagues at Embassy Rome - that they did not have all the information passed to us by various of our missions throughout the world - the USUN, etc. It is quite logical if you think of it. Our mission was indeed worldwide - and Embassy Rome's centered on Italy. And to give you another example: when we are assigned to the Political Section of an embassy in a foreign land, we naturally are expected to report on religious matters (no matter what religion) in that country. I recall that one day the Political Counselor at Embassy Rome gave instructions to his people that from that day on all matters relating to the Italian Church would be reported on by the Embassy to the Vatican. I objected very strongly and refused to have our political section take on that added work. We had nothing to do directly with the Church in Italy for that was within the reporting bailiwick of Embassy Rome. I didn't make myself very popular at Embassy Rome by this decision - but I think it was a just one. Religious practices certainly influences society - and politics - in every nation. Just look what a terrible mess we made of Iran by ignoring the influence of religion!!!

Q: Of course, a big part of it. Again, Peter, we are talking about that uniqueness of the role you played there of our new mission to the Holy See.

MURPHY: Exactly. I believe that the latter point underlines this uniqueness in a dramatic way. To move on to the ecumenical scope to our work, I recall facilitating the official visit of Bishop Robert Browning, the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church in the United States to the Holy See. He and his wife visited for three days as guests of the Vatican. Our Embassy facilitated that visit by acting as an intermediary whenever assistance was requested. Bishop Browning's visit was really very substantive involving the discussion of various political situations around the world (Africa, the U.K. - even Eastern Europe) were within our mandate for political reporting. In addition, there is no doubt in my mind that the visit fostered the spirit of cooperation and sharing between the Episcopal Church of the United States and the Roman Catholic Church.

Q: And friendly, I take it?

MURPHY: Yes indeed - quite friendly. The Archbishop of Canterbury also visited John Paul II while I was in Rome. We were involved in the periphery of some of these visits. The visitors - lay, clerical, military, political, academic, cultural - - you name it, Bill!! Everyone wants to see the Pope - - and this very fact provided the Embassy with a great source of contacts and reporting possibilities which would be rare in a "normal" Embassy.

Given the political overtones of the Orthodox talks, we were also very interested in the ongoing friendly - but most difficult - conversations between the Roman Catholic and various Orthodox Churches. During my tour in Rome, Greece established an Embassy at the Holy See. This was a major step for that government - given the influence of the Greek Orthodox Church in Greek society. I certainly never realized before going to Rome that the dialogue between the Orthodox (of no matter what persuasion) and Rome were so difficult. Such sensitivity is involved!! And the situation is so different, for example, between the Romanian Orthodox, the Russian Orthodox, the Orthodox Church in America. For example, the Patriarch of the Orthodox Church is based in Istanbul (Constantinople) - for historical reasons - even though he doesn't have much of a flock there. I did what I could to facilitate these talks between the two entities.

I even worked while on vacation in Israel on this very matter. Jackie and I - I think in 1988 - went with our youngest son, Marc, to visit old friends from Genoa days who were now posted in Tel Aviv. I had never been to Israel and was most interested in visiting as much as possible. Our friends, Dimitri and Christine Loundras, had been posted there for four years. The Greek government did not have full diplomatic relations with Israel, at that time, so Dimitri was assigned to Israel as Minister at the Greek Legation in Tel Aviv. During the course of our stay, Dimitri arranged for me to make an official call on the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, Diodoros I. I must take a moment to describe this unusual meeting, Bill. Dimitri and I arrived at the Patriarchate in the old quarter of downtown Jerusalem on a bright and sunny morning. The building itself was very old and the courtyard crowded with people. We were greeted by a very tall fellow in a fez who cleared the way for us through the mob. Dimitri told me that for hundreds of years the majordomo's family - of Arab descent - had been employed by the Patriarchs in Jerusalem. Eventually, we were ushered into a very large room - covered with oriental rugs with stern, dark portraits of former Patriarchs glaring down at us. The Patriarch, Diodoros I, was sitting on his throne dominating the seats of about 20 Greek Orthodox bishops and priests who were sitting around the room. I was shown to a large chair - which was separated from the group

- while Dimitri was given a place just behind me. As I sat, a young cleric in flowing robes came and sat at my feet. I soon learned that he was my interpreter! The Patriarch greeted me with a few words in English ...and then said "Speak!". On the spot, I gave a extemporaneous talk to the gathering. I expressed my pleasure at meeting the Patriarch and being in the historic city of Jerusalem; I explained my diplomatic mission at the Holy See and I also expressed my hope that the dialogues in progress between Rome and Constantinople would be fruitful. I guess I spoke almost 20 minutes. My entire talk was simultaneously translated by the Greek cleric sitting at my feet. Diodoros I then gave his reply. I should explain that he is a huge man and looked even more imposing in his flowing robes and beard, sitting upon his throne. Reading his text, he first welcomed me "as the representative of a great nationto a lesser See in Italy"! He continued, "Welcome, Mr. Murphy, to the center of the universe; to the city where Jesus Christ lived, preached and died." Throughout his talk, he made pointed negative references to the Roman Church. Towards the end of his half-hour talk, the Patriarch excused himself for receiving me in "such humble surroundings - when you are quite used to the luxury, the fabulous art and architectural monuments of the Vatican. We, however, receive you in humble simplicity - reflecting the true nature of Our Savior, Jesus Christ, in the city where he lived." He insisted on the poverty of the Patriarchate. On leaving the meeting, Dimitri told me that - as opposed to what I heard from the Patriarch - he was a wealthy man with Swiss bank accounts! He told me that the Government of Greece contributed over \$3 Million each year for the upkeep of the Patriarchate. At least half that sum was taken by the Patriarch for his personal use. In addition, the Greek Orthodox Church was the proprietor of much of the city of Jerusalem - not only the churches but of several apartment buildings as well as commercial space. All in all - it was a very interesting visit and one which, for me, underlined the difficult task of a meaningful dialogue between Rome and the Orthodox world. In addition, an episcopal member of the Patriarch's staff was in the employ of the Soviet government!

Q: And the smallest of some of the symbols of that have survived for a thousand and more years. The way you cross yourself, for example. The very sophisticated,...but to me incomprehensible, discussions that separate the Orthodox and Catholic worlds become very important.

MURPHY: Exactly. I believe they become important more because of the political implications than the theological. This is seen if you study the differences between the Orthodox church in Romania, Bulgaria, Russia - and Greece. They have great difficulty among themselves - to say nothing of their difficulties with Rome! As a matter of fact, I read recently that the Orthodox churches in the United States have voted to join together as one American Orthodox Church - and, in effect, leaving behind their ties to national ties in East and West Europe. This is a step of major importance - but one which I fear will be quite difficult to implement.

Q: Other visitors.....?

MURPHY: Bill, there were so many official visitors to Rome during my four years there - and they all wanted a private audience with the Holy Father. This, of course, was not possible. I knew full well that some of the politicians simply wanted that photo with the pope so they could run it in the local press - to assure the Catholic vote in their next election! A few Audiences do stand out in my mind. I well remember in the summer of 1986 we had a visit from Senator Edward M. Kennedy and a Kennedy family group of 20! Present were Eunice Shriver, Ethel

Kennedy and Pat Lawford - together with various and sundry children - and their spouses. The group had come directly from a tour of Poland - - remember - Bill, this was the height of the "Solidarity period".

Even before their arrival at the Vatican Palace, the Vatican gave strict instructions for the group audience: "only family - no press". I accompanied the group and we assembled in the small throne room immediately outside the Papal Library. We were arranged in a semicircle around the small Papal throne - and I recall that it was a rather hot and stuffy day. The usher - in tails! - came in and opened some of the huge windows and the white curtains billowed in the breeze! I remember being a bit shocked to note about that time that some of the teen-aged Kennedy girls kicked off their shoes - cooling their hot, tired feet on the nice, cool marble floors of the Papal antechamber! A word to Ethel Kennedy rectified the situation at once! I remember wondering where in the world these kids had been brought up! The Senator asked me if I would ask the Holy Father to pose for pictures with each family group at the end of the audience: i.e. the Edward Kennedys, the Robert Kennedys, the Shrivvers, etc. I told him I would ask the Holy Father but he should not be surprised at a negative reply.

The Senator and his group had asked for a group audience - and that was all that was expected. I knew differently, however. The Papal secretary came to me and asked if the Senator would like to meet with the Pope in private for a few moments. Kennedy, of course, agreed at once. Some day I presume that the subject of this meeting will be made public.

Fifteen minutes later the Pope entered the room - with the Senator trailing behind. Kennedy introduced his numerous family members to the Pope - and I then transmitted the Senator's request regarding the photographs. The Pope glanced at his watch and said "Va bene...ma rappidement, per piacere. C'e poco tempo!" --that is - OKAY - but let's do it fast! I cried out the names - "the Lawfords, Shrivvers, etc" - and the group gathered around the Pope. When it came to Ethel Kennedy's turn, a rather tall young man stood beside her. She said to the Pope - "Please pray for him. He is not one of us!" The pope was bewildered and said to me - "What does she mean". I said that I presumed that she meant that her son-in-law was not a Catholic! The Pope shrugged his shoulders and said "That's OKAY - - he's still a good boy" ..while giving him a pat on the shoulders!!

After that audience - we paraded as a troop through the Vatican Palace to the Sala Regina to visit the Pauline Chapel and the Sistine Chapel. Nothing was ever easy in arranging official visits by the Kennedys in a foreign country - not the time I was Ted's control officer in Paris when his brother named him a member of the official US delegation to General Charles de Gaulle's funeral in Notre Dame Cathedral; nor the visit of Jacqueline B. Kennedy - and her children John and Caroline - in 1967 to the Carcano family ranch in Cordoba, Argentinanor this "tribal" visit to the Vatican! Concerning the Vatican visit, I should make note that only Mrs. Shriver asked me to whom she should write at the Vatican in thanks for this extraordinary Papal Audience! We, at the Embassy, on course, never heard a word of thanks from Kennedy or his large office staff all in the line of duty! It was this way with any number of Congressional Delegations I have worked with throughout the years.

Q: I think we're near the end of your tour at the Vatican, Peter. Whether you want to or not..... we have to talk about William A. Wilson, the first American Ambassador to the Holy See.

MURPHY: Of course, Bill, But....allow me first to mention two other major parts of the world which were continually the focus of our political reporting at the Vatican. Latin America, for example. We continually monitored the human rights situation in several Latin American nations. In countries where the population is perhaps 95% nominally Catholic, the Church still has great political and social influence in all sectors of society.

Q: And, shall I mention at that period, the United States had difficulties in Central America. The number one - Eliot Abram's) - role in that area, for example.

MURPHY: Exactly.....and our difficulties with General Noriega in Nicaragua.

Q: Can you give us one example of your work in that area?

MURPHY: Let's see: I think it may be useful for the reader if I spoke a bit about what is called Liberation Theology - which was growing influence among both Protestant and Catholic clerics and laymen in a number of Latin American nations. This theological theory had a definite political content - and thus was an object of our political reporting. The tenets "Liberation Theology" can best be described as including doctrine that defines forced poverty and oppression - from the government or the wealthy or ruling classes of a nation - as sins. Some adherents to this theology in the '70s argue that even violence would be justified to eradicate such poverty. Now, Bill, I realize that may sound like we are getting into a theological discussion, and in effect we are, but soon after the writings on this subject by Latin American priests were publicized throughout the world, the Vatican came out with a strong condemnation of certain aspects of the teaching. Latin American leaders in this field of theological/political thinking were Fathers Leonardo Boff and Gustavo Gutierrez, a Peruvian priest/psychologist who, in the late '70s, wrote "A Theory of Liberation". These men represented a large number of clergymen and religious women who were frustrated with the Church's impotence against Latin America's social ills. Many of them took an active role in their countries in representing the poor. You'll recall the difficulty that the Pope himself had with the Marxist priest, Ernesto Cardinal, who was an official of Nicaragua's Sandinista government. The Vatican, in essence, thought the teachings far too political, too much to the left. Although the Pope had always advocated an "option for the poor" - and had indeed called Liberation Theology "useful and necessary", he and his advisors in Rome became uncomfortable with the perceived tendency of the movement toward Marxism. The new theology was, in effect, preaching that the wealth of the ruling classes in Latin America should be shared by everyone and some of the adherents to this theology advocated violence to attain this end. I am sure you remember the Maryknoll priests and nuns taking up arms in certain Central and Latin American nations, Bill.

The condemnation of the new political-theological ideas was led by the Prefect of the Congregation of Holy Office, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger. In 1985 his Congregation published two major documents which made headlines worldwide. Official Washington was very interested in the subject - - given the fact that followers of such a theological premise were starting to cause political unrest in Africa as well as Latin America. Why - the government of Iran even organized

a Liberation Theology Conference - inviting leading Catholic scholars to address the assembly in Tehran! Following the publication of Ratzinger's first letter of condemnation of certain aspects of this theology, I recall sending an outline of his letter to all of our diplomatic posts. A friend in Washington called to ask what in the world I was doing - "sending such theological stuff around the world". Bill - you wouldn't believe the cables I received in Rome - thanking the Embassy for sending an explanation of Liberation Theology - and its consequences - to Tokyo, Helsinki, Moscow, etc. Several posts told us that diplomats from Latin America and Africa, for example, were constantly referring to Liberation Theology - and our people hadn't a clue what they were talking about. I was very pleased, as you can imagine, at this positive reaction to our reporting. The importance of the religious revolution in Iran at the time of the Shah's downfall has always been in my mind whenever I weighed political reporting proposals! I have always believed that *all* reporting is important - not just the stuff you agree with!! When you stop and think of it for a moment, Bill, it is an obvious fact that several of the armed conflicts in the world have a religious bases: Northern Ireland, Iran, Yugoslavia, Greece-Turkey, Indonesia, Sudan etc.

Q: Just to finish with Central America, Peter. We remember, or maybe we've forgotten, how strongly involved the Reagan Administration was in making certain that everything went our way in Central America, and what Liberation Theology meant, because priests got murdered and priests made trouble and priests took up guns. We have only to look at the murdered Archbishop of San Salvador - Archbishop Oscar A. Romero - and the six Jesuits and their housekeeper at the university there. So this theology you are speaking of was very much involved with our Central American policy.

MURPHY: I couldn't agree more, Bill.

Q: We are nearing the end now of your wonderful four years tour of duty in Rome at the Vatican.

Peter, why don't you give us a summary of your overall impressions of your unusual assignment to the Vatican and perhaps talk a little bit about one personality we haven't mentioned. That is, the Pope.

MURPHY: Okay. Bill, before we get on to the Pope, I would like to leave the reader with a flavor of the types of visitors we dealt with on an almost daily basis as well as those members of our government having serious business at the Embassy and at the Vatican. I'll just read you a list of some of the interesting people that I worked with during my tour and hope you don't think I am just "name dropping". I would simply like to give you an idea of the people who are attracted there and travel to Rome on business for our government.

Q: And you were involved with them personally?

MURPHY: I was involved with practically every visit of an official American to the Vatican. There are many tales connected with these visits - because we got a chance to be with and speak directly to these people for extended periods of time. (There is a lot of *waiting* at the Vatican!!). I also think that most people - no matter who they are - are awed by the prospect of meeting the Holy Father in person. They are usually a bit nervous - no matter what their position in

government - - and don't know quite what to expect. I figured that a part of my job was to put these people at ease!

I recall waiting with President Reagan in a "holding room" in the Vatican Palace prior to one of his Audiences. Although there seemed to be the usual "cast of thousands" accompanying us to and from the Vatican that day, for some reason I was left alone with the President for about 10 minutes. The President pulled out of his coat pocket a 3 x 5 white card on which were noted about 10 major subjects he wanted to raise with the Pope. He asked if I would review them with him. As I had been responsible for gathering most of the points on that list months before and cabling them to the White House, I was quite familiar with this list! The President went through each point without hesitation. I was really impressed since - if one were to believe the press at that point in time - Reagan slept through half the meetings he attended! After this review, the President commented "*The Pope must have a hell of a job, Peter. It must really be tough to be in his position these days.*" When I asked why he thought that, the President replied with a question for me. "*How long is it*", he asked, "*since you have lived in the United States*". When I told him it had been about ten years, he said, "*You can't imagine how leftist and liberal all members of the clergy are these days - Protestant, Catholic and Jewish. I'll give you a good example: last year the University of Notre Dame gave me an Honorary Degree. Well - I arrived at the campus in a large motorcade. The entire campus was blocked as a protest to my visit. You'll never guess who was leading this protest..... none other than a group of Maryknoll nuns!*" The President was genuinely shocked by this fact! I thought that the President would really be amazed if he could have heard the political opinions and philosophies of some of the Jesuits living at the Rome Jesuit Headquarters - Borgo S. Spirito, 5 - - a five minute walk from the Vatican!

Other visitors included, for example, Geraldine Ferraro, former Democratic candidate for Vice President and her husband who came to Rome for a Papal Audience prior to making her first visit to the People's Republic of China. I recall that Bill Wilson wouldn't have a thing to do with her - - while Max and Ruth Rabb hosted a large dinner party in her honor! (The differences between ambassadors - both Republican!) As I was accompanying Mrs. Ferraro into the Papal Library - a group of cardinals was leaving. One said to me, in Italian, "*Congratulations, Mr. Murphy! You have two Americans on the new list of cardinals - O'Connor of New York and Law of Boston!*" After the group passed, Mrs. Ferraro took me by the arm and said - "*Don't tell me it's true! O'Connor won - and I lost!! and I had to hear it here in the Pope's house!*" She did have a good sense of humor - and impressed me as a very intelligent and caring person.

Others who came to visit various Vatican offices included Robert Novak, Edward Bennett and William Buckley. Many academics and writers came to discuss political and cultural matters with officials of the Holy See. Admiral James Watkins, Chief of Naval Operations, and then Secretary of Energy came several times to Rome. He was a good friend of Bill Wilson's and also had a son, James, studying at the North American College.

Q: Again, for business with the Vatican rather than coming to be briefed by you, or both?

MURPHY: Both. With visitors from State, the White House, NSC to other parts of the government - we would normally hold briefings at the Embassy prior to our meetings at the Vatican. General Vernon A. Walters (former Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency

under George Bush and our Ambassador to the United Nations and, later, to Germany) came to Rome on several occasions. Walters' missions were quite specific: to brief the Pope on major political situations around the globe. In all of the private meetings I have attended with Pope John Paul II, the Audiences involving General Walters were by far the most interesting. To begin with - the Pope felt most comfortable with General Walters - simply because he spoke fluent Italian - the Pope's working language. I recall one day when we walked into the Pope's Library. he threw out his arms and said "*Welcome, Mr. Ambassador! Finally an American Ambassador I can understand!!*".

Q: What was his role at that time? With the CIA?

MURPHY: No. During my time in Rome, Walters visited as our Ambassador to the United Nations. His role was to brief the Holy Father on explosive situations in the world at that time.

Q: So, when General - Ambassador Walters became your boss later on in Germany, he had already gotten to know you?

MURPHY: Yes, we knew each other very well by the time we reached Bonn. I have always had great admiration for him - both as a person and as a great public servant of our nation. It was as a results of my getting to know Ambassador Vernon Walters during this period that he asked me to join him in Bonn - my next assignment.

Then, Bill, as I have already mentioned, we had presidential visits to the Vatican. President and Mrs. Reagan came twice to see the Pope while I was at post in Rome. The preparations, as you well know, are simply unbelievable. Substantive work of all kind stops for about two weeks prior to the visit; three advance teams visit the post; their demands are unbelievable.....the Secret Service always wanted to search the Pope's Library where the Audience with the President would take place! They never did get in, of course, but it wasn't for lack of trying. I was even accused by members of the advance teams of working for the Vatican instead of the United States because I would not push the Papal Household hard enough to permit an SY search of the Pope's private library!!

Nancy Reagan visited the Vatican once by herself - to foster her "Just Say No!" anti drug program. Her staff thought that it would be a great boost to her anti drug campaign to receive the Holy Father's approval of her efforts. Thus, the main object of her visit was to obtain Papal endorsement of her program. I recall that the visit took place on a beautiful spring day (May 4). Mrs. Reagan had sent orders by cable from Washington that, for her audience with the Pope, she would wear a black silk suit and a hat. Normally, the wives of Chiefs of State are dressed in long black dresses with a mantilla as a head covering. Mrs. Reagan requested that Betty Wilson and my wife, Jacqueline, be similarly attired! I remember Jackie calling me from a downtown Rome shop to tell me that the cheapest black silk suit she found cost over One Million Lire! I suggested she get a linen suit - and be done with it. No one would know the difference!! For this visit, Betty and Bill Wilson had a special room constructed (cost \$65,000!!) at their Residence to host a private luncheon for the First Lady following her visit to the Vatican. (Their dining room at the Residence was too small to handle a large luncheon party.) Special table decorations were made in Venice - - and the room in which we dined is now known as "The Nancy Reagan Room" at

the ambassadorial residence Villa Richardson on Via G. Medici - property of the American Academy in Rome and leased to the United States government. I was rather surprised to learn that Nancy Reagan controlled the details of Guest List for this luncheon - which she approved in advance from the White House. A couple of the invited guests were - at the last moment - dis-invited by the White House! God only knows what these poor souls had done to fall into Nancy's disfavor. I had pity on our protocol people who had to telephone and explain "sending the luncheon invitation in error"! If you can believe it - - even the seating designations for this luncheon were cabled to Mrs. Reagan for her approval - - and she actually did change some of the seating! The event included about 30 guests: the Secretary of State Cardinal Casaroli, the Foreign Minister Archbishop Silvestrini, Audrey Hepburn and her long-time friend, the author Gore Vidal as well as a few of the titled Roman nobility who were ever-present at our official receptions and dinners. The reason I recall that Audrey Hepburn was present was because that day - May 4th - was her birthday - and Jackie's as well! Everyone toasted their Birthdays.

Speaking of Nancy Reagan: I should record my impressions of this famous lady here. As mentioned earlier, Nancy Reagan was a very close friend of Betty Wilson and her husband, Ambassador William A. Wilson. The moment it was made public in the world press that Bill had undertaken an "unauthorized trip" to Libya (referred to elsewhere in this oral history) - and subsequently disgraced President Ronald Reagan by this act, the Wilson-Reagan friendship was put on hold! The Wilsons left Rome within a few months of the infamous trip to Libya. Following the arrival of Frank Shakespeare as ambassador seven months later, our Embassy began receiving strange messages from the White House! To give you an example, Bill: we were aware that the Wilsons planned a trip from their home in California to Rome so that Bill could present his official portrait for our Embassy.....as is common practice at many of our missions around the world. Bill had his portrait done by a noted Portuguese artist. Word arrived, via Nancy Reagan's Chief of Staff, that there was to be no ceremony held in the Embassy in connection with the presentation of the Wilson portrait; that no member of the Embassy staff was to attend any social gathering in Rome or the Vatican in honor of the Wilsons - and, in addition, we were to cable all invitations to such events to the White House for their information!! The Friends of the Vatican Museum, a group of art-lovers founded with the Wilsons' assistance and backing, gave a formal dinner in the Vatican Museums itself in honor of the Wilsons. Frank Shakespeare, ambassador at the time, actually left Rome for the weekend on instructions from Washington so as not to be present in the city at the time of at the event honoring the Wilsons! As I was Chargé at the time - I was of course "too busy" to attend - according to White House instructions!! The interesting thing about the many invitations arriving at that time at the embassy was the fact that one was for a luncheon honoring Betty Wilson - and my wife, Jackie, was authorized - via cable from Washington - to attend that function!! (Who says Big Brother is not watching you!!)

Another very strange instruction coming from the White House directed us to "warn" Cardinal William Wakefield Baum - former Archbishop of Washington, DC and a close friend of the Wilsons - that, as an American and also Vatican official, he would do well to limit his contacts with the Wilsons - as the couple was "*not looked upon favorably by President and Mrs. Reagan.*" It was evident that Nancy Reagan was attempting to limit Betty and Bill Wilson's contacts abroad. I cannot believe that the President knew anything about such orders coming from his wife's office in the East Wing of the White House. I have never before seen such evidence of

personal spite in my entire life! I thought, at the time, that Nancy Reagan must be a most vindictive woman! It is ironic that since the Reagans moved back to Los Angeles, the Wilsons are now among their closest friends. They live near each other. Betty did all she could to help ease the Reagans return to a normal Californian life after eight years in the White House. Cardinal Baum, as you can well imagine, Bill, was outraged by suggestion that he break his friendship with the Wilsons at the suggestion of the White Houseand rightly so in my opinion.

Another even more outrageous example of Mrs. Reagan's direct intervention in our Mission's affairs took place shortly prior to the Holy Father's second Pastoral Visit to the United States - when he visited the South and West of our country. One fine day the Embassy received a cable from the Department of State instructing us to send a Diplomatic Note to the Vatican informing the Foreign Ministry that the U. S. government requested that the Holy Father take no public notice of either Mr. or Mrs. William A. Wilson at any public event connected with his forthcoming visit to our country. The telegram also mentioned that the Embassy should warn American prelates stationed at the Holy See that they should beware of forming close friendships with the Wilsons - who were "*personae non gratae*" at the White House!! My advice to Frank Shakespeare was: 1) that we check out the authenticity of this crazy message with the State Department and 2) that we remind State that the Wilsons are American citizens. In my opinion, the US government had no business instructing a foreign Chief of State (the Pope, in this case) who he can and cannot speak with when he is visiting in our country! In reply to our query, the State Department assured us that the message had the approval of James Baker, the then Chief of Staff at the White House and also "of Nancy Reagan's people" in the West Wing of the White House! Frank was thus obliged to deliver the Diplomatic Note to the Secretariat of State at the Vatican. (I do wish I had kept a copy of that Note! I am sure the Vatican kept their copy!) The Vatican's reaction was as expected - word spread throughout Rome in hours. I'll wager that every member of the American Catholic hierarchy knew of the White House's instructions within 24 hours of the delivery of that Diplomatic Note to the Vatican. There was general disbelief among friends at the Vatican that our government could make such a request involving American citizens - and the first American Ambassador to the Holy See at that! I recall consulting with the President of the Pontifical Diplomatic Academy at the time - Archbishop Justin Rigali (an American citizen from California) - who was stunned with the news of our diplomatic demarche! Needless to say, John Paul II took not the slightest notice of our "instructions" - and warmly greeted both Betty and Bill when they met him at the airport upon his arrival in Florida - as well as at other stops along the route of his travels in the United States.

My tale of Nancy Reagan's involvement in our little Embassy does not finish here! There is more, Bill - incredible as it may seem! Ambassador Frank Shakespeare followed the Holy Father around the U.S. on his historic visit. (As all Papal travels to foreign countries are "Pastoral" in nature, Frank was not present in any "official" capacity.) Following the joint visit of the Pope and Nancy Reagan to an elementary school classroom in California, the Pope left by helicopter for the next leg of his visit to that State. Nancy Reagan cornered Frank Shakespeare and questioned him about the "*serious leaks of inside information within the Embassy to the Vatican to the Wilsons*". Nancy claimed she had proof that someone in the Embassy was telling the Wilsons everything that happened on a regular basis. She named Mirella Giacalone - our Protocol Assistant as well as my secretary at the time - and faithful long-time American citizen

employee of the Embassy as the culprit. Frank came back to Rome and - after recounting this odd tale of his private conversation with the First Lady - said that, unfortunately, we had to fire Mirella on Nancy Reagan's direct orders! I strongly objected and told Frank there was absolutely no proof to the claim that Mirella Giacalone had passed information to the Wilsons. We could not simply fire one of our best and most loyal employees based on hearsay. It took me a few weeks, but I finally managed to have Frank drop the matter. I consider this a major accomplishment given the fact that Mrs. Reagan's Chief of Staff called us in Rome three or four times to learn how the matter was progressing! Never in my life would I have believed a First Lady of the United States of America would have directly interfered with our relations with a nation over such a petty matter - if I had not experienced it with my own eyes and ears!

To continue, Bill ---the Embassy at the Holy See also hosted many other official visits during my four years in Rome, including that of Vice President and Mrs. George Bush and Secretary and Mrs. George Shultz . National Security Advisor Robert (Bud) McFarlane visited on four occasions to brief the Holy Father. Senator Robert Dole, Senator Edward Kennedy, as well as several Congressional delegations.

Q: What stories, Peter! Some people went there for political reasons, but obviously some for substantive reasons.

MURPHY: That's right, Bill. There were many substantive visits. The Middle East remains today an area of great concern to the Holy See. Many of our Arab experts visited the Vatican. I recall that Ambassador April Glaspie visited the Vatican when she was seeking to understand the Rome's position on the Middle East problem. April spent two days in conversations with Arab/Israeli experts in the Secretariat of State. You will recall that April Glaspie was our ill-fated ambassador in Iraq just prior to the start of the Gulf War.

Q: Indeed. Did she come after she...?

MURPHY: No, April Glaspie was not then posted to Iraq. She was stationed in the Department at the time. And of course, Secretaries of State Shultz and Baker came through Rome often - and never failed to visit the Pope as well as the Italian government officials.

Q: Let me interrupt just a moment now. When these special VIPs, like Presidents and Vice Presidents and Secretaries of State, come to visit, your embassy was invaded. You are a very small Embassy; how could you possibly support them?

MURPHY: Well, when we had such visits, we naturally worked very closely with our Embassy to the Italian Republic. Embassy Rome handled all the transportation for the visitors as well as security outside of Vatican City State itself. We simply took care of things inside the Vatican - including the Papal heliport which is located within the Vatican gardens. I recall that the President Reagan landed there twice. For a small post like ours, Bill, I assure you it was no easy task!

Q: Security?

MURPHY: Security, yes. Of course, once inside Vatican City, we had to handle everything; our people had to do it all. Our own Regional Security staff worked with the Papal security service, the Swiss Guards and the Secret Service. We also had a contingent of 12 U.S. Marine guards at the Embassy, you know.

Q: Oh you did?

MURPHY: I guess I forgot to mention this fact. We did have our own Marine Security Guard contingent as well as Italian security personnel. The Marines were well housed in the new Chancery on Via Aurelia. Following their arrival, I spoke with the Commander of the Papal Swiss Guards, Co. Roland Buchs, and arranged for a social exchange between the Swiss Guards and our Marines. It worked very well - with the Guards coming to our Embassy for Friday night "Happy Hour" in the Marine quarters - and our Marines frequently visiting the Swiss Guard mess within Vatican City for great home-cooked meals. I also arranged with the Marines for Colonel Buchs to make an official visit to the Marine Commandant in Washington. This was certainly a "first" - since the only official contact that the Pope's Swiss Guards ever had with a foreign military group was with the U. S. Marines at our Embassy. No other diplomatic mission had military guards - and, of course, they had nothing do in an official way with the Italian Armed Forces.

When I left Rome, I believe we had about 18 people on our staff in total. But as you say, for a large Presidential visit or other official visit which involved an Advance Team, we had to rely on Embassy Rome for considerable assistance - - especially carting the mob of White House strap hangers around the city!!

Q: On visits of that order, the Embassy not only was involved, but was also a co-sponsor, if you will, of the visit.

MURPHY: Yes.

Q: Now, you mentioned the personality of the Pope, of John Paul II.....this Polish Pope we have. Was the Pope already installed when you arrived?

MURPHY: Oh yes, he was well installed by the time I arrived in Rome! The shooting of the Pope - in St. Peter's Square by the Turk - had also occurred before I arrived at the Embassy in 1984. As a result of the terrorist attack, the Pope did have a permanent disfiguration of his left hand. Because one of the bullets entered his stomach, the Pope also had difficulty standing straight. Much of his stomach, of course, was removed following the incident.

Q: To be very vital, we hear of these great tragedies that happen to people. Did you observe any direct effect, were you aware that this particular act carried out by the Turk had any evident effect on the Pope?

MURPHY: Well - the attack certainly had an effect on John Paul's physical well-being. That was for sure, because he subsequently walked with sort of a stoop. A shooting of that violence must

also have had a psychological side as well - but that was less evident from my vantage point in Rome.

Q: Was he hurting, do you think?

MURPHY: I really don't know, Bill. In public, at times, he certainly looked as if he was in pain. I would often see him in St. Peter's at a public ceremony - reading his homily - with his head bent down over the text. And of course his small finger and ring finger on his left hand are quite paralyzed as a direct result of the shooting. One of the bullets smashed that part of his hand - - broke the bones. I also presume that it affected the Pope in a psychological manner - as an attempted assassination naturally would do.

Bill - let me give you a brief anecdote to demonstrate John Paul II's more human qualities....of which he has many. This Pope is a very controversial figure; beloved throughout the world and perhaps the most widely known person in the world. He is certainly the most traveled Pontiff in history. This Pope, however, is also viewed by many as super-conservative in today's world. Many people, especially in Italy, believe John Paul II is out of touch with the reality of life as it is lived in our times. People severely criticize his conservative bent; yet, others criticize him because they feel the Church has become too liberal under his reign - in the 25 years since the Second Vatican Council. I know it will be hard to believe, but I have seen some of his strongest critics right in the Vatican - and most of them were Italian!

In order to begin to understand the mind of this Polish Pope, we must remember that John Paul II is very Polish. He was educated and grew upand workedunder a Polish Communist regime which was not only anti-religious from the core but actively atheistic.

Q: And he survived it.

MURPHY: That he did. John Paul II is a survivor - for sure! As a youth, he worked in the mines and in a factory to further his education at the university - and later at the seminary. You must understand what it's like to be a cleric in Poland at the time of the Communist regime. The Polish people are usually devout Catholics. The Polish clergy is very respected. I imagine that the respect shown to the Polish clergy is similar to that in Ireland at the turn of the century. Things have changed in Ireland - - and are, no doubt, fast changing in Poland today with the advent of a democratic society.

Q: Very authoritarian maybe, very paternal?

MURPHY: Without a doubt - authoritarian. The historic cultural ties of the Roman Catholic Church and the Polish nation are well known. It is a well known fact that the clergy was a great source of information for the Polish people during the years of Communist rule. They imparted information which the government attempted to keep from the general public. I had a personal experience with that when I visited Warsaw and Krakow in the late 1970s on an official mission (an Inspection) together with Stan Carpenter from the State Department. One Sunday we attended Mass at the Cathedral in Warsaw. We didn't understand a word, of course, as the service was entirely in Polish.... but during the sermon of the young celebrant, the entire

congregation started talking, with rather angry looks on their faces. It was obvious that they were shocked by something he had said. Coming out of the church, I asked a young student in French what in the world was going on.. He replied, "Well, we learned just today that two weeks ago a Russian personnel carrier crashed into a bus full of school children out in a mountain town - pushing them to their deaths down the side of a mountain! The Russian soldier-driver was dead drunk - but not a word of this tragedy was published in the press. To think that this happened only about 40 kms from Warsaw - and no one knew about it!

So - you see, Bill: the Polish people for years have depended on the Church as a source of information; as a defender of their civil rights - and, in turn, the people have shown loyalty to their priests. As I mentioned, it is rather akin Ireland - or the Province of Quebec in Canada - during the last century! This the sort of background from which the Pope comes. He is not at all used to the empty churches in Italy or in France. The "faithful" are expected to show respect - and obey! He is quite used to clerics being listened to - with respect...back in Poland.

Q: Isn't the Pope also an artistic and literary man as well. He isn't "just a priest." He was someone with talent.

MURPHY: I believe that the Pope is a person of great talent. He is an accomplished writer as well - as an actor. He is a first rate theologian. He is also an avid sportsman; skier and boatsman. He loves hiking in the mountains - and, to some extent, continues his hiking in the Italian mountains each summer, in spite of the constraints of the Vatican protocol. He also continues his swimming in the summer months in his pool at Castel Gandolfo.

I'll tell you another anecdote will illustrate John Paul II's good humor and powers of observation. This story concerns visit of Robert ("Bud") McFarlane (National Security Advisor for President Ronald Reagan) to the Pope - - one of several he made while I was in Rome. McFarlane was sent to Rome following a Summit Meeting in Geneva with Secretary General Gorbachev. The President went on to Brussels to brief chiefs of state and heads of government at NATO Headquarters. He sent McFarlane to Rome to brief the Holy Father regarding his meeting with the Soviet leader. While we were waiting outside the Papal Library, I took the opportunity of reminding Mr. McFarlane that the Pope's native language was not English - as he well knew - and I thought the Pope would understand him better if he used simple language and spoke slowly - when explaining such complex subjects as the Strategic Defense Initiative. McFarlane agreed.

Q: Peter - wouldn't an interpreter normally be used?

MURPHY: No, there was no interpreter since the Pope does speak and understand English. But - to tell the truth, Bill, English really is not the Pope's best language. An interpreter is used at such meetings only when the Pope doesn't understand a word of his visitor's language. He himself gets by in about 8 languages. McFarlane and I were invited into the Pope's Library.

(As an aside - you might think it strange that I - and not Ambassador Wilson - accompanied this visitor from the White House. Well - early on in my posting I was told at the Secretariat of State in the Vatican that it was appropriate for the Ambassador to accompany only the President, the Vice President or the Secretary of State to meetings with the Pope. They suggested that I

accompany all others. The reason for this - never stated explicitly, of course - was that the Vatican wanted to cut down the media attention of the United States at the Vatican. Mr. Wilson was very frequently in the European and American press in those days - and not all of the coverage was favorable!)

So....as I explained, I asked Bud McFarlane to speak slowly, not to use colloquial terms or complicated vocabulary. McFarlane is very bright, as you know, but not at all a warm-fuzzy personality! It turned out to be an extraordinarily long Audience - lasting about 40 minutes in total.

Q: How many were you?

MURPHY: There were just the three of us: the Holy Father, Mr. McFarlane and me.

Q: The Pope didn't have somebody on his side?....a note taker?

MURPHY: No, he didn't. There is a secretary in the area - but he always remained outside of the papal Library. A couple of times, he would stick his head in to see how things were progressing - but I gathered it was a signal to the Pope to indicate "times is up!". People are waiting!

Q: So the Pope has to do his own "minutes" afterward?

MURPHY: Yes. I guess he would have dictated a report - - if any report of the meeting was kept by the Vatican. Knowing how things work there - I presume that the meeting was recorded....somehow! As I said, this particular meeting was indeed interesting - and the Pope listened attentively to everything McFarlane had to say about nuclear proliferation, arms reduction and statistics on how much each side had, human rights violations by the Soviet Union.... and all the minute details of the recent Summit Meeting. About 20 minutes into the dialogue....

Q: With the Pope asking questions?

MURPHY: It was rather a monologue.... on McFarlane's part but, from time to time, the Pope asked a couple of questions. At one point, the Pope interrupted and said, "Mr. McFarlane, would you mind if I asked the Minister a question in Italian?" Mr. McFarlane said, "No, not at all." The Pope looked straight at me and says in Italian, "*Mi dica una cosa, Signor Ministro..... questo tizio soride mai?*" What the Pope literally said to me was "Tell me, Mr. Minister, does this guy ever smile?" He actually used the Italian colloquial expression for the word "guy," which is "*tizio*". I was rather amazed by the Pope's question and.... just looked at him and said: "*No lo so, Santita*""I don't know, Your Holiness. I haven't seen any evidence of it yet." And he said, "Well.....you just wait, toward the end of this meeting, I'm going to tell a joke and we'll see if we can get him to smile."

So. with that, the Pope asked me a technical question which I translated. I'm sure McFarlane thought he took an awful long time to ask this question in Italian because we had gone on so long. He answered the questions for the Pope and the briefing continued. Toward the end, the Pope did

tell a joke..... quite a funny joke - actually..... and McFarlane kind of grinned. As we were leaving the Papal Library, McFarlane walked out in front of me, the Pope was beside me. The Pope grabbed my arm and leaned over and said in my ear - "*Ha visto? L'ho fatto!!!*" "Did you see that? I did it, didn't I." I didn't know what to say - except: "*Bravo, Santita*" "Well done, Your Holiness." I never did say a word to McFarlane about this incident - but, you will admit, it does show that the Pope has a sense of humor!

I tell you this, Bill, to show you (and others who will read this) that the Pope is indeed a very human person. I saw several examples of his humanity in my years of working at the Vatican. Often when I would accompany a visitor to the Pope during the winter months, the Pope would ask if I had gone skiing the previous weekend. He wanted to know the condition of the snow; what kind of ski boots I had; my opinion on the best places to ski near Rome. In the four years I was in Rome, the Pope made three trips to the mountains around Rome - with his trusted secretary - to ski for a day - or a weekend. In addition, he once visited the Dolomites in northern Italy for four days - with President Pertini of Italy. There - he skied and Pertini watched!!

Q: If the Pope can't be human, then I want to be something else! So what you're saying is, in summary, with this example: the present Pope was not only a person from a different civilization than we are accustomed to with Popes in general....but very much so! He is the first Polish Pope, coming out a Communist setting. But he was also very human.

MURPHY: Yes. And, of course, this was to the great consternation of some very stuffy, protocol-minded Italian prelates in the Vatican. They did not like the informality of this Polish Pope at all....and made no bones about telling you so. A Pope having luncheon and dinner guests....and leaving the Vatican in the evening to dine at various universities and religious houses around the city!!simply unheard of just a few short years ago. Can you picture Pius XII (Eugenio Pacelli) conducting his life in such a manner in the mid-'50s?

Q: But he had a Polish grouping around him, didn't he?

MURPHY: Oh yes, very much so. There was what we in the diplomatic corps always referred to as a "a Polish Mafia" in all sections of the Vatican operation. They were usually Polish clerics - and the Papal household was run by a group of Polish nuns. They were rather stern looking - as I remember. I would often see them shopping in the early morning hours at the Vatican commissary - where we diplomats were also allowed to shop. All the goods were tax free - that the Vatican Pharmacy is considered one of the best - and most complete - in the world.

Q: So he could have, perhaps for his sanity and maintenance of his personality, a similar culture?

MURPHY: I am sure that is the reason. It is like a Democratic President bringing all his friends and supporters to Washington following a change of Administration!

All the Pope's original writing, for example, is done in Polish...although his French and German are really very good - - much better than his spoken English.

Q: Oh is it?

MURPHY: The Pope continues to write - but I don't know where he finds the time! As a matter of fact, I just read in this morning's paper that John Paul II has written a book based on questions submitted to him by Italian journalists which will soon be published in the United States. The article I read mentioned that the Pope had written the original in Polish.....and then it was translated into Italian.....and then into English.

I should mention that just before I left Rome, I was made a Knight Commander of the Order of Pius IX (Ordine Piano) by Pope John Paul II. This Papal honor was given to me in recognition of the work I had done in establishing the first United States Embassy at the Holy See and "in fostering excellent relations between the two governments". As is usual in such cases, in Washington the Office of Protocol and the office of the Secretary of State had to approve my acceptance of the honor. I obtained all the necessary permissions to keep the decoration from the States Department. Interestingly, months later in Washington, I received a call from George Vest, then Director General of the Foreign Service to confirm that I had indeed requested - and received - the Department's permission before accepting the Papal decoration. George said he had received a few cables and letters from colleagues asking if my award had indeed received the approval of the Secretary of State! Vest said that one ambassador asked if the award was a "religious or civilian" decoration! I relate this incident to illustrate the point I made at the opening of this interview - our Mission at the Holy See is not approved by all Americans - either within the government or by private citizens!

MICHAEL G. ANDERSON
Political Officer
Rome (1987-1990)

Michael Anderson was born and raised in Illinois and educated at the University of Illinois and the University of Chicago. Entering the Foreign Service in 1973, Mr. Anderson became a European specialist, serving at posts in Poland and Italy and on the Poland desk at the State Department in Washington. Mr. Anderson also had a tour as Political Officer in Islamabad, Pakistan. Other assignments concerned Arab-Israel affairs, Population and Refugee matters and Peacekeeping and Humanitarian affairs. Mr. Anderson was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 2005.

Q: Who led the Communist Party of Italy? The name escapes me right now but the head of it this was Mr. Euro communism.

ANDERSON: Oh, Berlinguer. He was gone by this point. He's dead.

Q: There was a lot of talk in the early 1980s about a new face of communism, particularly in Italy that didn't look to the Soviet Union. It stood on its own. Would this be Euro communism? How did we see that at the time?

ANDERSON: Yes, Euro communism. That was more like my first tour there in 1976, 1978. I should say 1974 to 1976. That was when Moro and the *compromesso storico* was being discussed. The idea of having a Christian Democratic government with a communist support or even participation. And of course we looked upon that with utter terror. The idea of communist participation in a government in Italy was certainly not something that we were going to accept whether they called it Euro communism or Stalin communism, made no difference. We were laboring quite hard to counteract that and in fact there were incidences of paid political announcements of one sort or another and publications both in the U.S. and in Italy that were arguing that this would be a disaster if the communist were allowed to participate in the government. By 1987 when I got there it ceased really to be much of an issue. I wouldn't think the communists themselves, they were a younger crowd really, pretty impressive people intellectually, but as politicians they weren't terribly successful in gathering a big following. Let's face it, the European left in general was kind of undergoing sort of transformation or mutation I guess in a way that the younger ones, even those who had started out as a kind of hard-line or dedicated Marxist, by the mid late 1980's were having to kind of rethink it and refashion their whole ideology. Massimo D'Alema was the leader of the communists, a young fellow, I think he is still active over there in one of the successor parties. Their old working class stuff, *L'Unita* you know, their newspaper and their red flag marches and protest of this that and other thing. Of course the labor union movement was, all of it was undergoing a kind of terminal deterioration. You could see happening in Italy really, much the same thing that was happening over in the Soviet Union. The Italian communists were trying to escape a sinking ship you might say, but I don't think they ever made it. Obviously the party went to pieces afterwards. After 1989, 1990, 1991, I don't know when they started to splinter as did the Christian Democrats. So today Italian politics is a bunch of debris at this point.

Q: How about the Christian Democrats? How did you find it? Its membership and what we were interested in and what they were interested in about us?

ANDERSON: A very diverse membership. Its leadership, I would say, or many of the local leaders, and I had contact with a great number, were not too different from our own way of thinking. I think we found them very compatible for the most part. They were the kind of guys you would see belonging to the Rotary, the Knights of Columbus. They participated in community affairs. They were rooted in the communities; most of them, representing kind of the upper middle class point of view. Italy, like most of Europe, was divided. There was a working class and a bourgeoisie and then there was a sort of upper class I guess you would say. The Christian Democrats appealed mainly to that middle class, church going, *gente perbene*, as they used to say, group and most of the people who were in it were that way especially if you went to central and northern Italy. Go further south there was tinge of the Mafioso in the whole thing too.

Q: Were we concerned about or reporting, or did you see it, on the corruption within the party?

ANDERSON: There were certainly reports on that. As I recall various attempts were made to try and figure out a political system. I'm trying to remember how exactly they were try to re-jigger things that would create a more responsive political class, whether try to get away from some of the proportional representation which caused a lot of splintering because the Christian Democrats, even in their best year, never reached 50% of the electorate. I think maybe they got low 40's but

by the time I was there they were more in the 30's. The communist in the 20% and then a whole slew of other people picking up the others, liberals, republicans, the MSI, proto fascists or neo-fascists groups and so on. The Lombard league. There's just all different kinds of groups coming up. Their problem was they couldn't form a coherent government because really it was just a question of getting into power. In terms of actually putting forward a program, nobody would agree to anything. They couldn't get a majority on almost anything. The big push when I was there, you got to get ready for the European Union. The Maastricht Agreement I think called for some kind of changes by January 1, 1990 if I'm not mistaken. Oh, Italy is not ready and the Christian Democrats were very pro-European Union. In fact the Socialists I think were also pro European Union. The Communists much less so of course seeing the deepening of EU involvement as something that would really dilute their influence and there were many regional and local groups in Italy that were also very anti-European. The trade unions, a lot of them also felt that there was a threat to their kind of established position there. The Christian Democrats, to their credit, were visionary in the sense as they were elsewhere in Europe, looking towards the creation of a much more unified European community so that came across.

Q: Did we have any message during this time?

ANDERSON: Well as I recall the main message -- and it wasn't so much coming out of the political section maybe, as I don't know, maybe it was political but at the highest levels -- was the putting in place and defending these INF, these intermediate nuclear force missiles down in Sicily. I think they put some up in northern Italy too. This was the period in the mid 1980s where the Soviets of course had put in there medium range missiles and then we had responded with our own deployments and it was very unpopular in Italy among the left groups and the peaceniks and so on declaring this makes Italy a target and these things are really destabilizing and dah, dah, dah. Of course our view being that, well what are you talking about, this is exactly what Italy and Europe needs to defend itself against Soviet blackmail. So that was the big issue and it started before I got there, but it continued and then right into that period of Gorbachev and Bush they, I think before I left that had already agreed on dismantling these missiles on the timetables. I saw that happen and certainly when I got there our big issue was to convince people and of course the Christian Democrats were on our side with this as were the Socialists. They were pro these missiles and this whole strategy of dealing with the Soviets. That dominated to a certain extent. We had to sell that, but it wasn't too hard of a sell to the Christian Democrats. Public opinion in general had to be convinced that these missiles and our strategy was a good one.

Q: What about, during this time what sort of role was the Catholic Church playing? Did it have a role?

ANDERSON: Well, it certainly did after the collapse of some of these communist regimes. You could see what was happening in eastern Europe especially with Pope John Paul II in the Vatican that Italy was focused on developments in places like Poland and then eventually as I said, Romania and then the whole cold war conclusion there in eastern Europe. So the church was focused on that seeing that I suppose as a terrific victory for not just democracy but for Catholicism too. Of course, Italians not being terribly religious, I mean the great mass of the population being pretty indifferent to the Catholic religion even though they are nominally Catholic, didn't really see the church or the triumph of the church if you will as anything to get

excited about. Christian Democrats themselves of course should have been more out in front on what a great thing this was for Catholicism but they were very secular Catholics I would say.

Q: I have to say that you're right. You look at a congregation, I mean going to a mass is mostly women and the guys staying outside and smoking. It was only when they had a special high mass with all the politicians down Naples anyway, we'd all show up along with the communist delegates, we'd all show up for a mass because somebody got killed or it was a special day or something and then we'd all go our own way and the women would come back into the church.

ANDERSON: I do think this is true of European Catholicism in general and the European approach to religion. It's very different from Americans and I've seen this. American Catholics and European Catholics are two entirely different fish. The odd thing is of course is that American Catholics don't recognize that. In fact I saw that with Volpe when I was over there. Maxwell Rabb, I don't think he was Catholic.

Q: I think he is Jewish as a matter of fact.

ANDERSON: OK, fine. His successor, Secchia was Catholic and Italian American but without any real understanding or appreciation for what made Italians tick. One of the big problems of course with our foreign policy toward Italy was that we thought and maybe this is true generally, we thought they were like us. They're not. They're Italians. They have an entirely, I wouldn't say entirely, but very different approach to things. They certainly don't subscribe to our kind of ardent religious beliefs. The great majority of Italians are, outside of course a few hard core Catholics, very indifferent to Catholicism. It's not something that really drives their lives at all. Therefore they had no trouble with legalizing abortion, divorce and all these other things that are so controversial here.

THOMAS P. MELADY
Ambassador
Hole See (1989-1993)

Thomas P. Melady was born in Norwich, Connecticut in 1927. He served in the U.S. Army in World War II. He received his BA from Duquesne University in 1950 and his MA and PhD from Catholic University in 1952 and 1954. His career has included positions in Burundi, Uganda, and the Vatican. He was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy on January 13 and 19, 1995.

MELADY: So I got over there in August, and began my almost four years as ambassador to the Holy See.

Q: What is the interest of the United States and its connections with the Holy See?

MELADY: When we established diplomatic relations with the Holy See in 1984, we had a Special Envoy--there's a whole difference between a Special Envoy and Ambassador. It was done with the procedure whereby the President nominated William Wilson to be ambassador to the Holy See, that is to the government of the Roman Catholic Church. As a professor of political science, I'm very much interested in church-state relations. I spent my whole time studying the whole confirmation process in which the majority of the senate committee members said, "We have unique special interests with this government with its worldwide connections. It is both a source of information and they engage strategy and they have influence in various parts of the world." So Mr. Wilson was approved by a landslide majority in the senate. And before going to Rome, there was a court case under our constitution, the American United for Separation of Church and State, and several other groups--I've forgotten their names now, they are in my book--they said it was a violation of the constitution. And the court held that it wasn't, the President did have the power, Article II, Section 2, said the President nominates with the advice of and consent of the Senate. He did that, and that the senate was the controlling group which would make the decision. So therefore, the first who was Ambassador was Mr. Wilson, the second, Mr. Shakespeare, I arrived as the third ambassador. I had no doubt there would be vital interest involved. I must say it turned out to be more than I ever thought it would be from the standpoint of information worldwide. The whole Gorbachev business when we got information that no one had, including the CIA, which I was able to transmit to Washington--the cooperation between Gorbachev and President Bush and with the Vatican in the key period of '89 to '91, until Gorbachev left office in '91.

It's a unique diplomatic post. I think very much like the embassies of the 19th century. If you just check the embassies (I used to teach diplomatic history) you have the ambassador and a few aides. That's all we had. I mean, we represented U.S. policy, we were involved in visas. I used to kid my good friend, who was the ambassador to Italy, if someone called us who had a visa problem, I'd say call his embassy. If something on trade, call the other embassy. We just did diplomacy. We were a small staff: the ambassador, the Deputy Chief of Mission, a political officer.

Q: Who was your deputy chief then?

MELADY: I had two. Jim Creagan, who is now the Deputy Chief of Mission to Italy; and Cameron Hume, who is now chief of the political division at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations--both first class officers.

Q: Jim Creagan certainly. He was political officer in Naples when I was Consul General there.

MELADY: Oh, he has had a great Italy experience. I'm just hoping he gets an embassy in the next go-around. You never know how the cookie crumbles. There never was any doubt in my mind that a U.S. Embassy to the Holy See was in our interest. And I felt so strongly about it that I wrote a book, "The Ambassador's Story. The United States and the Vatican in World Affairs." It always would have been an interesting place, but under this Papacy with a Pope who was very much involved in strategy. It was even more valuable for the U.S. to have a diplomatic mission there. This goes back to the meeting of, before I got there, the famous meeting--President Reagan and Pope John Paul II. At that meeting, and I remember the background, 1982, we had a Special

Envoy. Reagan was getting ready to go to the meeting, and the essential advice was in "executive summary," "Don't be talking about overthrowing the communists in Eastern Europe. Look what happened when we talked about it before. The Hungarian revolution, the Prague revolt of '68, the Soviets aren't going to do it." It's interesting. By the time I got there the Papal advisors were saying the same thing as this "Polish" Pope, "Don't be talking about it." Well, lo and behold, neither (President Reagan or Pope John Paul II) followed the advice of their experts. The President brought up to the Pope that he had read that the Pope had said that one day "Eastern Europe will be free, and Eastern Europe will join with western Europe." And President Reagan said, "Your Holiness, when will that be?" And the Pope said, "In our lifetime." The President sort of jumped out of his chair and said, "We're both not exactly young people." "Yes." So the President grabbed his hand and said, "Let's work together."

I remember Time magazine about 1991 had a major cover story, The Holy Alliance, and a picture of the Pope and Reagan. The article, with the exception of the first five paragraphs, was really quite accurate. With a handshake, without a formal treaty, there was never anything written--I know that--the United States and the Holy See cooperated in one of the greatest events in modern history. The collapse of an empire without, relatively speaking, any major bloodshed.

Q: What was the Holy See doing with its influence with the Soviet Union?

MELADY: Well, actually they had very good sources of information despite the difficulty of operating there. Soon after I arrived, I found out that there had been about a three to four year contact between Rome and Moscow. Cardinal Casaroli had been there on one of his visits in '87, there was a famous conversation between Gorbachev and Casaroli where they were talking about some things. At the end of a formal meeting, Gorbachev volunteered that he would be visiting his mother that weekend. And he said, "My mother is a deaconess in the church." And, of course, Casaroli knew he was talking to a very astute person, not an adolescent high school boy who just blabbed on, every word was meant to convey a message. And he described how sometime when he visited his mother in this cottage where she lived (she took care of changing the linen, etc. on the altar of the--it was the orthodox church), she had two portraits of Marx and Lenin.

Pretty standard at that time for any Soviet home, and that sometimes she would take them down, when she took them down there were two icons, and she would bless them. He said, of course, she is the one who baptized me. So the conversation went on and naturally Casaroli reported all that to the Pope and it began a correspondence period in which the letters were rather friendly. Gorbachev sent a note to the Pope inviting him to send a delegation to the 1000th anniversary of the orthodox church, and invited the Pope to come. The Pope said he appreciated the invitation but he couldn't make it but he sent a very high level delegation. Other letters followed. So therefore when Washington heard in November '89 that Gorbachev on his way to the Island of Malta to meet President Bush on December 1, with a stop-off in Rome to meet the Pope, I received high level instructions to find out what was going on, which I did. And I got all this information about the three and a half year relationship with Gorbachev, and the analysis by the Holy See that there was a change in the attitude of the leadership. It was far more flexible and amenable, and prepared for change, providing the change would protect their interest. But a rather rapid change which they found. They were communicating that. Our people and in my briefings didn't feel that way. They thought maybe Gorbachev was trying to pull something off.

Remember the crop harvest wasn't too good. Was he looking for some of those arrangements in regard to wheat and other things.

The President told me later that he felt that way too. So about two days before Gorbachev arrived in Rome, I received additional instructions. Try to find out what the Pope thought of Gorbachev, and various such questions. Can Gorbachev be trusted? Well, I dealt with Casaroli, who was number two--the head of government--the formal title there was Secretary of State, which confuses people here, but really is Prime Minister. I had known him for years before I went there. I didn't have much time because it was like two days after he saw the Pope, he would be in Malta. So I had to see Casaroli fairly soon, and I saw him in a long meeting and he briefed me on all of the things that were said, which I transmitted all to Washington. And then he said, "In regard to trust, we think we know the man, he's from the heart of the communist power structure, he believes in change and he wants it. We believe he can be trusted, within those perimeters." So I got that cable off.

I wonder if I can come back another time to continue this?

Q: Absolutely. We'll pick up on the Holy See. We're just really starting, we've talked about the Gorbachev thing, but there's much more to talk about.

Q: Today is the 19th of January 1995. I'm never quite sure how to pronounce your name. Melady. I'm sure you get Melady.

MELADY: Meledy is the first guess. When I was in the Army, I stopped correcting the sergeants. They get irritated anyway.

Q: Let's talk about the organization of our mission to the Holy See. It started when?

MELADY: Well, let's get a little history. In the 19th century we had diplomatic envoys to the Papal States. Now, technically that was not the Holy See. You may recall in history up until the unification of Italy, the territory of the Pope actually met the criteria of a sovereign state. They had land, they had a government, they had an army, they had currency. These Papal States extended from approximately north of Naples up to Florence.

Q: That was the mid section of Italy.

MELADY: And the United States recognized the Papal States, first in a cautious way with consular officers, but then full diplomatic officers from 1848 to 1867. In 1867 the United States congress passed the no-funding act. In Article II, Section 2 of the constitution is quite clear. The President appoints with advice and consent of the senate, and that was done. But the house of representative got the purse strings, and said, no more money for a mission accredited to the Pope.

Q: This is the 1860's.

MELADY: So our mission to the Papal States closed. When I was ambassador to the Holy See we tried to discover the grave of the first diplomatic representative, Mr. Jacob I. Martin. He was only there for three weeks after he presented his credentials to the then Pope, and he died of malaria which was quite a curse in those days in that part of Italy. And the State Department would only allow \$100 for sending the body back, and the family had him buried there. We found the grave. It is in the Protestant cemetery in Rome. We have erected an appropriate stone, and every year flowers are placed on his grave. He was the first diplomatic representative of the United States in what is now known as Italy, even before the Republic of Italy.

After 1867 there was a long interregnum, which coincided with a period of anti-Catholicism in the United States. The most difficult period was the Ku Klux Klan movement against immigrants. Now, some would say it was primarily against immigrants, some would say against Catholics, it was probably a mixture. A large number of immigrants were coming from Ireland, France, Italy. Eastern Europe came later, Germany, Spain, Portugal. I doubt that there would have been any kind of diplomatic representation in the late 1800's. But probably after the unification of Italy in the 1870's, our basis for recognition of the Papal States was based on the traditional customs. It had territory, chief of state, etc. That disappeared with the unification of Italy. The government of the Roman Catholic Church, which is the Holy See, existed and about 18 to 20 countries still recognized it in that period of the end of the 19th century. Along came the first 30 some years of this century and FDR, seeing that the clouds of war were gathering in Europe, wanted some sign of contact with the Vatican. He did various things. He sent Joseph Kennedy--he then was U.S. ambassador to the United Kingdom--as his personal representative to the coronation of Pius XII. Pius XII had visited the United States as Cardinal Pacelli, Secretary of State which is really their operating head, and was the guest of Roosevelt at Hyde Park. So there had been activity. FDR was convinced that the Vatican was a great source of information.

Q: Pacelli had been nuncio in Munich.

MELADY: So, what to do? And FDR's advisers came up with what they thought was a solution. They were fearful they would have trouble in getting Article II, Section 2 carried out with confirmation by the senate. So President Roosevelt announced on Christmas eve, 1939, after the war had started in Europe, that he was sending to--and he used the word the Vatican, not the Holy See--a personal envoy who would represent him, not be a government official. He also announced in that same radio address that he would be in contact with the Council of Churches in Christ in New York City, and the Jewish theological seminary.

Q: Touching all bases.

MELADY: Well, it was a qualitative difference, and the other contacts were never really carried out. But soon after Myron Taylor, his long-time friend, a leading Episcopal laymen and retired head of U.S. Steel, went off to Rome as the Special Envoy. There was some opposition to it, but there was no focus for debate because it did not require senate confirmation. Whatever goals he had for Myron Taylor, it certainly exceeded the goals. It was a gold mine. As things went on in '40-'41 there in the heart of Italy was Myron Taylor, operating in Rome outside of Vatican walls. After Italy declared war on us, he went inside Vatican walls. For a while he had freedom. He used to go up to Florence to visit his villa. The two significant sources of information for the

United States, were Myron Taylor and Mr. Allen Dulles in Switzerland. So significant was the information some of it is still classified. That was the office of Special Envoy. FDR died, Mr. Taylor continued through the first several years of Truman's administration. He was an older man then, and then he retired.

In 1950 Truman concentrated on the Vatican assignment, and he saw what a gold mine of information came out. Information, there wasn't much strategy, but information. He, without much consultation from what I can see in my own research, decided that we ought to have an ambassador. So he nominated General Mark Clark in 1951 to be the United States ambassador to the Vatican. Now I'm saying Vatican rather than Holy See for a reason. And on the basis the Vatican was a sovereign state, it was independent, it was small, that it had a chief of state in addition to being the Pope and leader of the Roman Catholic Church throughout the world, was sovereign of the territory of the Vatican. It had its own other characteristics.

But he didn't do much advance research on it and it raised a great storm. I recall because I was a student at the time at Catholic University, never knowing that I would later become the ambassador to the Holy See. I recall going down to the convention hall of the Daughters of the American Revolution, it was packed. I was then doing an MA on international relations. I was shocked as most of the signs were clearly in the category of anti-Catholic, some of them quite vulgar as a matter of fact. The nomination got stalled. It was quite apparent it wouldn't get through, and it died in that session of the senate, and Mr. Truman did not resubmit it. Technically, therefore, it never was defeated, but it would have been.

Q: It's a little hard...we're doing history now and both of us are of a certain age, and we know the era. But somebody coming along to understand the depth of anti-Catholic feeling there was in the country in some areas, and it would come out in these things. The idea being that somehow the Pope was a foreign agent. It's almost like anti-communism in a way.

MELADY: Yes. This was really quite strong. Actually, I'm doing another book which we can get into at another time, it's not out yet, "A Catholic Layman Looks at His Church." I'm right now on that, in the 19th century. Never to the point of oppression, never to the point where they excluded Catholics from the establishment. Catholics clearly were not in the establishment. There were other reasons, they were first generation immigrants, peasants, laborers, etc., not property owners. So there were other reasons. The one exception probably was a few Catholic families in Maryland who got here early because of Lord Baltimore's agreement--the Calvert family among them.

But getting back to that period. It really was a rough period. And obviously the three succeeding presidents--President Eisenhower, who made a visit or two to the Pope; President Kennedy, who announced in the campaign he was opposed to the reestablishment of a Special Envoy; and President Johnson, who also had some visits with the Pope--never reinstated, which they could have done because it did not require senate confirmation, the Special Envoy business. President Nixon reinstated the Special Envoy, and did what President Truman did, selected a prominent American. He selected Henry Cabot Lodge, who had been a previous U.S. senator, and a previous ambassador to Germany and Vietnam.

Q: And also a non-Catholic.

MELADY: That's right, a member of the American establishment. And he served throughout Nixon's term as well as the two years of President Ford.

Q: Did you have any feeling, looking back on it, that he did much there? One of the things that comes through with Lodge was that if he wasn't really engaged in things, he could be...lazy is the wrong term, but he has been called this. If he really got going on something, he'd do it.

MELADY: Well, I did some research, because remember a Special Envoy which meant he had someone in the State Department, I've forgotten the name, he's a retired Foreign Service officer living in Portugal, so it was the local officer so to speak, and there would be an office at the U.S. embassy that would sort of handle the paperwork. Although he would always stay in the big hotels, and he would generally see the Pope, and it was in a way very high level type of representation ad hoc. Remember it was the Vietnamese era and a major thing was in presenting our case in regard to Vietnam. And also remember it was the year of a major confrontation between the two super powers, and they'd be talking about and informing the Pope of the dangers of communism.

That took us through the administrations of Presidents Nixon and Ford, and along came President Carter. President Carter continued the Special Envoy, and appointed Mr. David Walters of Florida. Mr. Walters served for a brief period of time, and I wasn't able to find out just what was done there. It was about 12 or 13 months, and he resigned. And then President Carter appointed Bob Wagner, a former mayor of New York City, and you might say went back to the role of a rather prominent person. Walters, by the way, was Catholic. So he was the first Catholic to hold the post. Bob Wagner was also Catholic.

When I received my appointment as ambassador in '89, I talked to Bob Wagner. And he told me what a delightful position it was. It came at the end of a career. He was still in the practice of law. He took it all very seriously, he played a role in trying to extradite the hostages out of Tehran, and lots of things. He served the last three years of President Carter, and made a very strong recommendation that we send an ambassador there.

Along came President Reagan. People didn't notice at the time, but President Reagan in the first week or 10 days after his election were known historically...announcements were only made about major appointments--Secretary of State, members of the cabinet, he announced that his long-time friend, William Wilson, a well-known business leader in California.

Q: William Wilson?

MELADY: Yes, William Wilson, a well known Republican, civic leader, with other corporate interests, and a member of President Reagan's kitchen cabinet, would be his Special Envoy. Mr. Wilson went out (it didn't require confirmation) so he was out there probably right after the inaugural. Mr. Wilson, at that time regarded it really just about as a full-time job. A man of evidently significant personal means, he established his own residence. There really wasn't any budget, and carried on. He was, of course, the President's personal representative still, but he was

given the courtesy title of ambassador. And in private life he was well known in Rome's aristocratic circles, the old noble families, his wife being of partial Italian descent. He carried on as Special Envoy. In 1981 President Reagan decided he wanted to see the Pope--I go into more detail in my book, a full chapter, it was quite important. You may remember in the campaign and in private life, President Reagan talked about the freeing of Eastern Europe from the communist oppression, and also Russia. He was warned by his advisors that this was not going to happen. Look at (he was told) the Hungarian revolution of 1956, the Prague revolt of 1968, the rioting in Poland. The Soviets are there (he was told) and they have superior armed forces and there would be blood shed, and the Brezhnev doctrine, etc. Evidently in getting ready for the visit, Judge Clark, then assistant to the President for national security affairs, came across a speech the Pope had given some months earlier on his first visit to Poland after he became Pope.

Q: John Paul II, who is Polish.

MELADY: Made his first trip to Poland, and in an address that was ignored by the American newspapers, but was in Le Monde and therefore it came up in some research, the Pope said, "Soon Eastern Europe will be free" (of this domination), and western Europe and eastern Europe, because of their common heritage, will have a community in Europe." So the president had that quote, and there was more in the Pope's speech. In getting ready for the visit I found in my own research for the book, that some of the Pope's advisors too were concerned in '80-'81, that he was talking about freeing Eastern Europe. They said the only reasonable goal was reduction of the oppression, "some outside contact, build up the strength of the church in Poland and Slovakia, and Lithuania, where it had lots of members, etc." So a meeting took place. Mr. Wilson was the Special Envoy, he arranged for the appointment. President Reagan was there with his advisors. Then as the Pope does, and he did with me, he meets only with the principal. For example, I was not present when he had his long talk with President Bush, that's a standard procedure. He and the Pope, and President Reagan met alone. President Reagan gave him that quote, and Reagan said, "When do you think it will be?" And the Pope said, "In our lifetime." At that point the President grabbed his hand and said, "Let's work together."

You may remember that about 1991, Time magazine had an article on the "sacred alliance," the United States and the Vatican with a picture of President Reagan and the Pope. Its a fairly accurate article, with the exception of the first four or five paragraphs (from what I could see from my knowledge of the archives). There was no signed document, no formal agreement on cooperation between the Vatican and the United States.

Q: You said 1991?

MELADY: 1981. Eighty-one was the meeting. The 1991...

Q: was the article.

MELADY: It was a very interesting article. They (the Pope and President Reagan) talked about how to help each other, and the President said, "We'll do everything we can." The Pope emphasized it should be a non-violent transition from his analysis of the situation in Eastern Europe, particularly in Poland. The Pope felt that you could maneuver the transition through

tactics, and strategy. He then, as in the Gulf War later, has always opposed the use of war to solve problems. I think he recognized that in a political pact there might very well be a riot, but not war. It was a very important meeting and the President returned to the United States and instructed the State Department to work closely with the Vatican. Following the Papal-Reagan meeting the Special Envoy office suddenly had a lot of visitors. General Vernon Walters, then Ambassador-at-Large in the first term of President Reagan, was a frequent visitor. Other senior people like Judge Clark, then assistant to the President for national security affairs. And they coordinated assistance, and strategy. The U.S. assisted the solidarity movement. I was president of Sacred Heart University at the time, and even I had some visiting professors because there were all kinds of exchange programs. Printing presses were made available, advice on strategy. That was clearly the deciding factor when President Reagan said, "I want to establish a full fledged embassy."

He appointed an in-house commission in '83. The in-house commission was to look at several points. Is it constitutional? Is it in the national interest? And is it political prudent? Haig, who had left the State Department, got involved. A private person was brought in, Dr. Billy Graham.

Q: The most prominent Protestant leader in the States.

MELADY: And Senator Lugar, who at that time was chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee. In other words, there were quite a few people in on it. It was the unanimous recommendation, that it was constitutional based on Article II, Section 2. The President appoints with the advice and consent of the senate. It was the unanimous opinion of the group that it was in our national interest. The Vatican had gone from merely being a treasure house of information, to having influence and engaging in strategy. The third was probably the most important aspect of the study, and Dr. Graham played a major role there. He felt that while there certainly would always be opposition to it, that it wouldn't be a firestorm, and that it would get senate confirmation. So based on that in '83 there were discussions with the Vatican. President Reagan's original proposal was to recognize Vatican City. The Vatican said no, you must recognize the government of the Roman Catholic Church. This dates back to the 1815 Vienna conference. Around 70 other countries so recognized the Holy See in 1973. And President Reagan did that.

In January 1984, President Reagan announced the appointment, the nomination of Mr. Wilson as our U.S. ambassador to the Holy See. And that set in motion the normal procedure; the senate must confirm. Senator Lugar, meeting with his ranking Democratic colleague who was Senator Pell at the time, agreed they would have hearings and there wouldn't be so much of an examination of Mr. Wilson's credentials, but rather "should the U.S. have relations with the Holy See?" And that went on for about three weeks, and there were some organizations that were quite strong in opposition. The American United for Separation of Church and State, ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union). Actually the Baptist Association, the southern Baptist group of which Dr. Graham is a member, was opposed to it. And some Catholic organizations, not major ones, but several were also opposed. That went on for about three weeks, the public hearings. And to make a long story short, the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee by a strong vote, voted in favor. Then, of course, it went to the floor of the senate. The confirmation got 80-some votes, I think 12 were opposed, and one or two weren't there, so it was a landslide confirmation.

Mr. Wilson took the oath and went off to Rome as the ambassador of the United States to the Holy See.

Now, there's another footnote. Under our constitution there's still another way to challenge a decision by the Senate. Did it violate the constitution? So several organizations brought a suit, and I'm not a lawyer, but it went before the superior court in Philadelphia, for some reason, and the court ruled unanimously that there was no violation of the constitution. It was the constitutional prerogative of the President. He had to consult the senate, and that if there was any question about it, it was basically a political matter to resolve at election time. But constitutionally there was no question. So therefore, Mr. Wilson became our first ambassador to the Holy See having served previously as Special Envoy to the Pope. Mr. Wilson served approximately two years--it was in the second term of the President Reagan, I haven't the exact date but I'd say until about '86. And then he resigned in what was described as a controversy over whether or not he met with Mr. Qadhafi, head of Libya...

Q: With whom we were, to use a term, at loggerheads.

MELADY: So therefore, he served approximately two years as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. He was succeeded by Frank Shakespeare. Mr. Shakespeare had been in the administration of President Nixon, head of the United States Information Agency, and a communications executive in New York. And for a short term, I think less than a year, was ambassador to Portugal when he was named ambassador to the Holy See. The same questions came up in his confirmation. And I think he may have had one or two votes against him, but he was confirmed. And the same question came up in regard to the court, and the court made the same decision. So therefore, he served from approximately 1986 to the spring of 1989--he was the last Reagan appointment. I was nominated by George Bush, and he stayed there until the spring of '89.

I was fascinated by these questions in preparing for my confirmation. And I remember when President Bush asked me to serve. The process takes a couple of months. I used to go down to the Department every Thursday as Ambassador-designate and read all the files thinking that there would be a big question of the church-state thing again. And while that was not my specialty as a political scientist, I had a long-term interest in it. I was told by Senator Jesse Helms, then a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee...

Q: The House has affairs, the Senate has relations.

MELADY: He did not show up at the Senate hearing. Senator Biden presided. No questions came up. Several people had sent in petitions. I remember I was rather surprised, Senator Biden said, "Leave your document, and we'll put it in the record," and they were quite nice to me. I was unanimously recommended by the committee. I was pleased by the fact that my two senators who were Democrats--I'm from Connecticut--strongly supported my nomination. And then I also had letters from Protestant and Jewish groups. I had been active with ecumenical affairs. And I was recommended by the committee unanimously, and then was confirmed. I can't say unanimously because it was a voice vote, so technically you say there was no recorded opposition.

Q: The period again was...

MELADY: From the summer of '89 to the spring of '93.

Q: And this was when basically Eastern Europe crumbled.

MELADY: Oh, yes. I arrived as Poland was pulling out of the communist orbit, and the whole transformation of Eastern Europe.

Q: What was going on as far as American relations with the Vatican because most of Eastern Europe has a very strong...I mean Poland is the most renowned, but Czechoslovakia, Romania, all had strong Catholic roots. Were we doing anything, either coordination or something?

MELADY: Well, once we opened up the embassy under Wilson, and continued by Frank Shakespeare and by the time I got there, we shared the Vatican analysis which was, the mood was changing. The time was right for a transition, and that we should think of using strategy, always opposed to the use of war. But the information which the Vatican conveyed to us, was they felt things were also "right" with Gorbachev. So the dual analysis was that things were ripe in Eastern Europe, and Gorbachev.

I recall in Czechoslovakia, there in Rome in October of '89 before Gorbachev's famous visit to Rome, that there was going to be a religious ceremony, and all ambassadors were invited. It was for the canonization of a Czech woman, Agnes. And it was said that maybe about 25 people would come from Czechoslovakia. About a week before the ceremony, it was on a Saturday, it was announced that approximately a thousand had gotten out of Czechoslovakia. And by Tuesday or Wednesday, 5,000. They came by car, they came by train, they came by various ways. The Czech government, which wouldn't allow the Pope to appoint any bishops to any of the vacant Sees, was very hard dogmatic communists. They announced towards the end of that week that they were sending an official delegation, and that they would allow the Vatican to transmit it electronically so the people in Czechoslovakia could see the ceremony on television. I remember I went to the ceremony. There were about 10,000 people from Czechoslovakia. They sort of took over the Basilica.

I remember saying to my wife as we walked out, and I was going to a coffee shop there in Via Concilroziore, "That this is the defining moment." I remember it was a Saturday and I wasn't planning to be at the embassy, and a Marine came up to me and said, "Oh, you've got a message. You've got to go to the embassy." So I found my driver and I went to the embassy. I had instructions from the State Department to find out what was going on. And I received some instructions. I met with Cardinal Casaroli, the number two, and he gave me their analysis. They were convinced from the reports from the church of the underground, that Czechoslovakia was "ripe" for change. Cardinal Korec, now a cardinal, was a leader of the church of the underground in Czechoslovakia. It was a strong movement. And so we encouraged the Pope to visit Czechoslovakia. Well, they had a rapid transition in Czechoslovakia after that ceremony in November-December of '89. Soon the Pope was allowed to appoint the bishops. And then he was invited to visit Czechoslovakia in 1990. This was dogmatic communist country. You had the

awful memories of the '68 spring revolt. The Pope quickly visited the country in one day. And his evaluation was that, "Yes, there is a movement." I recall looking at my television set there in Rome and seeing the candlelight march in Prague. And I said, "Will this be another '68?" Because the same Soviets were there in bigger numbers than in '68. There could be a violent reaction by the Soviets. That was the assumption the Vatican passed on to us. Gorbachev would not order the troops in. To this day I don't know whether the Pope had inside information, whether it was just a feeling, or just what it was. That was a very important thing--the fall of communism in Czechoslovakia, and the rise of Havel. So we worked very closely in the period of '89 through '90 because it was then Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania where the Communist empire fell apart.

By that time it had moved into the '90s, President Bush had a more confident feeling about Gorbachev, and he more or less converged with the feelings of the Vatican about Gorbachev that we could deal with him. So when Gorbachev sent word that he couldn't rush things in regard to the Baltic states...remember the Vatican and we never recognized the Soviet takeover, particularly in Lithuania. We got word and I met with the Vatican officials, to give Gorbachev a little breathing time. And that happened. Now the attempted coup against Gorbachev in the summer of '90...

Q: He was in Odessa down in the Crimea.

MELADY: The Pope was in Hungary and very interestingly he wrote a...I'd love to have the document, it must be a great archival piece. He was on the outskirts of Budapest, and an aide said to him, "He has been overthrown." He issued a very strong statement supporting Gorbachev in terms of human rights. There's no question that he had that confidence. President Bush followed it with a statement. So did the Prime Minister of England. I remember Mitterrand didn't say a thing. And that gave us another year of Gorbachev. So in that, I would say, the Vatican was a significant player in a) the original analysis that the time was right and coming in with information and participating on strategy. And it went on later to the Ukraine, and the breakup of Russia itself into the federation. Gorbachev fell, went out of office, the end of the Soviet Union in December '91, the first visit Yeltsin made when he assumed his responsibilities as chief of state, was to Rome in December '91.

Q: What was the impression of Yeltsin who continues to be a controversial figure in the analysis that you were getting from...

MELADY: They were less confident. There was a very special relationship developed with Gorbachev which continues to this day. And Gorbachev has maintained his contacts with the Pope, and has written articles on it, etc. But when I interviewed Vatican officials in December '91, after the Yeltsin visit, they obviously were pleased that Yeltsin came down and reported to the Pope. He pledged to continue and carry out the promises of Gorbachev in Gorbachev's December '89 visit, which were freedom of religion, human rights, the restoration of the rights of the Ukrainian Catholic church, and the full freedom of the Pope to appoint without prior consultation bishops to all the vacant Sees in Russia. Yeltsin pledged to continue that. But they didn't feel, and never have felt, as close to Yeltsin.

Q: Were you getting from the administration of the Catholic church, and the Holy See, any concerns about the grass roots priests who had risen up in some of the communist countries, particularly Czechoslovakia?

MELADY: First of all, we knew that happened, and you had the famous case of now Cardinal Korec, a Slovak. So we were interested in getting what information they had. But when it came to church matters, I followed the guidelines very strictly. I separated between the state, the government. So the question of these priests who were married, was a church matter. I stayed out of all church matters.

Q: The problem, particularly in Latin America, of liberation theology? We saw this as being somewhat of a revolution, almost Marxist type of theology coming out of parts of the Catholic Church in Latin America.

MELADY: Well, giving you a quick summary. The political implications would have been appropriate for the ambassador to get into. The theological thing of doctrine would not be appropriate. That was the position I held. So I would report on the political aspect, but during my four years I followed a very strict policy of avoiding religious and church activity. Liberation theology, which was of great concern--perhaps in the time of President Reagan, and Nicaragua, etc., and that whole business of my two predecessors than it was with me, although I did have instructions in regard how to react to it, I separated the part that would affect us politically from the strictly religious.

Q: But in a way it was very political.

MELADY: Oh, yes.

Q: Was it much of an issue when you were there?

MELADY: It was not a major issue.

Q: By that time it had lost whatever...

MELADY: Oh, yes. The whole Nicaragua thing had been...

Q: For one thing Latin America had turned much more democratic than before. How did you find American Catholics? One of the big problems we have if you're the ambassador to Israel, and I'm sure you probably had an awful lot of people who come for religious purposes, its the social side you've got to tend to it but it sort of gets in the way of the practical diplomatic...

MELADY: People don't quite understand that I was the ambassador to the government. We rendered various courtesies. For example, the weekly audience of the Pope. We arranged tickets for prominent Americans, but always just Americans, not just Catholics. I made that a very important point with the staff who'd try to get first row knowing when the Pope came down the steps he would visit personally. I had people of all denominations in that first row. He also had a very select number, about 30 people could attend his private mass in the morning, and I would

try to get people into that. But, for example, I made a point to distinguish, I thought it was important because of our constitution, in what was accepted as the basis for opening the embassy in the Senate hearings of 1984. For example, the canonization of a saint, and other religious ceremonies, we regarded them as affairs of state, not religious. Being Catholic personally, I benefited from attending. But it would be like our ambassador in Norway, who was a friend of mine, evidently there would be the birthday, I've forgotten whether it was of the King, would be at the Lutheran church. And she attended an affair of state.

Q: I have to say I was Consul General in Naples, I'm a non-practicing Protestant, but I could recite the Catholic mass in Italian after a while. I went to everything.

MELADY: Like when I was first got out of school I served in Ethiopia and our ambassador would go to the various things in the Ethiopian orthodox church, when the Emperor was present. So we would distinguish. But not, of course, everybody could see that fine line. I can remember, for example, a very definite prohibited area to stay out of, anything dealing with appointments of the Pope with Bishops. I can recall one day my secretary said, "There's a Mr. & Mrs. So-and-so who just came in from the airport and must see you immediately." So I said, "Of course, bring them in." And they sat down and I called for some coffee, and they were people you might say, as they say in French, of a certain age, a couple. And he said, "We have a very important document here for you." And he pulled it out. "The Pope is going to make an awful mistake if you don't get this to him." And I said, "What's that?" "We have inside information that the Pope is about to name Monsignor so-and-so as a bishop and we've got this..."

I remember I said to the lovely lady, "I have to stop the conversation here as I cannot get involved in this. I am the ambassador of the government of the United States to the government of the Holy See. I have nothing to do with the religious activities, appointment of priests, bishops, etc." And she started to cry. You know, a person who didn't have an understanding of the hearings. I said, "I think there are channels for you, but it's not the U.S. government channel. If you were still in the States you should have gone to the nuncio." I said, "Here there is the office of the Congregation of Bishops if you wish to go there." And I tried to explain the whole thing, but they never really quite understood. We did have one famous recorded attempt to influence an appointment. It was at the time of the Special Envoy. President Roosevelt instructed Myron Taylor to take up with Pius XII the fact that he felt that his good friend, the Auxiliary Bishop of Chicago, Bishop Shiels, should be named the next...there was a vacancy here in Washington, the Archbishop of Washington. So the records are there following some business that Myron Taylor had with Pius XII. He said, "Oh, by the way, I have a message for you from President Roosevelt. President Roosevelt wants you to know the high regard that the American people have for Bishop Shiels, and that he would make an excellent Archbishop of Washington." The record says that the Pope smiled, and brought up something else. And Bishop Shiels remained the Auxiliary Bishop of Chicago. That was a definitely prohibited area. Some felt that maybe I was a little too strict on it. I am for better or worse, a known Catholic layman. I felt I had to be quite correct on the matter, and I also believed in it. I never officially called upon five or six high ranking people in the curia of the Vatican because they handled strictly religious matters. I dealt with the Secretary of State and the several subordinates. I dealt with the head of the educational office. I dealt with the foreign aid office, the office concerned with assistance to refugees, and other

matters. But I did not deal officially as the ambassador of the United States of America with those offices charged with strictly religious activities.

Q: Did you find that you were rubbing up against or involved with the...what is it, the American House? There's an essentially an American desk at the Holy See.

MELADY: Oh, yes. The North American Affairs. Monsignor Harvey, James Harvey, a native of Chicago. The Vatican, by the way, our people in our Foreign Service only have about a tour of duty of three years. The Vatican is not forever, but you definitely stay on for about seven years to eight years and have a different approach to it. Maybe even as long as ten. Jim is still there. I just talked to him a few weeks ago. And as the North American desk officer he has therefore been the officer for the United States and Canada. Oh, I wouldn't see a lot of him on U.S. policy and the usual exchange diplomatically of government policy. I had a lot of business. For example, a very important assignment given to me was Israel, to encourage the Holy See to establish diplomatic relations with the State of Israel. The instructions were secret at the time. They were later declassified. But the most amazing thing is, we kept it secret. When Archbishop O'Connor came over to Rome I briefed him, got him sympathetic to the matter. He played a leading role in influencing the Pope, helped me carry out my instructions. I also dealt with Jewish leaders, particularly the American-Jewish Committee whereby Rabbi Rudin, and Rabbi Leon Klenicki of ADL. I went off on a surreptitious trip, approved by the State Department, to State of Israel, to meet the heads of the small Catholic minority groups, to find out the problems. I played something of a role and I was very pleased when it happened. It happened not while I was there but we were on "third base" when I departed Rome in March, 1993. The Commission on Vatican-Israeli Relations in 1992 was established. The final establishment of Vatican-Israeli relations happened in December of '93.

Q: What was the problem between relations?

MELADY: Well, that's a long thing. The sovereignty of that area; remember it had passed from various hands. A long period was the Ottoman empire. And the Vatican had various concessions with the Ottoman empire, this little piece of land was tax free, etc. The Vatican wanted to make sure that all those rights were accepted by the government of the State of Israel. They were also concerned about full freedoms in Israel for everyone including the Christian Arabs, and their right to participate in the government, and have equal rights. They were concerned about the state of war that existed at that time. In fact I don't think it would have happened if President Bush, and Jim Baker, hadn't engineered the Madrid conference. Everything began to move rapidly after that. First of all I recall, I was called to the Vatican and given a message to President Bush congratulating him on the Madrid conference from the Pope.

Q: You might explain what the Madrid conference was.

MELADY: On the Middle East.

Q: You were getting the Palestinians and Israelis together for the first time to discuss things.

MELADY: It was a major accomplishment. The Holy See was very happy about it. Soon after that the Holy See announced in Israel the appointment of a commission to study the matter of diplomacy. We thought the commission was moving rather slowly. It was very legalistic, this point, that point. Our position was, which we expressed to the Vatican officials, and which Mr. Baker did, and actually the President on his visit, that, "Why don't you proceed ahead quickly and resolve these things later?" The Vatican wanted to resolve the issues as quickly as possible, but the movement went very quickly. And in December of '93, five or six months after I completed my mission, the New York Times phoned me. It was about November of '93 that the State Department responded affirmatively to my request that my instructions be declassified, or at least that part of the instruction that I received from Secretary Baker, so I could have it in my book. I recall I spent that period in Lithuania between mid-December and mid-January advising the universities there in restructuring, and the New York Times tracked me down to my hotel. And I was very happy because the data had been declassified. I could talk about the whole role that I played, and the government played. It was Holy See decision. But you might say it probably was an unusual fact that an ambassador of a third country received instructions from his government to urge the government to which he was accredited to diplomatically recognize another government. It was unusual.

Q: What was our rationale?

MELADY: That it would help the peace process in the Middle East. There would be a step forward, that it would increase the influence of the Holy See. I personally, as an individual, was very happy to carry out the instructions, which I would have carried out anyway because it was my duty, but personally because I felt it helped to correct a misperception that somehow the reason that the Holy See was anti-Semitism--that there was an anti-Semitism. I feel there wasn't. But this clearly was a perception in various circles, including Jewish circles, that I had been long active with the Jewish groups in my work as a trustee of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. So some of my friends, would frankly just tell me that they felt there was a lingering.

Q: There were still some things...I'm using the wrong term, but within the documentation, or whatever, of the Catholic church about the Jews being responsible for the death of Christ. Wasn't there something...

MELADY: Yes. One great result of Vatican Council Two, and something I participated in and played a very minor role in at their meetings, was to eliminate those references. You might say that the Jews killed Christ, that was exactly the...

Q: We're of an age where Irish boys chasing after Jewish boys and yell "Christ killers." That still permeated the church up through our youth.

MELADY: I can say now that in my personal talks, I'm thinking I made an official call on the Secretary of State of the Holy See, and transmit a message on this matter, and then at the end of the conversation I'd say, "Personally"...and I had gotten to know the people there quite well..."I really think it should happen." I said, "I know its not true, that it was not deliberate anti-Semitism, but that was the public perception." It's now past history but it was a step forward in better dialogue, etc.

Q: Back to something else and then we'll go to the Gulf war. On the social side, you say you'd arrange for prominent Americans. Whose a prominent American? This must have been a can of worms for you.

MELADY: Well, that was a judgment call. I say the judgment call, obviously if it were a U.S. senator, or former mayor, or people who had titles regardless of religious background, there was not a problem. And there's a lot of competition for that first row. And some people would sort of understand, and would request "tickets," and they wouldn't even ask for the front row because they sort of knew that. These are just judgment calls you have to make. And I'd say it's remarkable that in my four years there, probably just one exception from the standpoint of "getting good seats," that I avoided negative reactions. The one thing I felt important, and told my staff, that if Reverend Smith walks in, who happens to be of the Baptist church in Texas, he's just as important as a Monsignor from New York. We stood straight and leaned backwards on treating all Americans the same regardless of religious affiliation. I had a theme that I represented all Americans regardless of religion. And in the review of my book, I thought it interesting that Rabbi Jim Rudin, of the American Jews Committee, in his review it was his observation that I managed to carry out that goal.

Q: Did you get a lot of congressional mail and that sort of thing?

MELADY: Not so much, but congressional visitors. But not so much in regard to mail. It's a very popular place, former members of the senate, present members of the senate, and former and present members of the cabinet. We had former presidents, both President Ford--didn't have Nixon, he was planning to come in '90 and '91 after Moscow but got sick in Moscow and phoned me and didn't come down. But I had President Ford, who made a private visit to the Pope, and President Reagan. President Reagan after his last visit to Moscow had a long visit with the Pope, and the Pope also received Mrs. Reagan in for the whole business meeting which was unusual.

Q: The Gulf war. We're talking about events of '90 where Iraq seized Kuwait in a surprise invasion. George Bush led the opposition to this and eventually we led an Allied invasion which took back Kuwait.

MELADY: The Gulf war, there were three phases to it. The invasion, August 1990. You might say there was a total convergence between the Holy See and the United States. It was a unilateral invasion, it was the wrong thing, it was condemned. About two or three months after that various information came out about the occupation of Kuwait by Iraqi forces. It was bad. The Holy See condemned it, we condemned it. The convergence came to an end in or about October of '90 when we began talking about military action. And particularly when we introduced a resolution in the Security Council of the United Nations. And then I was called in by the Pope, and while acknowledging that it was wrong, and Iraq should leave, he urged the U.S. to avoid the use of war. I remember his famous words: "War is a road of no return." So therefore, it was the first area of disagreement in our policies while I was the Ambassador. I remember I was back on consultations. I informed the Department of State on the Pope's opposition to the use of war. His whole life when he fought the Nazis, then the communists, his whole campaign in Eastern Europe, strategy, etc., but war should be avoided. In November I was back and I informed the

President personally in the Oval Office that we weren't going to get Papal approval of the use of war to solve the Kuwait problem. Some in the Department thought we should be critical of the Pope. Some thought that I should be under instructions to request the Pope not to voice the opposition publicly. I was back in Washington and I knew this was happening. So I took advantage of a personal connection, and got to see the President. I remember when I heard on one day, thanks to his staff, I got in the next morning in the Oval Office bright and early, 7:15 or 7:20 after his briefing with the security people. I said, "I know we would like to have the Pope agree that it is a 'just war'. And there are six criteria for a just war. The sixth one, I said, he doesn't accept proportionality. You have to do what's in proportion. He thinks we should prolong the embargo, strategy, etc. The President more or less told me there was no change in plan, that we were going to proceed with whatever we were going to do. And I said, "There's no point in my being given instructions to ask him not to speak." First of all he had already spoken, while in an indirect kind of way. Because I said, "We have to respect him, because of his unique role, if he gives in to our pressure he loses his position of influence. If it became known that he gave into American pressure, and didn't speak, he loses the independent moral voice which is intrinsic to his sovereignty and respect." I have great admiration for President Bush. He understood that. I was never given those instructions to, "Ask him to keep his mouth shut."

We can sit here and have a big long debate what would have happened if the thing had gone on for six months or a year. It only lasted a few weeks, and the military operation came to an end, and then we had the Madrid conference. But there were several subsequent developments. The Pope always said we were wrong, but never held it against the U.S. I mean he smiled a lot and went on to other things. It never became personal. In the months preceding the Gulf War and during the war I never had a difficult personal experience with Vatican personnel.

Q: What was your impression of the Pope as a leader in foreign affairs? We're talking about John Paul II, Polish origin, the first one who is not Italian.

MELADY: Let me give you my impression. As a man, this will very much be in my new book, he is the product of his culture. So what was his culture? It was Catholic and Polish. I'm not quite sure what was the predominant element, but let us say he was strongly Catholic in a middle class family by our standards now. I've been to the little town where he was born. I've talked to the people. At an early age he went into the seminary which was traditional then, less traditional now. From the people who knew him then, sort of unique for a seminarian, in addition to being good in Greek and Latin, all those kinds of things, his interest in the theater, he was also writing poetry. He was ordained, and he lived through the whole Nazi occupation of Poland. There's a lot of written record because he was really chaplain to the students at the university in Krakow in southern Poland, which is the historic cultural capital of Poland. His advice to the Polish students was to stay together, help one and another, remain faithful to your beliefs, but don't do anything to risk war. Then came the communist takeover, and he systematically rose quickly to Monsignor, Auxiliary Bishop, and Archbishop of Krakow, a position of strength. He was the architect of a strategy against the communist leadership. He was always pushing for the rights of the church. He took some time off to go down to Rome and do his doctorate, went back, was active in Vatican Council Two.

Q: Under Pope John XXIII.

MELADY: Yes, and Paul VI, who made him a Cardinal. It was the time also he came to the attention of people from the standpoint of his philosophy. He was regarded as a strong person, articulate. That is combined with a very avuncular kind of personal personality. He was the friendly uncle. He set high standards, but he was always understanding. He was exceptionally good in languages. I'd say at this moment in the church, I think Time magazine made the right decision, it was my decision, Man of the Year. Strong and articulate for what he represents. He takes on what could be unpopular causes like the Cairo conference. He has played a major role in world affairs.

Q: You're talking about the Cairo conference which was on population.

MELADY: That's right. After my tour of duty.

Q: He was opposed to...

MELADY: What was the key element of the U.S. proposal that abortion be recognized as a legitimate form of family planning throughout the world. He essentially side-tracked it. I'm not going into the merits of that, but he played a leading role. I'd say a significant role. But using his tenure so far in the papacy, as a person to deal with, you know you were dealing with a man of history, the moment you sat down with him. He knows strategy. He speaks with a commitment. It is awesome. I got that evaluation from most of my colleagues--my European colleagues and ambassadors. He has a phenomenal memory. He remembers me personally. I hear from him, and of course, I was the ambassador of the United States, you might say it was a major country in that four year period.

In summary, I'd say he's a significant world leader, and has been an excellent leader for the Catholic Church.

Q: Do you have time for one more question"

MELADY: Yes.

Q: This is one that has bothered me. And that is, I'm a Balkan hand, I served five years in Yugoslavia, and I know that I served there during the '60s, and I know that in the Serbian world the Catholic church...and we're not talking about the communist, we're talking about the normal Serb, has a very deep concern and distrust of the Catholic church. Not just because of being Serbian, but because of the role that the Catholic hierarchy played during World War II, of forced conversions, slaughter, and this sort of thing, and that the Catholic church did not play an ameliorating role in this, but actually was in the forefront, the local priests. When Yugoslavia was coming apart, the first two states you might say to try to recognize Croatia, the Catholic one, with Germany and the Pope. You couldn't have asked for a worse combination. As a Serbian hand myself, I knew what this did. This aroused every animosity that you can think of. And here is the Pope who is a Slav. Why couldn't he have kept quiet on this one?

MELADY: What the Holy See advocated has turned out to be quite right. We wanted to keep Yugoslavia together. Those were my instructions. Keep it together. The house that held together was held by the communist hard fist of Tito. You had the whole phenomenon that little Liechtenstein could be independent. Luxembourg could be independent, the Baltic states, but why not the Slovenians? Why not the Croatians? After 1989 it became apparent that the Croatians really wished to have their own nation-state. I mean, I've been there, their own culture, their own country. And we said yes to 40 countries in Africa, to Benin, ex-Equatorial Guinea of Spain. We said yes to them all. We didn't say they had to remain part of the colonial power. Every public opinion pool in Croatia, and Slovenia said they wanted independence. So therefore, by the time I arrived in Rome, the Vatican was saying that the solution was to grant what these people want. My instructions were quite clear, "keep Yugoslavia together." And so I followed my instructions in '89 and '90. Right now the Serb record has not been very pretty, they're charged by the United Nations with atrocities.

Q: To understand, 50 years before the Croatian record was less than pretty too.

MELADY: And I can understand the reason for those tensions, and this is hindsight, but here is tragedy going on, would it have been a little different? If Europe had accepted either in late '89, or early '90--I've forgotten the exact month, the position of the Holy See was, recognize what the people want. Croatia, independent. Slovenia, independence. I don't think they had made a pronouncement on Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Q: Bosnia-Herzegovina was sort of off to one side at that point.

MELADY: It had to be worked out. Serbian, Montenegro, etc. We had a lot of supporters of Yugoslavia, and you can see why, because it was a great success story in the 1950's and we pulled Tito out of the communist empire, we put a lot of money into Yugoslavia. I thought it was interesting that most of the officers of the Yugoslav army were Serbians. The whole "greater Serbian" philosophy. So it's hindsight. I'm not saying it would have been any better. But it would not have been worse than the current tragedy.

Q: Which the Serbs resolved at this point.

MELADY: With the Serbs still fighting it in Bosnia-Herzegovina, even going over to Croatia. Would it have been a less of a traumatic event if we had gone the route of '89 by saying, we'll accept these boundaries of Slovenia, Croatia, Herzegovina had to be worked out, Montenegro agreed to stick with Serbia, that was now Yugoslavia. I think probably there's fault on both sides. Certainly the way we went. My instructions were changed in about '91, and we're accepting that reality; Slovenia and Croatia would be independent.

Q: My only concern on this thing was, the Pope and the Catholic church because of its not so benign role in the 1940-'45 period in Yugoslavia, that it would have been best for them to have let other countries take the lead, but to have the Holy See and Germany, the two parties that were seen by the Serbs as being unfriendly powers certainly going back to early things. I mean France, England, United States, anybody but not those two. Anyway, I was just surprised.

End of reader