LUXEMBOURG

COUNTRY READER
TABLE OF CONTENTS

James G. Lowenstein	1977-1981	Ambassador, Luxembourg
Charles Higginson	1978-1983	Deputy Chief of Mission, Luxembourg
Edward M. Rowell	1990-1994	Ambassador, Luxembourg

ARTHUR A. BARDOS
Radio Luxembourg
Luxembourg (1944-1945)

Arthur A. Bardos was born in 1921 in Budapest, Hungary. He entered the Foreign Service in 1951, serving in Vietnam, Belgium, Turkey, Washington, DC, Austria, and with the Voice of America in Germany. Mr. Bardos was interviewed by Hans Tuch on January 25, 1990.

BARDOS: That's right. There were altogether five mobile radio broadcasting companies in the US Army, and that was what psychological warfare consisted of. Indeed, the Fourth Company got into radio quite accidentally. We were in London, and it was decided by the authorities in the fall of 1944 that, since the war would shortly end, we would be put aside and used for occupation duty after the end of the war. But since space was short in England, they decided to send us to Luxembourg to sit it out until the end of the war.

We were billeted there and it was foreseen that we would, I suppose, do close-order drill and other useful military things while waiting for the war to end, but just about that time, Supreme Headquarters was setting up Radio Luxembourg as its radio station to pursue the war in psychological warfare vis a vis the enemy. As so often, two parts of the military were not quite certain of the outcome, and each had its own theory.

Q: When specifically was that?

BARDOS: This was in roughly October 1944, so still a long ways to the end of the war.

Q: This was actually still before the Battle of the Bulge.

BARDOS: Oh, yes. Our billeting officer, who had gone ahead to locate the horrible uniform factory in which to billet us, went to the officers' mess, and there got into a conversation with an English gentleman, Patrick Gordon Walker, the later Lord Walker, a very prominent intellectual member of the Labor Party. Mr. Gordon Walker asked him, "What kind of a company are you with, that you are billeting here?"

And he said, "Oh, it's called Fourth Mobile Radio Broadcasting Company," whereupon Patrick Gordon Walker's eyes lighted up, and he said, "What kind of people do you have in that company?"

He said, "Oh, broadcasters, young people trained in broadcasting in German and French and some in other languages."

Gordon Walker said, "But I have been fighting with Versailles (which was at that time Supreme Headquarters) for a staff for Radio Luxembourg, because I have orders to start broadcasting here, but I have no personnel."

So as soon as we arrived in Luxembourg, some of us were put to work in the radio stations. My initial assignment was monitoring, because we had no news sources. We had one Morse monitor who monitored one of the wire services, and otherwise we had some radio which somebody could listen to. Some of use were put to work listening tot the BBC transmissions, to the transmission of the American Broadcasting Station in Europe (London). I don't remember that we could receive the Voice of America at all, most of the time. We made monitoring reports which we quickly got up to the newsroom, and on which our next newscast was then based.

Patrick Gordon Walker seemed to like the way I wrote my monitoring reports, because he decided as soon as we got some more Morse monitors so that we were not quite as dependent on voice reports, that I should go up and work for him in the feature service, finding material for mostly BBC people who were then working these things up into broadcast materials.

Then one important day, after a few weeks, he said, "Well, you might as well write it up yourself." And that's how I was introduced into broadcasting. After a while it was discovered that I had a slight American accent when speaking German, and since the rule of the station was that news were broadcast by people without any foreign accent, but commentaries were broadcast by people with foreign accents, and since they were always short of such people whose German was good but accented, I became a voice for various Britishers and Americans who did not voice their own broadcasts.

Then pretty soon I was told, "Now you can write your own commentaries." Under the name of Peter Summers, for some reason, I was broadcasting especially to German youth. I produced an enormous amount of material, sometime two or three commentaries on the same day, because we were always short of staff.

Q: How long did this go on?

BARDOS: This went on until, I believe, November 1945. It was about a year altogether, by that time, most of the Britishers had left us to run for Parliament, as in the case of Gordon Walker, and to do other things. So essentially, most of the feature material was written by Golo Mann, now a distinguished German historian, and me, and maybe two or three others, different ones at different times.

Q: But you were still broadcasting for the benefit of the German public?

BARDOS: Yes, yes. In fact, at that point, by that time Radio Luxembourg was the key station for all the stations in the American zone.

Q: None of the German radio stations, had at that time, been re-established?

BARDOS They were slowly being re-established, but at first they took their news and commentaries from Radio Luxembourg. Then they very quickly abandoned that.

EDMUND SCHECHTER
Radio Luxembourg
Luxembourg (1945)

Edmund Schechter was raised in Vienna, Austria and attended the University of Vienna. After the Nazis took over Austria in 1938, he escaped to Trieste, and ultimately to Paris. After serving in the French Army and in Casablanca, he emigrated to the United States. Mr. Schechter served in Luxembourg, Austria, Germany as Policy Officer for the European Area, Italy, Bolivia, and Caracas. This interview was conducted by G. Lewis Schmidt in 1988.

SCHECHTER: Then I was transferred to SHAEF, and thus on the payroll of the Department of the Army. Therefore I was simple military transfer from London, ABSIE, to Radio Luxembourg.

Radio Luxembourg was the most forward of all the forward stations. It had been in German hands and then it started to broadcast for the allies after the Germans evacuated Luxembourg, in September '44. 'Til the end, we had in Luxembourg two compounds, one the Third Army, a tactical station, and the SHAEF main propaganda station beamed to occupied Europe. I believe I moved from London in January.

Since this was a SHAEF (Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force) station, we had all nationalities represented, particularly a lot of British. I replaced a Britisher as the chief editor, the head of all broadcasts to foreign workers. There were millions and millions of foreign workers doing slave labor for the Germans. Then after the liberation, they became displaced persons, and there were chaotic situations in Europe due to the wanderings of millions of people. In the first part we advised foreign workers what to do: to slow down and then try to hide out when the Russians or the Americans approached.

Q: You already knew that the Russians were picking up people and sending them back east for slave labor? So you were helping them escape that potential.

SCHECHTER: What we tried to do is, first, to save the workers from the fury of the Germans in their last convulsions. That meant to try to hide in the countryside from the Germans that tried, in the very last few months, to starve them or kill them outright.

Then after the unconditional surrender, the question was instructions for the DPs [displaced persons]. There were two types of DPs. One type, the westerners, French, Dutch, Belgians, etc., that solved itself very easily because these nationals by their own initiative, and by the ten thousands, made their way back home. The main and real problem were the survivors of the

concentration camps, (fortunately relatively few). And the eastern people, as you said, the Russians wanted them as quickly as possible back into Russia. Some of them went, some didn't want to go.

One of the wonderful things in Luxembourg was that by that time, part of Germany was already liberated, occupied by our troops. We made study trips to know how to broadcast. So I was very early in occupied Germany, in Aachen, in Wurzburg, in all the western cities that were liberated. I saw them often just days after the liberation. Of all the destroyed cities, I shall never forget Pforzheim and the degree of its destruction, or Wurzburg, and then later Berlin.

On one of the trips, we went into Austria, and I saw the first concentration camp after its liberation. It was Mauthausen near Salzburg. That was the first concentration camp that I saw a few days after liberation, the next was Dachau.

Let me mention a personal angle as part of this overall story. Vienna had been occupied by the Russians already in the spring of '45. Patton's army on the way to Prague and Vienna, was stopped near Linz. Linz was the birthplace of Hitler, by the way, the second largest city in Austria. Patton's Army was inactive for three months because the negotiations with the Russians to make Vienna like Berlin, a four-power city, with different sectors assigned to the four occupying nations, mood very slowly.

I was in Luxembourg, and all the time, I think, excusably dreaming that I would love to get into Vienna with the first American troops. You know, in Luxembourg, from the Army we got all the latest intelligence, and it looked like this time it would work. I got myself orders to Linz and there I talked myself into being part of the first convoy to go to Vienna. It was in July or August 1945. It was a very exciting moment, having left Vienna seven years earlier as a refugee, without any rights, without any money, without any standing, and to come back seven years later in an American uniform on a jeep as victors and liberators, it was very exciting. I remember when we drove into Vienna--I was with an associate of mine from Luxembourg--and we had a GI, a southerner as driver of our jeep. We slowly moved into Vienna, and we passed the main road near where I had lived, the side street, and I all of a sudden impulsively told him, "Get out of the convoy and drive to the right."

He said, "How do I find my way back?" I said, "I'll tell you how to get back." And he never could really understand that I could have been a Viennese coming back in American uniform. We drove by the house where I had lived, and then we joined back with the column. It was a very moving time for me. I stayed eight days in Vienna.

Probably this is the psychological reason why Vienna has become, from then on, sort of an indifferent city for me. Since that time, I have been innumerable times in Vienna; but never stayed longer than a week. All my deep-seated emotions and feelings of humiliation were compensated by this--for me--"triumphal" return.

So that was my re-entry in Vienna. I think it was a difficult and complex life, running away from the Nazis a few times, but I had these two incredible compensations. One was this return to Vienna, and secondly two or three months earlier, on the day of the end of the war, May 8th, also

still stationed in Luxembourg, I was in Paris celebrating Victory Day, the Paris that I had left three years earlier to be taken prisoner by the Germans in the Bretagne, leaving my mother to an unknown fate. These unforgettable days were great compensations.

Luxembourg was closed on November 11, 1945. I was the last remaining American there, and I returned the station, because all the military were dispersed, demobilized, literally the keys to the station--to the French-Belgian owners who had owned Radio Luxembourg before the war.

GEORGE L. WEST
Chargé d'Affaires
Luxembourg (1948-1950)

George L. West entered the Foreign Service in 1938 after working in the private sector. His assignments included posts in Greenland, Sweden, Finland, Germany, and France. Mr. West was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 1990.

Q: What was your job in Luxembourg?

WEST: I was it, the Chargé. It was a curious thing. Technically, you were really Chargé on teach, not Chargé on interim.

The British and the Dutch had the same arrangement. They had a permanent Chargé in Luxembourg, but an Ambassador in Belgium, who was accredited down there.

But, for example, I presented credentials from the department to the Luxembourg Foreign Minister, my old roommate Bech.

I was also Second Secretary in Brussels, under Admiral Kirk. I made a point of getting up there at least once a month and playing it the way they wanted. Kirk's a delightful guy. He later was Ambassador to the Soviet Union, but he'd been the top American Navy man during the Normandy invasion.

Three of us were sent out simultaneously: Doug MacArthur to Paris; Woody Wallner (who had been out of the service because he'd married an English gal, but was back in) to Brussels; and myself to Luxembourg, in connection with NATO planning.

When I went through Brussels on the way to Luxembourg, you could see one thing that was bothering Kirk.

He'd finally gotten rid of Waller. Waller sort of thought that he was definitely in charge. (I'd love to tell you about him sometime, but I won't take up the tape.)

Kirk wanted very much... He said, "You know, it's funny that the British Ambassador here, who is also accredited to Luxembourg, has been to the palace for a meal, and I never have. It's really

strange, isn't it?"

So when I went down there, first I called on the Chief of Protocol and, as well as I could, intimated that Kirk would like to come down when I presented my credentials -- wouldn't it be nice if he could do something about it. I didn't specifically mention feeding him, but at any rate, they did. That helped me in my relations with Kirk.

Later on, when the Goodyear Tire Company wanted to go into Luxembourg, the Belgians and Dutch were trying to block it because of some Benelux agreements. I eventually discovered that the Belgians had, themselves, invited Goodyear at one time.

I got them from Eyskens, who was then the Belgian Foreign Minister, at a party in Arlonges in the Belgian Province of Lausorn. I got Goodyear into Belgium.

Kirk wasn't too happy that his clients didn't come back. It was a good thing for Luxembourg, it was good service for an American company, a new job there.

Luxembourg was fascinating. Here I was, a junior officer, at a very lovely residence. It had formerly been the Gauleiter's. It had been built originally as a German legation.

Luxembourg was a fascinating assignment. Gosh, [Field Marshal Viscount Bernard Law] Montgomery, [General Jean] de Lattre de Tassigny, and all of them were getting the European...

The headquarters for the European Army was established there. A lot of people don't know much about this. The Western European Union was one way of folding Germany into this thing, as a preface to NATO. This was all part of our German strength [?]. It was nice while it lasted.

Then President Truman, in his infinite wisdom and on the advice of his wife, sent Perle Mesta to Luxembourg.

Douglas MacArthur, who was back on the desk in WE, had promised that I'd be gotten out, if and when it happened. And so, I was immediately... Jimmy Riddleberger had asked for me over in Germany. Jimmy was the POLAD (political advisor) at High Commission in Germany. I was ready to get out in a hurry. I was a DP (Displaced Person), had to get out of the residence.

Then there was a great stall in getting a DCM for her. The department recommended a fellow named George Renchard, who was quite well-off, who had been with Cordell Hull's outer office, broken by a weekend assignment up to Ottawa, and his wife was quite wealthy. In fact, quite many years later, they lent Truman their residence in Washington, while some of the intensive work was going on the White House. They wanted to send George Renchard there. This is sort of funny, my having been turned down in favor in Renchard to the Hague. He was a good friend of mine. She'd [Perle Mesta] call up Harry and say... What she wanted was a bachelor. She'd gotten a military aide, he wasn't really an Attaché, Bertie Hoffman, who was very nice, very social. He would be her escort.

She had her sister, who was really the power behind the throne in terms of all this nefarious

plotting, and her niece, plus she'd gotten a gal from the Press Club, professed to be her public affairs officer. Then she had brought her personal secretary. She had all these women, and she wanted to pair them. She was thinking very much of the social side.

As a matter of fact, our Vice Consul was transferred out shortly after she got there. They named somebody who was then down in Marseille, but who was going home on home leave, to succeed this fellow as Vice Consul, Third Secretary.

So she asked if he could come by Luxembourg on his way home on leave. She quizzed him, and no he wasn't married and all that. Of course, the guy got back to the States and got married, so he's out, send someone else.

They go on about Renchard. There was a letter from Chief of Personnel, Don Smith signed it. I eventually found out who wrote it. It was the stupidest letter to ever go out of the Department of State. It said: Mrs. Renchard is a woman of some means and a very accomplished hostess, and would be of great assistance to you in your representational activities -- telling "The Hostess with the Mostest."

I think this arrived at the same time Lindsay or Krause was visiting in preparation for the musical *Call Me Madam*. I wasn't fancy pants, actually, that was my...

She eventually got a guy. Meanwhile, she was over in the States, and she spent about five months over there. And they paraded all these models in front of her. She finally got a guy named Clinton Swayze, who was not married. He lit up as a homosexual. He had these exquisite tastes, and she was the most gauche person you could...

Q: She was Oklahoma oil or something.

WEST: They had a little oil, but she was a Scurvan, they had Scurvan Hotel. You looked down on it from the Petroleum Club in Oklahoma City. She was 30 or so, and she married an older man named George Mesta, who was head of Mesta Machine Tool Company. He didn't leave her much money, but of course when he died, she was still in her 30's. I don't know how old she was. They weren't married all that long.

So she came to Washington. Eventually, Swayze arrived. She was the most gauche person you can imagine.

Q: Did you serve with her?

WEST: I had to stay on until I could go, until Swayze arrived. She'd give these parties, and she'd insist that the General up in Wiesbaden send a certain number of guys down every weekend. And she'd give these receptions, and they'd be played up in the papers. There again, I have material for a number of books. Either that or chapters in my biography.

Q: While you were there, did you just do the business?

WEST: I did the business. Finally, I got off, and I went to...

Q: Were the Luxembourgers, the officials there, sort of laughing at this?

WEST: Well, they were not too happy. You see one thing that had happened was that for years the Netherlands Minister in Washington, a guy named Hugh Legalle, had been pushing Bech and been pushing Prime Minister Dupont to make an embassy. Legalle sold the idea to the department that they would send a Minister to Luxembourg. Mesta was never Ambassador, she was Minister. There was still a legation when she was there. It was the next guy, Buchanan, who became Ambassador.

WILLIAM C. SHERMAN
Belgium-Luxembourg Desk Officer
Washington, DC (1958-1960)

William C. Sherman was born in Kentucky in 1923 and raised in Pennsylvania and Ohio. He attended the University of Louisville until he joined the U.S. Navy in 1943. His career included positions in Korea, Japan, Italy, as well as other State Department positions in the States. He was interviewed by Thomas Stern on October 27, 1993.

Q: *You left INR in September, 1958. I gather you could hardly wait to get out. How did you manage to be assigned to the Belgium-Luxembourg desk?*

SHERMAN: I was delighted to leave INR. My reassignment was probably the responsibility of John Burns, who had inspected me in Yokohama. I therefore knew him as a friend. He was in 1958 the Executive Director for the Bureau for European Affairs. When the Belgium desk was about to become vacant, I think that John suggested that I be assigned to it. I knew nothing about what was going on. One day, Bill Magistretti called me into his office and said: "As you probably know, there are some efforts being made to assign you to the Belgium desk". I could barely believe my ears; I had never heard of such a plan and furthermore I thought that my chances would not be very good since I knew nothing about Belgium and had no special qualifications for the job. I was not unhappy to go to EUR, but it certainly came as a major surprise. I don't know that Bill ever believed me, but I had nothing to do with that assignment. I only found out later that it was John Burns who had suggested the transfer, based on his review of my performance in Yokohama and later.

Q: *Let me ask you about the structure of EUR in 1958. Who was the Assistant Secretary? What was its structure?*

SHERMAN: The Assistant Secretary was Livingston Merchant. The Bureau was organized around European regions: West Europe, East Europe, North Europe, etc. We also had an Office of Regional Affairs, headed by Lane Timmons. The Soviet desk, also part of the East Europe Office, operated as a self-contained unit. It took care of its own personnel and operated pretty

much independently of all levels below Assistant Secretary. The Office of Western Europe (WE) was headed by Bob McBride, who succeeded Tully Tolbert when the latter went to Rome as the Political Counselor. WE was divided into sections: Italian-Iberian Affairs, Benelux and Switzerland Affairs, French Affairs. In the Benelux section, we had an officer-in-charge, an economic officer, a desk officer for Belgium-Luxembourg and another for Holland-Switzerland.,

I had to bring myself up to speed on Benelux affairs in a hurry because shortly after I took over the desk, King Baudouin visited the United States. I suspect that it was the first time that any senior level of the U.S. government had to become knowledgeable about Belgian affairs. Belgium was a small country, but I found it very interesting. I had a lot of fun on that desk.

Belgium and Luxembourg did not have a very high priority on the list of foreign policy issues facing the Bureau of European Affairs or even the Office of Western European Affairs. De Gaulle was at his orneriest forcing the Office Director and Deputy Director to focus essentially on France. After that, for them, the important agenda items concerned Italy and the Iberian Peninsula. Benelux did not appear on their screen very often. Our division ran itself, largely unsupervised. So, as an FSO-4, I was left pretty much to my own devices.

The Belgian and Luxembourg Embassies in Washington were accustomed to dealing with the desk officer. Their Ambassadors did not demand to see the Secretary of State or the Assistant Secretary every time they had a request. We at the desk officer level were able to handle most of their concerns. The Belgian Ambassador, Bobby Silvercruys, rarely came to the Department. At one point, he was the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, a position which goes to the ambassador with the longest service in Washington. He had married Rosemarie McMahon, the widow of the late Senator. So he knew his way around town quite well and didn't really need the Department's assistance. Occasionally he might wish to see Bob Murphy, the Under Secretary, or another high level Department official. On those occasion, I would accompany the Ambassador on his call, but that was the extent of the services we had to provide the Belgian Ambassador.

The Luxembourg Ambassador changed while I was on the desk. George Heisbourg, who had been the principal secretary of the Foreign Ministry, came as the Ambassador from Luxembourg. He went about making all his calls, which we had arranged for him. I accompanied him to these meetings. He could not have been nicer. We were frequent dinner guests at his Embassy. The Luxembourgers were known for their pro-American attitude and were always warmly received wherever they went. I made one trip to Luxembourg and Belgium at the end of a fiscal year to use up some leftover funds. I spent a week in Belgium and three or four days in Luxembourg. When you walk passed the Foreign Ministry in Luxembourg, the windows were wide open; anyone could have reach in and taken all the papers off the a desk. I, a lowly desk officer, called on the Prime Minister one morning. In the afternoon, I attended a parliament session and sat in the VIP gallery. The Prime Minister walked in, looked up and waved at us. Luxembourg was very casual.

Of course, there is a long history of US-Luxembourg relationships, made immemorial by Perle Mesta. Even before that, we had as Charge a career Foreign Service officer, George Platt Waller. He was "crown happy" as Wiley Buchanan used to describe him. He emphasized his relationship with the Grand Duchess, not just the Duchess. He used to caution everyone to use the correct

title for the lady. He wrote a despatch that was preserved at the FSI for a long time in which he described at some length the extreme conditions that were imposed on Luxembourg when it was invaded by the Nazis. He stayed there, maintaining a presence. We often read George Platt Waller's despatches because they were so typical of an era long past. In one, he wrote; " To the Honorable Secretary of State: Sir: I have the honor to report that yesterday the remains of St. John the Blind, were returned to their historical resting place, the Cathedral in the Grand Square of Luxembourg City. As the Department will recall, St. John the Blind died in 1539.....I remain your obedient servant, George Platt Waller". That was his style and he was one of the last to write that way!

It was these episodes that led me to say that "I had fun on the desk". I had some contacts with other agencies, but they were somewhat limited. For example, when the French Defense Minister came, I took him over to call on the Secretary of Defense and his Deputy. Then Colonel Vernon "Dick " Walters was the translator. I became acquainted with some of the other agencies when I took Ambassador Heisbourg around on his calls. The government had not at that time established a Country Director system so that my contacts with other agencies were somewhat limited.

One event that I can still recall was the tenth anniversary celebration of NATO. The headquarters were still in Paris. The anniversary celebration was held here in Washington and was attended by all the head of governments. That was a major event, which kept us busy for some weeks.

MORTON A. BACH
US Common Market Mission
Luxembourg (1960)

Morton Bach was born in New York City in 1904. He worked with the U.S. Army Counterintelligence Corps from 1942, and afterwards was posted in Bern, Seoul, The Hague, Vienna, Luxembourg and Brussels. Mr. Bach was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 1999.

Q: You left there in 1960. Where did you go then?

BACH: To Luxembourg, Luxembourg. The main office of the U.S. Common Market mission was in Brussels, but the original U.S. Common Market mission was in Luxembourg at the time of the Coal and Steel Community. Then it moved up to Brussels, but they maintained the Luxembourg office.

Again, stuck in a hotel.

Q: That gets a little bit weary after a while.

BACH: It does. We were in Luxembourg and I know that Foreign Service families with children thought it was ideal, which it is. It is the size of a postage stamp with woods, picnics, and all the rest of it. But professionally, there wasn't that much of interest - at least to me - although we got

to know a number of the Luxembourg officials, one of whom told a story that he was on an official mission down in Ghana or one of the African countries. He said, "As usual, you go to the airport. They tell you to get there and then you stretch out and you hope a plain will arrive." He was stretched out and all of a sudden, three military people with bayonets drawn said, "Get up. You're under arrest." "Why am I under arrest?" He said, "The band at the other end of the airfield is playing our national anthem and you are lying down." But there wasn't that much interest in Luxembourg, so I was very pleased to move up to Brussels. I was assigned responsibility for the former colonies in Africa.

DONALD A. KRUSE
Economic/Commercial Officer
Luxembourg (1960-1962)

Donald A. Kruse was born in Philadelphia in 1930. He later attended Wheaton College and majored in history. Following his graduation in 1952, he received a masters degree in political science at the University of Pennsylvania and then joined the army. Following his two year run in the army, Kruse joined the Foreign Service and served in posts in Canada, Luxembourg, France, Belgium, Jerusalem, Italy, and England. He was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in March 1997.

Q: You were in Luxembourg from when to when?

KRUSE: Two years.

Q: '60 to '62.

KRUSE: Right.

Q: What were you doing in Luxembourg?

KRUSE: Having done my administrative swing, they gave me the Economic/Commercial office. This was a very small embassy in those days. We had an ambassador and a DCM and another agency type. Then we had an admin. officer, a consular officer. I don't think we even had more than that one consular officer. So, we're talking about something like five American officers. This was the start of the Kennedy era. Within a few months of my arrival (We came in the summer of '60.), we knew Kennedy had won the election and we expected a "New Frontier" ambassador, as we got in early 1961. He was a very charming and serious-minded man named James Wine. His claim to fame with the Kennedy troupe was that he put on that meeting in Dallas, where Kennedy faced the Protestant ministers.

Q: Kennedy being a Catholic. At that time, it was considered that the Baptists and others in the south would never vote for him. Wine was able to arrange a meeting with 50 religious ministers and answer their questions. It helped diffuse the issue.

KRUSE: It did lay it to rest. I don't know how many votes it got, but it certainly laid to rest the public issue. As a result, Jim Wine came out to be the ambassador. I must say, he turned out to be a good ambassador, certainly in wanting to make use of me. He had some problems with the DCM. I have to say, I think it was the DCM's fault. So, I got a little bit in the middle there between the ambassador and DCM. But the ambassador wanted to use me whenever he went to the Foreign Ministry. We negotiated a treaty of friendship and commerce with the Luxembourgers, which may sound like walking through an open door, but we never had one before. I got experience in doing negotiations.

Q: Anything like that gets very technical and time consuming. To get a feel for this, because I think relations at an embassy are always important- I take it our DCM was a professional career Foreign Service officer?

KRUSE: He had had previous career assignments, but I think, to be honest, his claim to fame was some very good family connections. He was, as I learned later, not held in great regard by most of his colleagues in the Foreign Service. In fact, there were those who said that he shouldn't have been sent to be a DCM. He had some problems in previous posts. I think probably providence was keeping me in its favor here because he could have done me a lot of damage. I don't think he felt very good about my role there. But again, the ambassador was able to, in effect, make Washington understand that what I was doing was what the ambassador wanted to do. I did my best to keep the DCM informed. That was probably the most tricky interoffice relations I ever had.

Q: This is one that occurs again and again of particularly a relatively junior officer being picked by an ambassador and sort of bypassing the system, maybe for perfectly good reasons. Resentments had be built up and the junior officer is sort of hostage to fortune. There's not a hell of a lot you can do.

KRUSE: That's right. You're the guy in the middle.

Q: Could you describe Luxembourg in the early '60s?

KRUSE: I'm not sure it's changed all that much, except it's probably gotten a little wealthier. They often say it's like the mouse that roared, that although in the case of the Luxembourgers, they didn't get help from the United States because of being difficult, but basically had an almost embarrassing love for the United States. This was only 12 or 15 years after World War II. Although it may sound like a lot of years Luxembourgers still remembered and appreciated what America did in coming back and liberating the continent, they acted as though we came only to save Luxembourg. There is an American military cemetery in Luxembourg where General Patton is buried. That became a virtual shrine to venerate the American effort to liberate Europe. They were not embarrassed at being absolutely grateful.

Q: There were ceremonies at Bastogne?

KRUSE: The Belgians, of course, had their effort. Bastogne is just across the border. But that

whole Battle of the Bulge did encompass the northern part of Luxembourg and the eastern part of Belgium. I would go up to that area 15 years later and the foxholes were still there. You could run across a grenade if you were unlucky or not careful. In fact, Luxembourg would have escaped almost any damage from the war because in our initial invasion, we swept right through Luxembourg and the Germans retreated. But this, as you know, December offensive in 1944 brought the Germans back in. Lots of bombardment, lots of fighting going on in northern Luxembourg. Luxembourg City escaped it. One of the great institutions in Luxembourg in my days was the American-Luxembourg Society. They got very close to the embassy. They were very kind to us all. We certainly had many good dinners and banquets. Luxembourg wine flowed.

Q: Were there any stories still circulating about Perle Mesta, who had been Truman's ambassador? A very good musical was made called "Call Me Madame."

KRUSE: That was all well-known. Of course, they didn't understand why it would have been funny that they had such an important person come. There were jokes that never ended. They told one, for example, that a French general had just come back from Indochina and was talking about how difficult it was out there fighting the guerrillas. This took place at the dinner table of Mrs. Mesta at the embassy. She listened very carefully. She was quite surprised to hear all this and said, "You know, that is really just terrible, mon general. I'm going to report that to Harry tomorrow." As though this might be the first time Harry would have heard about it. Of course, Harry was Harry Truman. The first time that she left the post, she thought it was perfectly appropriate if her brother could just take charge while she was gone. She found it a little difficult to accept Washington's view that that really wasn't possible. She did do a good representation job for Americans in those days.

Q: Well, she helped put Luxembourg onto the American map. It probably would have stayed with Liechtenstein if Perle Mesta hadn't gone there.

KRUSE: It's a tiny country of 300,000 people. One ward in Chicago.

Q: Did you get any feel for NATO while you were there?

KRUSE: Just a little. The Luxembourgers' entire military, the size of about 500 men, was totally committed to NATO and would join up and had exercises with American troops in Germany. Their duty would be to just get enveloped into an American outfit and assume their duties. So, there was just the beginning of a NATO connection. What was even closer to us in those days was the European economic communities. The European Iron Steel Community had its first headquarters in Luxembourg.

Q: As economic officer, you must have been up to your neck in that, weren't you?

KRUSE: We didn't do so much with the European communities. Remember, we had a separate mission to the European Community also. What I was doing was trying to help American businesses come into Luxembourg. The Luxembourgers were actively recruiting American companies like Dupont and Monsanto. That was kind of fun. The idea of being good for

Americans to get inside the Common Market with their production facilities so they would escape any kind of an external tariff. But you see, the big business of Luxembourg then and, I think, even still today, is iron and steel. That's the one industry that kept them alive for decades.

Q: How about banking?

KRUSE: That was just beginning. As I suspect, that would probably account for a lot of their prosperity today.

Q: Did you have any problems getting data, information and all?

KRUSE: No, they were helpful. Iron and steel, china, and a certain amount of wine and agricultural products. So, it wasn't a very diversified economy. The only problem would be often that the government itself was slow in collecting data, but they were very cooperative.

Q: What was your feeling about the Luxembourger's relations to the Germans?

KRUSE: Certainly in front of us, they were very anti-German. They wanted it to be very clearly understood that they were Francophile, although their language or their patois was mostly Germanic. (You had these kinds of "Bonjour, mein Herr" combinations of French and German that they put together.) Even though this patois was mostly German, they were always with the French against the Germans. Of course, culturally and linguistically, they tried to stress as much as possible the French side. The interesting thing was, of course, that they had both French and German as official languages. I think they realized that they had to get along. They were, as were the other Benelux countries, very loyal to the concept of the Common Market. English became basically a third language. Luxembourgers were very, very good at learning languages.

Q: What about relations with Belgium?

KRUSE: Of course, they had these jokes about the Belgians, that to be a Belgian is not a nationality, it's a profession. They see in Belgians an unerring instinct for money. I think a little bit of that might be kind of projection. Luxembourgers weren't too bad at it either. They recognized that they were tied in the economic union with the Belgians. Belgian money was legal tender in Luxembourg. They just recognized it was a fact of life. They had to get along with the Belgians. Sort of like the Canadians and us.

Q: How about France under de Gaulle at that time?

KRUSE: I would say, officially, the Luxembourg government would be a little nervous about too much anti-Americanism from de Gaulle because Luxembourgers would never forget the fact that the most important Western power was the United States. They would not like to have seen the United States react in a huff and leave Europe or retreat into isolationism. That was always a fear that the Luxembourgers had. I think there was a certain satisfaction that de Gaulle stood for French pride. But I think they did feel that he went too far, particularly when our troops had to leave France, which would be a later chapter in my life. I wound up in France to help work on that issue.

Q: When did you leave Luxembourg?

KRUSE: We left in the fall of '62.

THOMAS W. FINA
Political Officer
Luxembourg (1961-1963)

Thomas W. Fina joined the Foreign Service after serving with the U.S. Air Force in World War II. His assignments included posts in Paris, Brussels, Washington, DC, and Milan, where he served as consul general. Mr. Fina was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 1992.

Q: In Luxembourg, you were there from '61 to '63, what were your responsibilities?

FINA: I had three responsibilities. One, I covered the steel industry and a colleague covered coal for the entire European Coal and Steel Community.

Q: This was the core of the entire European integration, was on the coal and steel.

FINA: At the beginning. It all began with the concept of merging the coal and steel markets so France and Germany would not feel that they each had to own these resources. After this supra-national structure was created, the members states went on to broaden the coverage with nuclear energy, and to the general market, the European common market, and that all became the European Communities later on.

Well, steel is pretty interesting. The American steel industry was already having problems. I was fascinated by the problem. I went around and visited steel mills, I crawled around blast furnaces, and met all kinds of people, and talked to their experts. Anyway, it became very clear to me after a little while, that we weren't going to be able to compete with the Europeans because they were making enormous investments in new steel making capability. They were making oxygen steel, and we hadn't even started. The Austrians were making oxygen steel, and some of the others were too. They were beginning work on continuous casting, they were building brand new rolling mills that were very effective, a lot of the equipment bought in the United States, of course, but a lot of it also manufactured in Europe.

So I went back to the States on home leave about that time, and the Department, which has good arrangements for returning people, made it possible for me to go visit Bethlehem Steel. I thought, the thing for me to do since I'd seen all these European steel mills, was to see what my fellow countrymen were doing. Well, that shook me up pretty badly. I went to Bethlehem where they'd been manufacturing steel since the 1800s, and some vice president put a hard hat on me, and we went off to visit the steel mills. Well, my family had been involved at the labor level with the steel mills, I guess forever, and so I had an impression of a great steel company even if it had

was not loved by its employees. Bethlehem Steel was a big name when I was a kid. I got there and they took me around. I was absolutely appalled at what I saw. They had a mill where they were forging castings as the steel came out of the soaking pits. But the equipment they were using had been installed at the time of the First World War! There it was. They were still using the same stuff. My guide proudly pointed this out to me, "Boy, she works like a charm. We installed her in 1917," or something like that. In fact, all of the equipment that I saw, as I went through the Bethlehem plant, was old. It couldn't hold a candle to what the Europeans were doing. Well, you draw some conclusions from that.

Then the other thing that I worked on in Luxembourg was the European Court of Justice. And that had me very excited because the Europeans had set up a court, modeled on our Supreme Court. The idea being that it would review legislation of the Community institutions, their regulations, that is, as well as legislation of the member states to see whether that legislation was consonant with the treaty. The treaty overrode any national legislation. I went around and interviewed the justices on this court.

At the time the Chief Justice was a Dutchman with whom I had a wonderful meeting. I had always been moved by the dignity and majesty of our own constitutional law. I wanted to see how their philosophy related to our experience in establishing the authority of the Supreme Court to determine the constitutionality of ordinary law -I was delighted to discover that they knew all about American constitutional history. They knew about Marbury versus Madison. And they were very consciously shaping their rulings to try and create precedents which would give their European Court of Justice, and which would give the European Communities, the kinds of constitutional review which our Supreme Court has had in the United States. Well, it was one of the most interesting experiences I had, and I spent a lot of time documenting, reviewing, and reporting on it.

The other thing I did...well, I did some work on European transport policy, which I also felt was very fascinating.

But then my other responsibility was to go as an observer to the European Parliament, which met in Strasbourg. The Communities, like all political institutions, have to divide up the benefits, the rewards and the French didn't have and of its institutions on their soil. anything. The Belgians had the offices of European Commission, and the Luxembourgers had the Coal and Steel Community. The French wanted something so they got the Parliament. It met in Strasbourg, impractical, but close to Luxembourg. So the US Mission to the European Communities in Brussels which supervised the office in Luxembourg said, "Okay, Fina, you go down and be our reporter and cover the parliament." I was incredibly lucky. It was a wonderful job, because the Parliament was dealing with all of the issues of the Communities, all across the board: nuclear energy, market questions, coal and steel, political problems. And the members of the European Parliament were politicians from all of the parties, except the Communist as I recall, from all the community states.

I had a wonderful time. I went around and met these people, I interviewed them, I wrote reports on the issues and proceedings, and telephoned the reports up to Brussels to be used there and cabled to Washington. It was a lot of fun for me, and apparently it was useful for my bosses.

JAMES W. WINE
Ambassador
Luxembourg (1961-1962)

Ambassador James W. Wine joined the Foreign Service in 1961 after serving in World War II and then practicing law. His posts included ambassadorships to Luxembourg and the Ivory Coast. Ambassador Wine was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 1989.

WINE: There's no question about that. The President in his inaugural address he said something to the effect that "the torch has been passed to another generation."

There was a very strong philosophical consensus among a lot of us, regardless of how we came into the campaign originally. The people involved under President Kennedy had what it took to achieve the kinds of things we thought ought to be achieved in post-World War II.

So I held myself in abeyance and still made some temporary contacts about returning to the practice of law. I was called and asked if I would be interested in serving in the State Department. It was well known among these people in the Administration about my interest in foreign affairs. We had had enough conversations back and forth through the months to know that. So I said, "Yes, I would be very much interested and it would depend upon some practical matters, family, etc." I had four children.

Shortly I received a telephone call asking if I would be interested in becoming the Chief of Mission. I said, "Where?"

They said, "Israel or Luxembourg."

I said, "Well, my wife and I both speak French. I helped re-take Luxembourg in World War II. If I have any kind of choice, I would be interested."

They said, "There's more to it than that."

My law practice had involved coal and steel and Luxembourg was the seat of the coal and steel community as you well know.

Q: Which was the progenitor of the entire European community, the Common Market, etc.

WINE: Exactly. Even after the Treaty of Rome, many of the first organizational meetings were all held in Luxembourg because they were already set up and had the membership in the coal and steel community in place. They just changed the players. This fact was brought out. I said, "Yes, I am familiar with that."

In general, those were the things that took me to Luxembourg.

Q: Could you explain what you were doing during the war in the Luxembourg area?

WINE: We were part of the 7th Army and Luxembourg had been occupied early on when France fell. The Germans were pushed back, and during the Battle of the Bulge Luxembourg was occupied again. In the process of the 7th Army moving eastward on the front, Luxembourg was in the 7th Army area and the troops comprising those with which I was a part moved through that corridor that re-took Luxembourg.

Q: How were you particularly interested in foreign affairs prior to joining the State Department?

WINE: I think not unlike anyone else who may have had advanced college degrees and who read a good deal more than the ordinary person. I think exposure to Europe in World War II as a very young man opened my eyes tremendously to first-hand cultural differences despite the circumstances of hostilities. It also reawakened my own interest in history. John Sherman Cooper, who was the Senator from Kentucky and later Ambassador to India, and I were very close friends. John and I had many discussions about the United Nations during its infancy. At one point John suggested to me back in the mid-1950s that I ought to come to Washington and maybe look into some possibility of going into the State Department, particularly in the U. N. side where we had discussed a number of things.

So I came up and visited for two or three days, but it was a gradual growing thing. I found my own perspective in the world broadening considerably. I tried to inform myself and I was attracted to various publications, books, etc. which dealt largely with foreign affairs. I think it just became an integral part of me.

Q: Your experience is very typical of a generation of people who were informed citizens, particularly those who participated in the war. It put many people on a different course. It paralleled also the rise of the United States as a power in the world. Prior to that, our diplomacy was really almost marginal.

WINE: That's correct. We were just there.

Q: Yes, and with a couple of oceans in between. In going to Luxembourg, did you have any particular preparation for being the Chief of Mission from the State Department or the White House, any particular instructions?

WINE: Yes. I spent about six weeks in the department, an extended period largely on my own initiative. I had a learning process to go through. I was fortunate to have conversations with a number of people from Averell Harriman on down talking about ambassadorial capacities.

I might mention that on one occasion I asked Averell Harriman, "I don't know anything about being an ambassador and I'm trying to learn."

He said, "I'll give you two pieces of advice. Always know when to take one step backward when

you're negotiating. The other one is to remember that there are two kinds of ambassadors: those who are interested in "being" and those who are interested in "doing." Be the latter."

Retrospectively, I think that those two cryptic statements were the best piece of wisdom that I've ever run across anywhere.

Q: I heartily agree. Of course, Luxembourg had the distinction of having too many ambassadors who were more impressed with "being" rather than "doing."

WINE: That's what the Luxembourgers thought.

Q: How did you find the mission in Luxembourg?

WINE: It looked to me like it was a store-keeping proposition with very attractive people competent in their particular assigned tasks. They were not taking any initiatives and were not being required to, apparently, from what I could judge. I felt that there was a failure to assess certain important propositions. For example, Luxembourg's small army was integrated into and became a part of the United States Army for training purposes. In cases of hostility within the NATO plan, it would have been under U. S. command. This is the first time in American history that a foreign country's military had been made an integral part of the U. S. military. This presented some very interesting experiences over a period of time while I was there.

Secondly, the airport was built by the United States and was part of the NATO infrastructure, targeted to be used in the event of hostilities and built into the defensive plans of Europe.

There had never been the usual trade, commerce, and friendship treaty, so I took the initiative on that and negotiated it to mutual satisfaction.

The Luxembourgers, and not without justification, had a very negative view toward the Germans for the treatment that they had received. Several of the ministers, as a matter of fact, in the government while I was there had actually been taken over during the war and put into labor camps. They told me the stories of their experiences. As a consequence, I think one of the tasks was [not] to point out -- which would have been a futile thing anyhow -- to the Luxembourger that they couldn't afford to continue to be hostile to their neighbor but to try to work at creating a climate of better understanding, looking toward the future as to what Europe was going to be. They would have to work together at some point.

It was easier for an American to take that position than it was for anybody else, any of the other ambassadors from the other countries. While that was done persistently, it was done low-key by simply taking advantage of occasions in an effort to try to change -- not necessarily in defense of or in favor of the Germans, but trying to create a better climate of harmony in Europe in that small country which was rapidly becoming the financial center.

Originally, Luxembourg was to be the general headquarters for the Common Market. Subsequent decisions put it in Brussels. The trade-off was that all of the participating partners would aid Luxembourg in becoming a financial center along the idea of Switzerland. They had good

banking laws and they wanted better banking laws and to attract financial institutions, etc. A small country like Switzerland for generations is in an awfully good position to do something like that. They have been successful. So that was the trade-off, the consequence of which I had a modest hand.

Q: Did you have a feeling that Luxembourg was pushed aside by our concerns with France, Germany, and England?

WINE: Yes, I think so. I think there had been a long history of benign neglect as far as the little country was concerned. The department had not been, perhaps understandably so, in tune with the discussions that were going on within Europe to which I have just referred a moment ago -- the trade-offs, the move to Brussels making it the financial center, keeping EEC the high court in Luxembourg. These were the trade-offs that were made and I think the department was quite tardy and was beginning to see the significance of those trade-offs that were made.

On the other hand, I remember particularly when Bill Tyler was Assistant Secretary for Europe. I remember when Bill Blue had the office of Western European Affairs. Both men and I became good friends, and in the course of numerous discussions and exchanges of correspondence and official cables, a lot of these things began to get more visibility and the significance began to be appreciated a good deal more.

Q: Were you aware of the battles within the State Department between the Europeanists who were looking at integrated Europe and pushing that -- I think George Ball was the prime exponent of this -- and those that said, "That's all very well, but we have relations with France, with Germany, with England, etc. Let's not get completely overwhelmed by this Europeanist thing." Did you find yourself involved in this?

WINE: I was very much aware of that and knew of this bifurcation of viewpoint within the department. I knew George Ball's position very clearly, but I also knew the position of a number of the career people and I found them divided on the particular point that you described. I think it was an intellectual political struggle that was going on with the best intention on both sides. I saw the world a little differently and, of course, outside the State Department there were various and sundry organizations that came into being such as the Atlantic Council which continue to exist and perpetuate this very strong feeling between the United States and Western Europe. There are a number of such organizations of which I'm sure you are as familiar as I. That viewpoint still exists and I'm watching it with a great deal of interest as we go toward 1992.

Q: That's the date of the full integration of Europe. Did you find yourself falling into a camp or were you between the individual country people and the integrated Europeanists? You were there from 1961 to 1962.

WINE: I don't think I became an apostle of either viewpoint. I think I appreciated what they were saying on both sides, but at that point I watched to see where the interests of the United States could best be served in the little country of Luxembourg as these two schools of thought began to emerge and gel.

I remember on one occasion a particular issue in Europe that taught me a good lesson. There was a man, the old man of Europe, Joseph Bech. He and Tryquehie were the two first candidates for General Secretary of the United Nations. He was a Luxembourger and a long-time advisor to the royal family and government and always had been a part of it. Joseph Bech and I grew to be great friends.

I had an instruction to ask if he would take a certain position to the NATO Council in which the United States was very much interested. I went to see Mr. Bech and he said he wanted to make it very clear that he was sympathetic but that, in the context of the forum in which we were talking, if Luxembourg took the lead, he felt it would be rather silly because they did not have the military power to back up the proposition that he would introduce. He had no intention of making himself look silly. However, he would certainly be a party to any of the negotiations going on -- the reason they selected him is because he was a man of considerable stature in Europe at the time. He felt it would be a serious mistake from the standpoint of Luxembourg itself to take the lead in that move for the reason I just mentioned.

Q: How did you deal with the Luxembourg government? Who were your principal points of contact?

WINE: I was very fortunate in the fact that I had four children, twin sons, a family, and by far I was the youngest ambassador that they had had there. The Kennedy Administration was looked at most favorably. I was the unwitting beneficiary of all kinds of things of which I could not take credit under any circumstances. I was received with open arms in the most genuine, warm way. The prime minister who was also the minister of finance lived just one block from me and frequently, on Sunday afternoons, while walking with his family and I with mine, we would stop in and visit, have a cup of coffee and talk at great length. We became very closely associated outside of official circumstances which is very helpful. This was an experience that occurred with considerable frequency. I remember sitting up in their front yard watching the Tour de France on one occasion. There was a big park just above the street there. As I said, on Sunday afternoons we found our families commingling, walking and talking. The wives established an excellent rapport. The foreign minister and I developed quite a good friendship as well.

When we had the first satellite that went up that had the transatlantic telephonic communications, I remember it was about two o'clock in the morning. We were all in the mayor's office downtown with all of the powers that be talking with the mayor of Albany, New York. We have pictures of that event. They felt like they were in direct contact for the first time with the United States on a large scale. [These were] little things which are symptomatic, I think, of the very warm relationship.

I might say, on the other side of the fence, they made it very clear to me that they didn't like it worth a damn that Luxembourg was used from time to time to send people over there who spent most of their time out hunting or simply giving parties, etc.

Q: Of course, one of the most famous ambassadors, probably the most famous ambassador there, was Perle Mesta.

WINE: She was a minister.

Q: She was a minister but she was renowned for giving parties in Washington.

WINE: It was a joke as far as Luxembourg was concerned.

Q: Of course it would be. In a way it was a joke in the United States, but it certainly does not reflect well on our relations with another country.

WINE: It did not at all.

ROBERT E. FRITTS
Economic/Commercial Officer
Luxembourg (1962-1964)

Ambassador Robert E. Fritts was born in Illinois in 1934. He received his B.A. from the University of Michigan in 1956 and served in the U.S. Navy overseas from 1956 to 1959 as a lieutenant. His postings abroad have included Luxembourg, Sudan, Rwanda, Indonesia, and Ghana. Ambassador Fritts was interviewed in 1999 by Charles Stuart Kennedy.

Q: *Well, then, you said you got yourself on the Luxembourg Desk. Did you know you were assigned to go to Luxembourg?*

FRITTS: Yes, Bob Miller headed the desk for Belgium and Luxembourg. I was over complement for about six months so I became his assistant desk officer. I was fortunate to be able to learn what was going on in Luxembourg and who the few policy players were in the Department and Washington.

An anecdote from that period is that I would brief officers going to Luxembourg for one thing or another. A new Army attaché, who would be resident in Brussels and also accredited to Luxembourg, came through one day. I did the usual review of policy thisses and thats and who was who. In Luxembourg, about six months later, the same Army attaché visited the embassy on his first trip and stopped by my office to get some military budget data. He asked for an overall briefing, which I gave, almost exactly the same stuff I had told him a few months before. "My God", he said, "It's a pleasure to meet someone who knows so much about Luxembourg. The guy who briefed me in Washington knew nothing and had never even been there." Lesson learned: "If you ain't been there, you don't count."

Q: *Had you asked for Luxembourg?*

FRITTS: Yes I wanted a small post where I could do a broad range of things, as I had done in the Navy. I was fortunate to be the sole economic-commercial officer and Luxembourg was a full member of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and the relatively new European

Economic Community (EEC). Actually, Luxembourg's steel industry was larger than Belgium's, so Luxembourg wasn't the smallest potato in the field. It was a dynamic formative period and our Ambassador to the European Community at the U.S. Mission to the European Communities (USEC) in Brussels, Jack Tuthill, added high energy. I was often called to USEC or Embassies Bonn or Paris for policy coordination and review sessions held by Tuthill or other VIP officials. My so-called counterparts at the other U.S. embassies were twenty years older, truly senior, and many of them European and economic experts. on Europe. But still, I was on the ground in Luxembourg and knew a few things. So it was a valuable exposure to sophisticated policy analysis and management. I received the same instructions as the economic ministers in Paris and Rome and my reporting and assessment got folded into all the analyses. I was fishing in a small pond - but it was my pond.

Q: *When were you in Luxembourg?*

FRITTS: 1962 to 1964 - about two and a half years.

Q: *Who was the ambassador?*

FRITTS: When I arrived, it was James Wine. I think he had helped sew up the religious vote for President Kennedy in the South. After a few months, he was succeeded by Bill Rivkin, a lawyer from Chicago. The American Foreign Service Association "Rivkin Award" is named after him.

Q: *I've interviewed James Wine and he was important to the Kennedy campaign. Luxembourg has the image of being sort of a social post for political ambassadors, such as Perle Mesta in the Truman Administration. However, I've had a husband of one of the recent ambassadors there, a woman, say, "You know, I gave so much money and all they gave her was Luxembourg," Did you find that it was sort of a putdown that so many political appointees ended up there?*

FRITTS: Both James Wine and Bill Rivkin were political ambassadors. I never heard them talk about their financial donations. I knew Rivkin far better than Wine, but each of them was committed to the job. Each wanted to have influential impact on the Government of Luxembourg (GOL) and to be respected by their American peers in the other capitals. Rivkin was a high profile activist. He thus irritated his American ambassador peers by portraying Luxembourg as more important than they thought it was. Perfectly normal.

Rivkin also believed that cutting a social swath in Luxembourg was an important aspect of the job. As De Gaulle was then President of France, Rivkin relished competing socially against the French Ambassador, who returned the favor. The contest was a source of much amusement to Luxembourg officialdom.

Q: *The head of the association I'm working for is Ed Rowell. He's a former ambassador to Luxembourg. He's said that Luxembourg was in a way a very handy place if somebody wanted to use it. It was an approachable part of the European Community - you could go talk to people who were sitting in the policy center of the emerging European Community or Union. You could pick up quite a bit about what was going on elsewhere because you could get to them, whereas in*

the other countries, it was a little more difficult, more layers of bureaucracy. Were you able to find out what was happening in other parts of the European Economic Community (EEC)?

FRITTS: Sure. Our relationships with Luxembourgers were terrific. They were fond of saying that Luxembourg had been liberated by the United States three times: once in World War I and twice in World War II, including the Battle of the Bulge. It was a very, very pro-American place and even more so in the context that De Gaulle and France were such a pain. Their sincere devotion and appreciation for the liberations of Luxembourg affected all of us. We probably attended 20-30 small events a year attending commemoration ceremonies throughout the country, sometimes just the laying of a wreath at a crossroads. In addition, there was a large annual ceremony at the U.S. military cemetery at Hamm, where most of the American dead from the Bulge are buried.

Luxembourgers also have a sense of quiet humor. They didn't take themselves too seriously and would lampoon the vainglorious stance of the French and the patronizing attitude of the Belgians. They liked American candor, humor and our more informal manner. While somewhat self-deprecating, they also have a quiet pride, which is only expressed when using the unwritten language of Letzeburgesch.

Thus, we always had access. But Luxembourg had not existed between France and Germany for over 900 years without having its own smarts, however much down-played. They communicated much by innuendo, satire, raised eyebrows and indirect guidance, such as "Why don't you ask that question in a different way?"

We added to the Department's knowledge of what was going on inside the EEC. And there were occasions, I can't recall specifics, when we knew fairly well that the GOL was, in its own way, using our views as part of its own within EEC councils. Which was, of course, our goal.

At that time there was also a two-officer sub-USEC (European Coal and Steel Community) office in Luxembourg whose purview was the ECSC and the EEC
Court of Justice, both located in Luxembourg. The sub-office reported to Ambassador Tuthill in Brussels. There were some jealousies, but our relation-ship worked pretty well and we exchanged insights.

Q: *What sort of view were you were getting from the Luxembourgers over the very nationalistic regime of Charles De Gaulle in France?*

FRITTS: As I mentioned, Luxembourgers don't like bombast nationalism. They puncture it with drollery. The effective way to work in Luxembourg is the collegial informal American way. They found repugnant the formalistic high profile demarches of the French. On the other hand, their nine centuries of experience led them to move deftly among the powers on their borders.

Q: *We're still talking about the post WWII period of the '60s. How were the Germans looked upon at the time you were there?*

FRITTS: There was a deep residual anti-German feeling in Luxembourg. It was sub-rosa and not

public or official. The German embassy in Luxembourg was very low-key. The German ambassador, although imprisoned by Hitler, was not really snubbed, but invited only to the most formal events.

It's not well known, but in proportion to its population, Luxembourg lost more civilians killed by the Nazis than Poland. Many German Jews fled though Luxembourg, hundreds with the assistance of George Platt Waller, the American Minister to Luxembourg in the '30s. Luxembourg was also the first occupied country to revolt against Nazi Germany. Steelworkers in 1943 nailed the Luxembourg flag to their smokestacks and went on strike. The Nazis put it down brutally by executing people at random selected from various social and occupational groups and organizations.

So the Luxembourg policy attitude was "We value what the Americans have done and the kind of Europe (with Germany constrained) you are trying to build." Former Luxembourg Prime Minister Joseph Bech, still alive, was one of the grand old founders of the EEC. Germany aggression, atrocities and attitudes were still vivid, dating from WWI and before.

Q: *What were American economic and commercial interests in Luxembourg?*

FRITTS: In the 1960s came the first wave of direct foreign investment by American firms within the EEC and Luxembourg got is share - Monsanto, Bay State Abrasives, DuPont and maybe a dozen more new American firms arrived to complement a Goodyear plant that had been there before WWII and was constantly expanding. While just a first-tour officer, I was still the go-to Embassy point guy for American firms on briefings, advice, negotiation strategies, and eventually plant openings and visits. It also provided lots of excuses to travel throughout the country. The downside was a lot of nights and weekends in the office as I was a one-man band.

On the economic side, the interest was to breakdown and forestall trade barriers.
I made the demarches and became knowledgeable on all the issues that large commercial-economic sections were handling at our other EEC embassies. A particularly tiresome but high-profile matter were the recurring "Chicken Wars."

Q: *I was going to ask about the Chicken Wars ...*

FRITTS: We had textile wars, too, but the Chicken Wars - we had two great Chicken Wars, as I recall.

Q: *Could you explain what the Chicken Wars were?*

FRITTS: Sure, the generic issue of American export promotion versus EEC protectionism. It's still being fought today in different guises, such as beef hormones and genetically modified seeds. Back then, the EEC, currently the European Union, sought to protect its agricultural producers from American agribusiness. Ostensibly our farmers vs. their farmers. Essentially, European poultry producers charged that cheap American chickens grown with hormones and prepared feeds were unfair and unhealthy, whereas more expensive EEC chickens were grown "naturally" by scratching around in nature and were thus healthier, even if more expensive. The

official EEC view, of course, was not any alleged concern over the finances of its chicken producers, but that the hormones were bad for humans and that we were exporting these scientific chickens to destroy the EEC poultry industry. Which, of course, we were.

Q: *So what happened?*

FRITTS: Well, the crises were replete with brinkmanship threats for the imposition of countervailing duties e.g. no chickens, no cognac. There were broad policy debates over the implications for the vision of the Atlantic Alliance and the future of the world etc. Each compromise would soon become unglued.

I went back to Luxembourg twenty years later and looked up some colleagues who had been in the Luxembourg Foreign Office - one of them became ambassador to the EEC. We were having a glass of wine down by the Moselle. "You know," he said, "When you called to say you were coming in, we'd ask the topic. If you said "chickens," the three of us in the office would draw straws to see who had to receive you."

I recall on several occasions making a demarche on one thing or another and the Luxembourg official would say, "Okay," that's over. Let's adjourn to the bistro across the street for a glass." As an American I wasn't used to an aperitif in the morning, but that's where I heard about what the French and Germans and others were really doing.

Q: *Were you there when President Kennedy was assassinated?*

FRITTS: Yes, tragically. Ambassador Rivkin and I were in his limousine driving to an American trade show in the Hague. We only realized what had happened when we got to our hotel and the manager rushed out to say we had to watch TV as President Kennedy had been shot. We stayed in The Hague that night. The next morning, we returned to Luxembourg after a brief stop at the American trade show. The mounds of flowers laid by Dutch citizens overnight were so high that we had to go in the backdoor.

A memorial mass was held in the Luxembourg Cathedral with the Grand Duchess, the government and the diplomatic community present in droves. Hundreds were outside. There was a walking procession through the streets and, again, massive floral tributes. The embassy was banked by huge amounts of flowers. There was a tremendous outpouring of truly national grief. All of us received condolence letters for weeks, even from people we didn't know or who had met us only briefly. They talked about what the President and what America meant to them. The Kennedy image and impact were unprecedented for an American. The concluding memorial mass was held at the U.S. military cemetery at Hamm. There was a massive crowd there as well. It was really something.

Q: *Were you there during the Cuban Missile Crisis?*

FRITTS: I was, but it didn't impact much on me. All the high level stuff was handled on very close hold by Ambassador Wine and the DCM. Frankly, I was new, up to my ears, and really had no idea how dangerous the situation was - there was no CNN then and not much TV. Incredible

as it may seem now, it was a foreign policy crisis in another part of the world and I had a dozen things to be done tomorrow.

Q: *Was Joan Clark at Embassy Luxembourg then?*

FRITTS: Yes. Joan was the administrative officer. She was another role model, the first woman I had worked for. A fine manager, experienced and deft. She was expert in the intricacies of melding foreign policy with people and a subtle tiger in protecting policy and resource turf. She had a better grasp of how Luxembourg worked than either of our ambassadors and DCMs. She kept me out of trouble several times by explaining the pitfalls of my naivete or zeal. She was terrific to work with and for.

Q: *What was your impression of the Luxembourg diplomatic service?*

FRITTS: It was a totally career service. All the officers had advanced degrees, usually in law. Although they were low-key, I felt that underneath they believed they had to be a bit better than everybody else if they were going to retain Luxembourg's national independence and sovereignty. They were professional in every sense.

Q: *Bob, you said you'd like to comment on political ambassadors to Luxembourg. Why don't you do it now?*

FRITTS: Sure. I'd like to discuss political ambassadors in general later on, but as far as Luxembourg is concerned, by far most of our ambassadors have been political appointees. I'm aware that at one time the Luxembourg Foreign Minister requested a career ambassador and we sent one out. We've had a few.

Rivkin and Wine were serious and respected. Others wee not. I heard lots of unflattering Luxembourg anecdotes, for example, about Perle Mesta, who had been appointed by President Truman. She also lived on in embassy lore as having named her resident sister rather than the DCM as charge d'affaires a.i. when she left post on one her frequent absences. It got straightened out, but the Luxembourgers never forgot it.

The issue of representation to Luxembourg is now topical again (1999) as the Clinton Administration has spent several years seeking to confirm a Mr. Hormel, who is gay. I have no objection to gay or lesbians representing the United States, either in the Foreign Service or as ambassadors. As a matter of fact, I know a number of FSOs who were fine officers who did well, but were gay and I didn't know it until years later. But in the case of Mr. Hormel, as a retiree I wrote both Virginia Senators Robb and Warner recommending that Hormel not be confirmed. My view had nothing to do with his sexual preference, but that his confirmation with t such a delayed hyped appointment at such a late date in the Clinton Administration would be a financial waste for the taxpayer and a mismanagement of our bilateral relationship. The Luxembourgers, of course, will accept any American appointee and then work through their usually capable professional ambassadors in Washington. Anyhow, that's my two cents about that.

Q: *Let's see, you left Luxembourg in about..*

FRITTS: The summer of 1964.

THOMAS D. BOYATT
Economic/Commercial Officer
Luxembourg (1964-1966)

Ambassador Thomas D. Boyatt was born in Ohio. He joined the Foreign Service in 1959. In addition to serving in Chile, Ambassador Boyatt served in Luxembourg, Cyprus, and was ambassador to Upper Volta and Colombia. He was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 1990.

Q: *Your next assignment was another two year assignment. You went to Luxembourg.*

BOYATT: Yes, I did.

Q: *What were you doing there? This was from '64 to '66. How did you get the job?*

BOYATT: Roosa got me the job there, essentially. I was the economic-commercial officer, and he thought it would be useful to have somebody with a Treasury background. There was no Treasury officer there, so Roosa wanted to have someone with a Treasury background in Luxembourg because Luxembourg was just beginning the financial capital of Europe. I mean, officially designated as such by the communities, and still is. But the Eurobonds were being developed at that time, dollar denominated Eurobonds, and a variety of other vehicles were in the process of becoming, and I was to serve not only as the Foreign Service person there, but as kind of the Treasury person there. And whenever they would have any of their Treasury attaché meetings, I would get invited.

Q: *Was this almost your complete focus then while you were there?*

BOYATT: Yes.

Q: *You had an ambassador who was fairly well known in political circles in Washington, Patricia Harris.*

BOYATT: About half the time, yes.

Q: *Who was in the first half?*

BOYATT: Bill Rivkin, of the Rivkin Awards.

Q: *What was your impression about these two ambassadors?*

BOYATT: They were both politically appointed ambassadors, and they were both bright, and they were both dedicated. But they both had a political agenda which was something I had never seen before. I had been accustomed to bureaucrats with just simply a bureaucratic agenda, and that was it. And each of these ambassadors had a larger political agenda. There's nothing wrong with that, it's just a fact of life.

Q: *How was this translated as a political agenda? What do you mean?*

BOYATT: In the case of Bill, he was a Kennedy appointee, and he took his leadership, I think, from the White House and not from the State Department. And what he was interested in as an ambassador, was what was on the White House's plate, and not what was on the State Department's plate.

Q: *But in a way I can't think of anything dealing with Luxembourg that would even raise a...*

BOYATT: You're right. Apart from some of these economic/financial issues, and the fact that the Luxembourgers withdrew the company that they had in NATO during our time, there wasn't that much.

Q: *A company, you're talking about a military.*

BOYATT: I'm talking about a military company. They had one company, artillery, I think, committed to NATO and they withdrew it.

Q: *Were you involved at that time? I mean this is obviously a very small matter, but at the same time it is one of the NATO countries and for one to take its troops out, was there concern at the time this would be a snowball effect?*

BOYATT: Absolutely. It was viewed with great concern by Washington. This was the period in which de Gaulle had pulled France out of NATO as well. The beginning of the European maturation process was probably in that era. When people simply no longer took orders from Washington, and began to go about their business in their own ways.

Q: *From what you saw, how did the embassy react to this?*

BOYATT: Well, there wasn't much we could do. We reported, and the ambassador carried out his instructions to express concern. The thing that was the most interesting to me was the degree of hand wringing inside the Department. The Department was really concerned about the whole process of the centrifugal forces in Europe being more powerful than centripetal forces.

Q: *Was there anything we could do? Were there any pressures, or buttons we could push in Luxembourg?*

BOYATT: No, there wasn't much we could do. The only thing that we really could have done about the NATO problem all along, the only leverage that we had was the threat to drawdown and pull out our forces, and that was a non-playable card then. It's slightly more playable today,

but it was a non-playable card then. So we were in a situation where we didn't have much choice other than to bemoan the situation.

Q: *Why did Luxembourg do this?*

BOYATT: Money. Sheer finances, and it was unpopular with the youth. The same reason the Belgians and the Dutch are busting to get out of NATO now. They can't wait to declare peace, and get their troops out. You will recall recently there has already been one flap along those lines.

Q: *What about Patricia Harris? What was her agenda, and how did she operate?*

BOYATT: I have to tell you that I had real problems with her. I've since learned that I'm not alone in that regard, a lot of people did. She was very suspicious of the career service, and from my perspective, she equated disagreement with her on professional issues, issues of substance, as disloyalty. She gave both the DCM and myself very bad efficiency reports. And in retrospect I suppose I'm thankful because I suddenly realized that there were inequities in the Foreign Service. I was an FSO-4, I'd been promoted from 8 to 4 very rapidly. Now you think about that Stuart, that's four promotions in five years and, you know, I was a hotshot. I went from being a hotshot to being in the bottom five percent of the class in one year on the basis of her one bad efficiency report. So I wrote back to someone in Personnel, some bureaucrat, and said, "This is silly. Either I wasn't as good as you've been saying I was for the last five years, or I'm not as bad as you're saying I am now." I got this totally bureaucratic response, and I said, "To hell with it." But from that moment began my interest in the American Foreign Service Association.

Q: *Which for this you were later president of it, and a very active president. It's equivalent to the...*

BOYATT: It's not too much to say that we changed the whole damn system, Stuart. We put in an employment management relations system, and we put in a grievance system. In a sense we gave power to the people, and its never been the same since. It was the view of the abusive use of power by Ambassador Harris that got me started. I suddenly realized that there were no checks and balances. There wasn't due process. More for the DCM than myself, I was young and junior, and it didn't matter so much but he got hounded out of the Service because of this. From that moment on I was a sword carrier.

CHRISTIAN A. CHAPMAN
Political Officer
Luxembourg (1964-1966)

Christian A. Chapman is the son of an American father and a French mother. He entered the Foreign Service in 1950. In addition to Luxembourg, Mr. Chapman's career included posts in Morocco, Lebanon, Iran, Vietnam, France, and Laos. He was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 1990.

Q: In 1964 you finally got yourself out and you went to Luxembourg.

CHAPMAN: I chose Luxembourg for my next assignment because that was the seat of The High Authority of The Coal and Steel Community, the first in the construction of Europe. I still consider that the European Community was the one creative idea that came out of World War II. It has changed history. I had read up on it and was interested to take a closer look at it.

In terms of career, it was not a very intelligent move because by the time I reached Luxembourg the High Authority was in its dying days. It had fulfilled its basic functions and its only future was to be integrated into the larger framework of the European Economic Community in Brussels. So I didn't get much scope for activity and I was glad to be transferred a year and a half later to the international staff of NATO. By then, Ambassador Jack Tuthill and everyone else recognized that there was not much going on in Luxembourg. The Europeans had decided to fuse the High Authority into the European Community. The outstanding questions before the organization were largely administrative- questions of personnel, assignments and division of jobs among the different nationalities, the allocation of the various elements of the Authority between Luxembourg and Brussels. The fusion took three years to be resolved.

JAMES H. MORTON
Political Officer
Luxembourg (1964-1966)

James H. Morton entered the Foreign Service in 1964 after graduating from the University of Chicago. In addition to Luxembourg, Mr. Morton served in Greece, New Zealand, and Washington, DC. He was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 1993.

Q: So your first posting was to Luxembourg. What were you doing there?

MORTON: I was general factotum as the DCM wrote me in a letter. There was the ambassador and four officers. One was Tom Boyatt, the economic officer; one was Joan Clark, administrative officer; and then I was there. The Ambassador was a guy named William R. Rivkin, who had been John F. Kennedy's Mid West campaign manager. He was a Chicagoan and really the reason I ended up there because he went through the files looking for a Chicago boy to have at post. So I was the assistant political officer. I was the consular officer doing consular work a couple of hours a day. Joan Clark was combined admin/consular head. I was also the protocol officer. I had asked a couple of questions in Washington because I heard that it was the "Call Me Madam" post, a very protocol area post. I remember being told that I didn't have to worry about things, I could check with the protocol officer on my arrival. I asked for the protocol officer when I got to post and was told that I was the protocol officer. So that was one of my titles.

Another fascinating thing that I did and it was a great experience, I loved it, was to be the USIS

officer there. I worked with support out of Paris and Brussels. I also was the press attaché which was a real baptism under fire but it was something I liked and have always had a love for working with the press since that time. I have put it to good use in subsequent assignments.

So I did a little bit of everything.

Q: What was Ambassador Rivkin like?

MORTON: He was a hard charger. He was a heavy drinker. He was a guy who went full force. He was very good about inviting us to dinner. He invited me in my third week there to a dinner he hosted for the Prime Minister. We hit it off very well. But he was the kind of guy who after a dinner was over would say, "Come on let's have a drink." We would sit with him until three in the morning, of course you had to wait until the Ambassador dismisses you, totally sloshed and then we would go home. We had to show up at work at 8:30 and he would kind of walk in about 2 in the afternoon.

But he was a good ambassador. He was extremely active. He had a program that when he left that he was going to go and say goodbye in the ten largest towns in Luxembourg. Well, after you hit Luxembourg and Esch on the border, a steel town, the tenth town was called Larochette, which I think had a population of probably 300 people, and the mayor came and greeted us and he had big boots and mud and perhaps cow dung as we did on our shoes.

But he was a great guy and I hold him in great affection. Oddly enough not too long thereafter I got a telephone call, he had been named Ambassador to Senegal, and he asked me to come and join him there. I had heard about this Foreign Service phenomenon of hitching your wagon to a star and I decided that it wouldn't be a good thing, I enjoyed Luxembourg. Lo and behold three months later he died of a heart attack.

Q: We are talking about solid Cold War time. What was Luxembourg's role? We are talking 1964-66.

MORTON: Well, Luxembourg at that time was consolidating some of the elements of what used to be the Coal and Steel Community into Brussels. They were fusing the higher authority so that some of these offices were moving out of Luxembourg. As compensation they were making Luxembourg one of the banking centers of Europe, which it still is today.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of Luxembourg in those days is that the Soviet Embassy was a very large operation and purportedly they ran their spy operation out of Luxembourg. Other than that it was a very quiet, backwater post. They had one particular gentleman who was a prominent post war figure, Joseph Bech who finally died when I was in Luxembourg, but other than that it didn't bear much influence on anything. Although the Ambassador thought we were an important listening post, I don't think anything we reported had much impact back in Washington. But it was a very pleasant post and the people were extremely pleasant. I worked 60, 70 hour weeks mainly because Bill Rivkin spun his wheels a lot and we tried to keep up with him.

Q: There you are and we are talking not exactly about the navel of the universe and you are working 60 hours a week with the ambassador charging around, what was being done that needed being done?

MORTON: That is an excellent question. I have a theory, and I talk about it in my courses now, that if you open an embassy somewhere, for some reason, and I have been observing the embassy in Bishkek, some how work occurs. Activity just fills in the vacuum. I don't think I would have been working 70 hours a week if it hadn't been for Bill Rivkin. On the other hand there was a fairly heavy consular load because among other things Icelandic Airlines terminated there and all the people who did Europe on a shoestring...

Q: Icelandic had the cheapest air fares.

MORTON: Icelandic did not belong to IATA at that time. Every American who did Europe on a shoestring would end up back at Icelandic Airlines in Luxembourg usually broke and we had an extremely large group of people who wanted money from the US Embassy. We had a little slush fund, which I think was illegal, and all sorts of problems. So there was a heavy consular load.

We did all sorts of other spot political reporting and we had a very active cultural program. I was also the cultural officer and during that time we had Arthur Rubenstein give a concert there. They had a beautiful concert hall. We kept bringing in concert groups and that took up a lot of my time making arrangements. I think they made a lot of impact because they are very culture conscious in Europe in general, and Luxembourg in particular.

Q: How was it as a so-called listening post?

MORTON: Well, I have to say I don't think it was much of a listening post. There wasn't really much important things to write about. One of my responsibilities was to keep track of the Luxembourg army. Now that was 600 men strong. But it was seen as a token and an important contribution to NATO, that they were doing their share. I would go off with the Luxembourg army on maneuvers in Bonnhoder Germany, one of the pits of Germany. It was sort of like Iceland contributing its airport to the NATO cause.

But I can't remember, as I search my mind, writing much of anything of great importance to Washington. Nobody quite frankly cared. The Luxembourg political scene was fairly stable. One of the things I did that I still have some pride about is trying to work with the trade union movement in the south of Luxembourg where all the steel mills are. At one time Luxembourg was the sixth largest steel producer in the world, if you can imagine. I actually came back and recommended for an International Visitor Grant, a guy named Jacques Post, who later became the Prime Minister of Luxembourg. So that was a pay off that came some twenty years later. He came back with a very positive opinion from that visit.

But back to your point about political reporting, I can't remember a single report that sticks out in my mind.

Q: Well, somehow I don't have a feeling about the cabinet and the President sitting around and

saying "Well, what do you think Luxembourg will do if we do this?"

MORTON: Exactly. I can't even remember a request from Washington. Some times we would get things asking how Luxembourg will vote on this issue or that issue in the United Nations. And occasionally about their attitude re a NATO issue. But Luxembourg followed the US line pretty well.

Q: Then in 1966 you went where and did what?

MORTON: Let me say first of all that after Bill Rivkin left, we received in Luxembourg the first black woman ambassador in history, Patricia Roberts Harris. She was appointed by Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Q: Was she there while you were there?

MORTON: She was there. I worked for her for a year. We hit it off very well as did Joan Clark. But there was a division in the embassy and frankly I think she was responsible for the ending of the career of our DCM. She found in him her worst suspicions about career Foreign Service officers and they did not hit it off terribly well.

Q: People admired her because of her career and rising up and all, but at the same time I heard she was not a very lovable ambassador.

MORTON: She wasn't. We got along but she could be pretty nasty about things. I think she came with a large chip on her shoulder. I think the DCM brought troubles on himself. But her reaction was an over reaction, I think. It was a very unfortunate thing because this small embassy was driven into two camps. I was in a position as a junior of not wanting to get into a camp because the DCM happened to write my report. And I have to say I think that when he perceived I was in his camp, she would tell me to make up a guest list for dinner and say not to show it to the DCM and he would come in and ask me to see the guest list, so it was one of those situations.

Q: How did you deal with this problem?

MORTON: I tried the best I could to keep my fences mended in both camps. I did the best I could to serve two masters and sometimes I would just have to say, "Mr. DCM, the Ambassador asked me to do it that way. All I can suggest is that you talk to her about it." It was very difficult. I was a junior officer. I was at that time quite hopeful of getting a rapid promotion and that sort of thing. I went out of my way when we were all together not to show that I did have a special relationship with the Ambassador.

Q: You saw her operate for a year, how effective did you find her?

MORTON: I don't think she was an effective ambassador. She really came into an alien world. Her father had been a porter on the railroad. She came from a poor background in Alton, Illinois. Again I say she had a chip on her shoulder and I think everybody bent over backwards in Luxembourg officialdom, but somehow I think part of her lack of effectiveness was that she felt

like she was a fish out of water in one of the most protocol conscious area of the world. I think she just didn't like to play the game and consequently conversations would be brusque and impatient. People would say that she was a tough woman to deal with and we are not sure she is doing the best job for America's image here.

Q: Well, then you left. How did you come out?

MORTON: I came out of it very well because to be perfectly honest the DCM knew that he had to write a good report on me in both instances and she wrote glowing reports. I got two very rapid promotions in the Foreign Service out of that one post. I said to myself at that time, "I am moving too fast. This is ridiculous, I shouldn't be moving this fast. I have done nothing." And, of course, later on I felt I was moving too slowly.

RICHARD W. BOEHM
Deputy Chief of Mission
Luxembourg (1966-1968)

Ambassador Richard W. Boehm entered the Foreign Service in 1954 after working in the private sector. His assignments included posts in Japan, Germany, Turkey, Cyprus, Oman, and Washington, DC. Ambassador Morton was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 1994.

Q: Then you left EUR in 1966. Where did you go?

BOEHM: I was offered the job of DCM [Deputy Chief of Mission] in Luxembourg. Of course, at that stage of my career, to be offered a job as DCM as a relatively junior officer was a happy kind of situation to be in. So I went to Luxembourg.

Q: Who was the Ambassador and how were you...

BOEHM: The Ambassador was the well known figure, Patricia Roberts Harris -- Pat Harris -- whom I had first become aware of during the 1964 Democratic convention which nominated Lyndon Johnson to succeed himself as President. I remember staying up until early in the morning, watching the umpteenth seconding speech to his nomination. Pat Harris gave one of those. She came on television around 2:00 AM to second the nomination of Lyndon B. Johnson. It was gripping. I was really going to sleep at that time, after a series of speeches and a lot of hot air. All of a sudden, here was this vibrant personality, saying something interesting and trenchant, and I woke up. So I knew of Pat Harris. President Johnson appointed her Ambassador to Luxembourg.

Q: Had you met her before you went to Luxembourg?

BOEHM: Well, of course, she had been back in Washington, and she interviewed me and other candidates for the position of DCM, as well. She invited me to go there as her DCM. I should

warn you ahead of time, Stu, that I'm not going to make any personal comments on any ambassador I ever served as DCM. So don't ask.

Q: Let me try, not in an oblique but rather direct way. As a practical matter, I would like to ask you how they operated, because ambassadors operate in different ways. I'm always interested in personal comments, because I think this shows that foreign affairs are not just a matter of robots going out to a post. There are personalities and real people and all that. But beyond that, there also is the operating style. I wonder if you could comment on that.

BOEHM: I could make some general observations on this. I'm counting now, in my head, the number of ambassadors I worked for as a DCM. There were two in Luxembourg, two in Kathmandu [Nepal], and two in Turkey. I worked for a total of six ambassadors as DCM. Four of these ambassadors were political appointees. Two of them were career people. As far as all of them were concerned, whether they were career or political people, you had to gain their confidence. They have to believe that you are working for them and that you haven't got your own agenda which you're trying to carry out. One difference would be that the career ambassador might know you, though not necessarily. I worked as DCM for a career ambassador I had never met. If the career people don't know you, they know somebody who does know you, and they can find out a lot about you before they actually get you as DCM. They are less likely to be suspicious of you because they figure that you know what the relationship should be.

Political ambassadors, on the other hand, don't start from that position. My own feeling is that they often tend to start from the notion that the career Foreign Service is out to get them, or at least, to control them.

Q: It's a funny thing, because it just isn't true.

BOEHM: It's almost never true. Sometimes the political ambassadors have this perception ahead of time. Sometimes they reach this conclusion later on. I didn't have that experience. From what political ambassadors for whom I worked as DCM told me about my predecessors as DCM, I could see that some of my predecessors had never gained their confidence. The political ambassador ended up thinking the same thing that he thought at first, that the career DCM was out to subvert him.

The Department is probably at fault for this. I'll tell you why. There's a natural tension between the Department and a political ambassador. The Department thinks that the guy probably doesn't know what he's doing. Except at a really large Embassy, like Germany or the U. K., where the Secretary of State probably has direct contact with the ambassador, in the case of a smaller Embassy, the Department relies on the DCM to steer a political ambassador. The Department in effect tells the DCM, "Look, this ambassador is brand new and doesn't know what he's doing. It's up to you to steer him." Some DCM's, I regret to say, don't have the tact to handle that.

Q: The diplomatic skills.

BOEHM: They don't have the skills, and the Ambassador might conclude that they're trying to manipulate him or have their own agenda. They may be too blunt in telling him what he ought to

do. The first thing you have to do in that situation is to gain the confidence of the political ambassador. Then, when you've done that and he believes that you're there to help him and to make sure that he succeeds in his job -- that you're really working for him -- he will probably listen to you. If you say, "I really don't think that that's the way we ought to do this" or, "You ought to go and call on so and so," he'll usually pay attention. However, unless the DCM gains the ambassador's confidence, it's going to be a very bad situation.

Q: You had two political ambassadors...

BOEHM: In Luxembourg.

Q: Patricia Harris and George Feldman. George Feldman came from Malta, where he'd been Ambassador.

BOEHM: George Feldman had been Ambassador once before.

Q: What were their operational styles?

BOEHM: I'm not going to discuss the individuals.

Q: OK. What were the issues in Luxembourg?

BOEHM: There were basically very few issues. Luxembourg was a country which was very favorably disposed to the United States, the country which had liberated it in both World Wars, and also as the country that prevented the smaller countries in Western Europe from being dominated by France or Germany. The weight of the United States in the Atlantic Alliance was very beneficial to the small countries. So Luxembourg was very pro-American. There were parades and processions all year long, honoring this or that occasion when the United States liberated this or that town.

Q: You went to Bastogne and other places?

BOEHM: That was in Belgium.

Q: But right next to Luxembourg. I meant places like Echternach and Ettelbruck and so forth.

BOEHM: They had societies devoted to commemorate wonderful things that we had done for them. It was very refreshing.

Q: Were you getting any reflections from them on how they viewed France? The withdrawal of France [from NATO] must still have been reverberating.

BOEHM: It was reverberating for everybody. The Luxembourgers, of course, don't want trouble with any of their neighbors. They don't say much. They don't tend to take strong positions on issues. They just sit back and let other people [lead the way]. As long as the United States is in there, they figure that nothing too awful can happen. So they accept whatever decisions come

out, which are made by others. They have no illusions about their own place in the world. They know that they are a very tiny power. They don't want to play a power role. So it was a very easy situation for the U.S. Embassy there. But the French posture was not easy for the government of Luxembourg, and they took the position not to take any position. They would support us when they could, which they usually did. But they wouldn't get up in arms and argue with anybody. And they wanted to maintain good relations with France. In Luxembourg the countries which the people needled were the Belgians and the Germans. For Luxembourg, these are the two countries they have perceived historically as leaning on them. The German Embassy really had a hell of a time in Luxembourg.

Q: What were some of the things that happened?

BOEHM: Well, Luxembourg is hypersensitive to anything German, although Luxembourgers are far more German than anything else. Every time a German tourist would come over the border, the Luxembourg cops would give him a speeding ticket, even though he was going 10 miles an hour. They just kept needling the Germans.

The Belgians -- well. If you look to see what is going on in Luxembourg, most of the time nothing much is going on. It's a lovely, pleasant place, but not a place where things are happening. So whenever anything comes along, you go to see and do it, whether it's a concert or an exhibition. Well, the Belgians mounted an exhibit of political cartoons, which sounded like a lot of fun. We were looking forward to it. They opened it in the town of Esch, in southern Luxembourg. It never got to the capital because it turned out that some of the cartoons had been drawn by a Belgian who was supposed to have been a Nazi collaborator during World War II. The Luxembourg press made a tremendous thing out of it, and the Belgians withdrew the exhibit. We never got to see it.

That was the kind of thing that happened. They were always looking for some club to beat the Belgians and Germans with.

Q: But there was no "Americans, Get Out" or "Americans..."

BOEHM: Well, you would get the occasional demonstration. There was a Communist Party there, which was active, anti-NATO, and anti-American. The Vietnam War, which was going on at the time I was there, did produce some demonstrations by kids -- youth, teenagers -- who marched up to the American Embassy, carrying signs denouncing our policies in Vietnam. Vietnam was the one sour note, I would say, in U.S.-Luxembourg relations, as it was with many other countries.

Q: Well, you left Luxembourg in 1968 and went to the War College. Is that right?

BOEHM: Well, I had to leave there in 1968 because of a family illness. It should have been a three year tour, but I had to cut it short and return to the United States in 1968 and went to the War College.

Q: Which one did you go to?

BOEHM: I went to the War College at Ft. McNair, the National War College.

Q: How did you find that as a training experience?

BOEHM: In view of what I'd been doing for some time, which basically was political-military stuff -- and this was true of Luxembourg, too...

GEORGE FELDMAN
Ambassador
Luxembourg (1967-1969)

Ambassador George Feldman began his career in international relations in 1965 after working at the Federal Trade Commission and in the private sector. He served as ambassador to Malta and Luxembourg. Ambassador Feldman was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 1988.

Q: Moving on to Luxembourg, how did you come to be assigned from Malta to Luxembourg?

FELDMAN: I think it was at the time when -- what's her name? She had been ambassador to Luxembourg, and she wanted to get out.

Q: Was this Patricia Harris?

FELDMAN: Patricia Harris, yes.

Q: She became a cabinet secretary of HEW or something like that.

FELDMAN: So they asked me if I'd be interested, and I said I was. I had better than two years in Malta, and so we went there. However, it was very different there, because it's very prosperous.

Q: What did you see as your principal goals in Luxembourg?

FELDMAN: My principal goals were to just cement our relationship, mostly. I worked hard. You know, you can sit on your ass and do nothing, not do a hell of a lot; on the other hand, I never did that, because I never did it all my life. I had to be active. I became very close to the prime minister. And I became -- oddly enough, close to the head of the Socialist Party there, he was about as anti-American as he could be. He came to a cocktail party that we had at the residence, and he was insulting. I didn't insult him back or anything of that sort, but pretty soon he came around. I'd see him once in a while. Then he got sick, and I brought over some books. From then on, he couldn't have been more pro-American than anybody there. And that was true with Gaston Thorn, who was the head of a different party. His wife was the best journalist in Malta. We became very fast friends. I can show you pictures here. They came and visited us in the south of France and all that sort of thing. When they came to this country, we saw a lot of

them. We gave some parties for them in New York and all that.

Q: How was your staff in Luxembourg?

FELDMAN: I had Dick Boehm as my deputy there, and he was marvelous, absolutely marvelous. He was there for about a year, and then his wife had that dialysis thing. In fact, the State Department couldn't do much about it, but I arranged for John McCormack to get her into Peter Bent Brigham Hospital.

Q: The hospital in Boston.

FELDMAN: Yes. Naturally, he had to be with her. I had a good staff. In Malta, I had the worst administrative officer, and that was Alta Fowler. When the inspectors came, boy, they were the ones to get rid of her, and she was replaced by Wyrick, who was very good. But in Malta, I had -- what's her name? She became the director of the Department.

Q: Joan Clark?

FELDMAN: Joan Clark, yes.

Q: Yes. She became Director General of the Foreign Service and later became ambassador to Malta.

FELDMAN: To Malta. Joan was terrific. I gave her a hell of a report. Dick Boehm was marvelous. Then he was replaced by -- what the hell was his name? Oh, God, he was awful. He was Josh Logan's half-brother. You know, the playwright. What the hell was his name? His wife, she wasn't American, but she was just awful. He started to raise hell with some of the other staff, who were good, very good, in fact. You couldn't ask for -- particularly when Dick was there with just one. I had a secretary in Luxembourg, McCanliss, who was better than anything I ever had in private life. She was smarter than I'll ever be. Wanda McCanliss. She then went with Ambassador Beam in Poland and then went to Russia and then to Japan, and just recently retired.

Q: Mansfield.

FELDMAN: With Mansfield. She's in a class by herself. She was smarter than I. She just was great.

Q: That can make a post.

FELDMAN: Oh, she was out of this world. I really mean this. I love her.

Q: How were your relations with the iron and steel community? Did you have much to do with that?

FELDMAN: I had something to do with all of them there. I'm a busybody; what are you going to do? We had the Goodyear Tire thing, the biggest employer there, and we also had the entire tire

company, the one on the Belgium border. Then we had Monsanto. Had a lot of American factories there, you know, a number of them. I'll never forget when they had the fair each year, and the Russians and Hungarians and all that sort of thing had big, big displays there. All we had was a little booth. I remember going through it, and the Grand Duke came through, and the Prime Minister was there and so on, going through it, and all of a sudden, the Russian ambassador came by, and he said, in his broken way, "Mr. Ambassador, could you show me where the American exhibit is?" The Prime Minister was there, the Grand Duke, and so on, their Minister of Industry and whatnot.

I said, "I'd be delighted to. I have my car outside. If you want to follow me or come in my car, we will go to the Monsanto, and I'll show you Monsanto. We'll go to Du Pont; I'll show you the Du Pont plant. I'll show you the Goodyear plant and the other tire plant."

Q: Firestone?

FELDMAN: No. I forget the name. Then I said, "We'll go up and I'll show you the new plant that you just put in there, the one building the large earth-moving equipment in the steel area." So I couldn't possibly put them all together in any other place. [Laughter] Everybody laughed, and he just kind of crawled away and didn't bother me from then on.

Q: How were your relations with the Grand Duke?

FELDMAN: Couldn't be better. He gave me the highest award there after I left. That's the one that's hanging up there.

Q: Were we very much involved in the politics of Luxembourg?

FELDMAN: Wernerago, was very pro-American. They're good, solid people. The only thing bad about Luxembourg was for my wife. There were good things, because it was near Paris and London and Belgium, which she loved. [Laughter] But they had the most modern kind of an insane asylum. They have the most modern hospitals. They were highly, highly cultivated people.

Q: Did you have much to do with the American military there?

FELDMAN: Sometimes. Yes, I had the general out. I've got pictures in there. We had the NATO whatchamacallit there, and the armed forces came in.

Q: War College and things like this. But there were no great military . . .

FELDMAN: No, except this. Most of the speeches I made there -- and most of them are in the Congressional Record, by the way -- were made at the cemetery.

Q: Oh, yes, because particularly of the Battle of the Bulge.

FELDMAN: Hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of Americans, as far as you can see.

Q: Yes.

FELDMAN: The only mistake the President made when he went to Bitburg, which I had visited often, was that he didn't also go to the cemetery.

Q: We are referring to the controversial visit of President Reagan to the German cemetery at Bitburg several years ago, because there were many SS troops buried there.

FELDMAN: I visited it. I didn't see a thing wrong about the President visiting it, but I think they could have offset whatever criticism took place, which I think was unjustified. He should have visited the other cemetery, just 30 miles away.

RUTH LEWIS FARKAS
Ambassador
Luxembourg (1973-1976)

Ambassador Ruth Lewis Farkas was born in New York on December 20, 1906. She obtained a B.A. in education from the University of New York and an M.A. from Columbia University. She was ambassador to Luxembourg. Ambassador Farkas was interviewed by Ann Miller Morin on October 24, 1985.

FARKAS: Because when I came to Luxembourg and asked to look over the budget of the previous year and saw things that never had been spent, I said to John Hollingsworth, my administrative counselor, "Look, we don't need as much money as they give us." And I was advised, "Don't send any back, because once you send it back, you'll never get it again." I said, "Well, I'm sending it back." I sent back $10,000. Never got a thank you for it, but I sent it back. But then, a year later, when Mr. Kissinger wanted to come with some men and we needed more space, and I was going to partition some of the office off for them, I asked for some money and they wouldn't give it to me. I did it to myself. It was like *deja vu*: "I told you not to do it."

Q: Yes, I can just hear John.

FARKAS: He was right.

Q: Well, he'd been in the government enough years to know.

FARKAS: Yes, he was. I wasn't used to seeing --

Q: You thought it worked like business.

FARKAS: Yes. I learned a lot. What we could say? You don't know! I'm telling you, on the sensible things, you can't get anything.

I got some furniture in there that I never even ordered. Somebody ordered it. Kingdon Gould must have ordered it; I don't know. When it came, I said, "What's it for?" We didn't even have room to put it. You know what? I put it up in my residence, on the fourth floor. I never saw it again.

Q: Is that right?

FARKAS: I didn't need it; I just didn't need it. Couldn't get your money back.

***

Q: So you prepared yourself to go over to Luxembourg. You requested a good briefing on the politics, et cetera. How much briefing did you actually get on the nuts and bolts of running an embassy? Or did they figure that you knew?

FARKAS: I got nothing out of it [as to] nuts and bolts.

Q: Did they tell you what your rights were? The people that you yourself could hire?

FARKAS: Yes, they told me that if I wanted to keep the chief minister [Deputy Chief of Mission], I could. Anybody I wanted not to keep I could let go. They told me that.

Q: Apparently they don't always.

FARKAS: Well, I asked.

Q: Part of it is knowing what to ask, isn't it? So you went out there and you decided to keep the people as they were?

FARKAS: Well, no. I didn't keep Galanto for long.

Q: No, but he was due for a transfer anyway, wasn't he?

FARKAS: Well, he really would have liked to stay because his children were in school there and everything, but I figured that he was so directed by Kingdon Gould, who was before me, that I didn't think it was wise.

Q: He was still trying to run things the way Gould had done it?

FARKAS: Yes.

Q: Can you give me an example?

FARKAS: Well, let me see. A certain telegram came, and I don't know where I was. I wasn't out of the country, but I was some place in another city. It wasn't important, but, on the other hand, I didn't think that he had the right to do it. He answered it.

Q: He did? No, of course, he didn't [have the right].

FARKAS: And I told him, "Don't you ever dare do that again. I'm the responsible party here." I said, "Not that what you did is so wrong, but the fact of the matter was that it could have been wrong."

Q: Well, yes.

FARKAS: And he'd better know that: "I'm the Ambassador now and you're no longer the chief here." So that's when I decided that maybe it was best to change.

Q: He had been chargé for a while, hadn't he?

FARKAS: Oh, yes. He was chargé for a good bit. You know, it's a difficult thing. He didn't know me, didn't know my abilities -- or disabilities, for that matter, and so I guess he figured, "Well, maybe I'd just as well answer the thing." So I was a little bit miffed.

Q: I don't blame you. This was early on, I gather?

FARKAS: In the beginning.

Q: Well, now I want to ask you something, because this is the thing that I didn't know about before. Some of the people like yourself, who have come in from other careers, have told me there's a sort of patronizing air that the FSOs use toward what they called "non-career." Did you run into that?

FARKAS: I'll tell you with whom. Disappointingly, Joan Clark.

Q: Did you? With Joan Clark? And what were the circumstances of that?

FARKAS: Well, she was the one who directed you to the embassy, I think; I forget exactly. I had lunch with her once or twice, but I never could get really *to* her, never, and I always felt that: "Kind of keep your distance." And you know, she was the one who should really have been doing the briefing, too, at the time. She eventually became an ambassador to some place.

Q: That's right. Currently, she's the Assistant Secretary for Consular affairs.

FARKAS: Is she?

Q: Yes, she's got one of the big jobs. She's done extremely well.

FARKAS: I understand that she's very capable.

Q: Yes, so I've heard.

FARKAS: She's probably a very nice person, but I just could never warm up to her. She's an impersonal person. Maybe her job makes her that way. I don't know.

Q: I met her only once, when she agreed to do an oral history. Among the staff that you had there, did you ever feel --

FARKAS: You mean, in Luxembourg?

Q: Yes. Did you ever feel that any of them were regarding you as though you were an outsider?

FARKAS: No. I had wonderful rapport with all of them.

Q: Oh, I know John and Renate (Hollingsworth) think the world of you.

FARKAS: Well, what I would do, and lot of ambassadors never do, I invited them to dinner every once in a while. Let their hair down, talk to each other, talk to me. You know, I'm a person, they're persons. I think it was very helpful. And even with the Marines, I went to their place a few times and had lunch or dinner with them. After all, they were youngsters, and their parents' sons. I have sons.

Q: How did you see your mission as the President's personal representative? What were your goals when you took on this job?

FARKAS: Well, first of all, I was asked to see if there's a way that we could have Luxembourg importing from the United States, and inasmuch as my husband was in the department store business, and knowing a lot about import/export, and looking at some of the things they had and the prices -- because Luxembourg had very high prices even then -- I thought there was a way that they could really go to the United States and learn about some of the things that we could send them. I tried. I had some of the merchants at my home.

Q: Did they have a Board of Trade there, that sort of thing? Do they have organizations such as we do?

FARKAS: No.

Q: They don't have anything like that?

FARKAS: No. You know, it's not a big country.

Q: Sure, but it's quite wealthy, isn't it?

FARKAS: I would say it's a very comfortable country. There's no terrific wealth and there's no poverty.

Q: They could import?

FARKAS: Yes. They did import a lot of things. You know, they're known for their steel. They have one of the biggest steel mills -- Arbed -- and things like that, but they didn't make clothing or shoes. Those were all imported.

Q: From France, mostly?

FARKAS: France, Spain, different countries, but I could see that they had nothing from the United States, and we could have done a lot with them. I once asked my husband to help me, and he said, "I have nothing to do with your job." I did have a meeting, though, of the top merchants in Luxembourg. I told them that we would be very happy to help them go to the United States, and go to the Department of Commerce, and be directed to some of our best manufacturers and purchasing offices, and, sorry to say, Commerce didn't do anything.

Q: Commerce dropped the ball?

FARKAS: They didn't do anything. What happened was, one of them [Luxembourgers] came to me and said, "You know, I was in the United States and I saw some wonderful leather coats in Alexander's. Where did you get them?" I said, "I really don't know where we get them."

So I said to my husband, "Would you do me a favor just once, and talk to them at the residence?" "Well," he said, "only once."

So they came, and he said, "Look, we buy from all over the world. If you want to come to our buying office, we'll try to direct you for the things you want. We don't go any further than that. We'll be as helpful as we can." So, about 12 of them went. They had to go to our office and they directed them where to get things that they wanted in the United States.

Q: Through Alexander's?

FARKAS: Our buying office did it for them.

Q: I mean, it wasn't the government.

FARKAS: No, no. Our buyers didn't want to bother with it; they had their own problems, you know. So they would send them to purchasing offices that had nothing to do with us at all. They'd say, "Look, these people know about leather coats, these people know about shoes," and so forth.

Q: So, did they eventually --

FARKAS: They bought quite a few things, through the different purchasers. It had nothing to do with Commerce.

Q: Who was doing your commercial work at the embassy? Did you have a Commercial Attaché?

FARKAS: Economic Counselor.

Q: Who was that?

FARKAS: It was [Stephen] Lande. Then he was sent to Geneva. He's a brilliant young man, by the way.

Q: Is he?

FARKAS: Yes, I would have taken him into our business in a minute, but he was sold on the government; wouldn't change. Capable as all come.

Q: Did you select your second DCM after [Galanto]?

FARKAS: I sure did, yes.

Q: How did you go about that?

FARKAS: I spoke to some people I knew in France who were partially in government; not political, but knew what was going on in the world. And then I spoke to somebody I knew in Belgium through my sister-in-law's family, and I finally decided on a young man. He was terrific. At that time, he was principal officer in Lyon.

I didn't ask anybody [in the Department] about him; just what I gleaned for myself. I had him come to see me, and I liked him. I liked his ideas, I liked his viewpoints; a clean-looking young guy. And I took him on. They offered me somebody else first. Forget it.

Q: Did they send you a list to let you pick people from?

FARKAS: Yes, but I didn't want them.

Q: You didn't do that; you got your own?

FARKAS: I figured I'd use my own list and my head. He was with me for two and a half years, I guess; I think it was that. He was -- I'm just trying to think -- he was everything you would want. Spoke French beautifully. He had gone to the Sorbonne for awhile. His father originally was with Macy's, if I'm not mistaken -- one of those department stores -- so we could speak the same language in a certain way. I would write my own reports, you know. Sometimes if I'd want to write a report to the government that I felt was more than [narrow] political [reporting], I would say, "Peter, just go over this," and he always did very well. He was really good.

Then what happened was, Mr. Kissinger decided to send one of his young men that had been with him for a while and wanted to be an attaché and wanted to be under me in Luxembourg. He'd heard I was a good ambassador to work for, because I worked with my people -- not as a top-notch ambassador, but as somebody who was part of a team, and I told them that. I said, "You know, even though I'm ambassador, everybody has to have a head of every firm, [but] we're all working together and nobody's trying to compete." I don't know, but I think we had a

pretty good team; we really did.

Q: Well, so I gather. What happened?

FARKAS: Well, what happened was that on account of Kissinger, I had to let him go. Kissinger was going to put this . . .

Q: Was his name Tarnoff, by the way? Peter Tarnoff?

FARKAS: Yes. Peter Tarnoff. Oh, he was good. Finally, Vance took him on.

Q: Vance took Tarnoff?

FARKAS: Yes. He worked for Vance for some little time.

Q: I had heard -- I wondered if you kept in touch with Tarnoff, because I understood that he became disillusioned with the system.

FARKAS: He was, and what happened was awful. I wrote in his resumé that he could very capably run an embassy. No doubt.

Q: How did you handle efficiency reports? Did you have your DCM do the draft?

FARKAS: No. I did those myself.

Q: You did all of it?

FARKAS: I never let them do it, because, you know, there's certain things you see in a person and the other one doesn't, just like correcting a paper for a student. I mean, he may be expressing himself in a way that a person just reading would say, "He doesn't know what he's talking about," but I knew what his ideas were, so I would say, "Nothing doing. I correct papers." And the same thing with that. Nobody ever wrote a report for me. That was taboo.

Q: How many efficiency reports did you do? Did you do all of your principal officers?

FARKAS: Yes.

Q: And your secretary?

FARKAS: And my secretary, yes.

Q: Tell me about her.

FARKAS: Oh, she was great.

Q: What was her name?

FARKAS: Louise [Farnus]. My social secretary [was] Miriam Zigrand. She was great. I still keep in touch with her.

Q: Was that somebody you hired -- your social secretary?

FARKAS: Yes, I hired Zigrand myself. Kingdon Gould left me a very lovely young lady, but I like a goer, a doer -- somebody very alive -- and Kingdon's girl was a lovely lady, very gentle, but I felt: "Never mind gentle; I need someone more alive," so I got this Zigrand.

Q: Was she a Foreign Service secretary, or was this somebody you brought in completely from the outside?

FARKAS: She was not American. Not American Foreign Service. She was terrific. She knew everybody. Her mother was from Belgium, her father was a Luxembourger. She was living in Luxembourg. Her mother was a descendent of one of the [noble] families of Luxembourg. She had a fine background. She went to the University after that. I think she went to Montpellier.

After I let this girl go, from Gould, I got a very lovely lady from Virginia. I think her name was Virginia, too, and she was about to retire. She told me when she came that she was going to be doing it. I said, "That's all right." I said I'd rather have her ability for a short time than not." So she was with me for about seven months. She was very good. And then I got Louise. Well, she was excellent, and I tell you, she used to work.

Q: Did you ever have any women officers working for you?

FARKAS: Yes, I had one downstairs that had to do with passports and things like that, and I had another one who had to do with auditing. They were Luxembourgers.

Q: What is your unvarnished opinion of the quality of FSO personnel? The professional diplomats?

FARKAS: Well, of course, you can't make an overall, general rule, but I do think that they sometimes hesitate making a decision because it's not within the format of the diplomatic peripheries.

Q: Do you think this is because of the "promotion up or selection out" business? That they're afraid to put their careers on the line?

FARKAS: I think so; I think so; very much so. That's why I liked Peter Tarnoff so much. He just figured, "If I'm wrong, I'm wrong, and what the heck!" And another very nice man -- I think John Hollingsworth later left me -- and I got a very nice young man by the name of O'Connell; a lovely kid.

Q: By the way, how did you like John's work?

FARKAS: I found John a very fine Foreign Service Officer, but he got so German, you know, really. I used to get a kick out him, though. You know, he'd wear these plus-fours, and it was always "kuss die Hand." I used to get a kick out of it. But he was a very nice, a good worker.

Q: Yes, yes. And he knows his business.

FARKAS: When he was going to do something, you could be sure that John would do it. It was going to get done.

Q: And another thing that certainly was true in North Africa: he was very, very aware of where Uncle Sam's money went, and you never had to worry that there would be anything funny going on if John was handling the books.

FARKAS: Yes, I know, I know.

Q: With your staff, did you ever have any problems of morale? I couldn't imagine it in Luxembourg, but did you have any alcoholism, that sort of thing, among your people?

FARKAS: No, they were really terrific. I had two men down in Communications that were out of this world. There were no hours that they wouldn't work. They were really terrific.

Q: Luxembourg's a plum, of course.

FARKAS: Yes. I don't think a group could have been better. I'm not kidding. I'm not just saying that. As I say, you make them feel they're part of you, and that's very important.

I remember when we first opened -- you know, I opened up the first cultural center in Luxembourg, because I felt that the Russians were doing such a job and we weren't doing anything. I said to my social secretary, "Miriam, we've got to have something."

"Well," she said, "Let's see if we can't get some building." We got the building from the government. It wasn't being used. I think it was an art gallery, or something -- first floor and basement. We asked the government if we could have it, open it up, and they said yes. We got 3,000 books first, and then we had some pictures and things like that, so we'd have an art show. Then we started to have children's books, and it really became a heck of a wonderful center, because, you see, Miami University -- now, not the University of Miami, but Miami University from Ohio -- had their junior year there. They really enjoyed it, because it was a place for them to come, and there were American things there.

Q: Where'd you get the books?

FARKAS: From our government.

Q: From the Department -- USIS?

FARKAS: Yes. And then, of course, a lot of other people gave us books.

Q: Who was your USIS officer, your PAO [Public Affairs Officer]?

FARKAS: We didn't have one.

Q: You didn't have a PAO? Who did you put in charge of the library?

FARKAS: Actually, Miriam. She did it.

Q: She handled that? Well, that was pretty good. It still exists, does it?

FARKAS: Oh yes. It's gotten much bigger.

Q: Sometimes it takes an outsider to point out the obvious.

FARKAS: Yes. I couldn't imagine not having something cultural for the Americans who were there, or even for Luxembourgers interested in Americans. And they're so interested.

Q: Is there a very large group there, an American group?

FARKAS: No.

Q: No? But I suppose they drift through all the time?

FARKAS: Oh, yes; that they do, but, I mean, as stationary, no. There's the American-Luxembourg Society, you know, and these Luxembourgers, they adore the Americans, I tell you.

Q: How did they react to having another American ambassador who was not only a woman, but a political one?

FARKAS: Well, I wasn't political. You see, I was diplomatic -- I never did anything political, to say. I never was out for this Republican or that one, no. What I did was mostly in the cultural area, or diplomatic service, like UNESCO's Science Commission. Being on the Executive Committee of the Science Commission is not political. And all of these things -- for handicapped, not political.

Q: Was that brought out in the press -- all the things you had done back here? Was it explained to them what your background was?

FARKAS: Well, I'll tell you. When I first came here, I went to the Prime Minister, Mr. Werner -- Pierre Werner -- when the Communists were talking all this kind of nonsense, and I said to him, before I even took the oath, "If you feel that you're unhappy or dissatisfied -- if I'm questionable," I said, "I can leave before we have any problem." He said, "Absolutely not. We're looking forward to having you. We're very proud of your background, and we know you're going to make a great ambassador." I must tell you, he was just wonderful.

Q: Since you didn't have a PAO, a USIS group, I wondered how the press was notified, so that people would know what your background was. Did anybody publish any articles in Luxembourg about you? You have a very rich background.

FARKAS: No, only the government knew.

I felt that seeing Luxembourg was a big financial center -- we had, at that time, 18 American banks in Luxembourg -- I figured it would be good for our American banks to get with the European bankers and try to discuss things. I'd always give them a good lunch, and good cigars, and what not, and they would banter things around. Well, I must tell you something: we gave them a lot of information; they didn't do too much for us.

Q: Really?

FARKAS: No. They're very closed-mouthed, very closed-mouthed. Anyway, our bankers liked it, because they got the feeling they did get some information.

Q: And you did this every two months?

FARKAS: Every two months, yes. When I was in Luxembourg, there were about 90 banks, you know, and so I would choose different banks. I always had the American bankers. That was 18, and then I'd always have about 12 -- because I had a tremendous dining room and it opened out to be a big salon, and I always opened it. Then I'd let Peter carry on if something else were planned, or if I had to do something else at the embassy.

Q: If your husband wasn't there, did you have Peter serve as host? Or did you just run it yourself?

FARKAS: I served as my own host and hostess; I didn't do anything about it. I felt comfortable doing it. I was brought up in a family where my mother was head of a big business, and at home with my own husband, we had to do a heck of a lot of entertaining to foreigners and businessmen.

Q: So the entertaining must have been really very easy for you. It was something you've always done.

FARKAS: No problem. I brought my own help.

Q: You brought your own help from Jamaica.

FARKAS: So my cook knew exactly what she had to do. You know -- all the accoutrements that went with the meal.

Q: Was your house furnished well enough? Or did you have to bring a lot of your own stuff? I mean, quite apart from the art.

FARKAS: Yes. I recovered the furniture. My husband went there first, came back to me, and he said, "Honey, that place hasn't been redone for God knows!" Of course, the Ambassador before me, Kingdon Gould, had too many children and couldn't live in that house. [He] took a house in the country. He had ten kids.

Q: Oh, I didn't know that.

FARKAS: So it wasn't lived in really at all. He had a few affairs in it, but that's it. When my husband saw it, he said, "It's sad. You might be able to do something with the furniture, but you'd have to have it recovered." He said, "The electrical wiring is dangerous." He was very aware of that, having department stores, you know. So he said, "Unless the government does something about rewiring and repainting that place, and putting some bricks in where they're out, and taking that ivy off," because there was ivy growing over the windows and in the windows, he said, "You can't go there. You just cannot." The government gave me $80,000. But I want you to know, it cost me another ninety.

Q: Did it really?

FARKAS: Yes. Recovered the furniture, did some of the rugs over. As you know, you have to do it.

Q: Sure. Well, did you find that your entertainment allowance was adequate for this?

FARKAS: No, I dug into my own pocket.

Q: You had to dig into your own?

FARKAS: I guess if you wanted it very simple, it could have been done. But somehow .

Q: You had to use your own money to do it the way you thought it should be done. And I suppose you also wanted to see that your officers had enough money to entertain?

FARKAS: When they entertained, yes. They'd always tell me how much they were using, and if they needed more, I'd give it to them, you know.

Q: Sure, sure. Did you inherit any particular problems with the Luxembourg government when you took over from Kingdon -- well, you didn't take over from Gould -- you took over from the chargé.

FARKAS: From Galanto. No, not really, not really.

Q: Things were running.

FARKAS: Things were running all right, except that the Russian Ambassador didn't like Galanto too much. And he didn't like [Gould] any better. So when I first went there, it was very interesting. You know, you have to meet all the ambassadors. His deputy said, "The ambassador

only speaks Russian and German." I said, "Really. Well, I'll speak French, if he could." He said, "No, no. You speak French, and I'll interpret."

Well, I couldn't do too much about it. So I spoke to him in French, and whatever he said, I still don't know. A lot of the other ambassadors were cordial, but they shunned him to a certain extent. He'd been there a long time. He was there about nine years when I got there.

Q: They do that, because then they become the doyen of the Corps.

FARKAS: I know. It's true. He was the *doyen*. He had a lot of receptions, and I'd go and I'd always ask if I could bring an escort, and I'd bring somebody from the embassy with me. He had a charming wife, by the way. They used to live together before he became the ambassador; he had to marry her. They have a little girl and a son. She used to be an opera singer. She didn't have much to do with us. Even if she went to a luncheon, they'd pick her up, maybe after she was there a half hour or so. Had a very nice embassy, but they had a great big wall built around it. They don't want us to see in.

I don't know why, but he sort of took a liking to me, and one day the embassy called me up to ask me if I would accompany him and a couple of other ambassadors to the Unknown Soldier [monument] in Luxembourg. Well, I didn't know there was an Unknown Russian Soldier in Luxembourg. Of course, they were our allies. At that time Haig wasn't there. Nixon was some place off in the skies. I don't know; I never was able to talk to him. I said, "Well, I've got to figure it out myself." I was thinking about it: Should we honor a Russian Unknown Soldier? And then I said to myself, "Well, at that time they were our allies. It was their unknown hero. Just then, the French ambassador called me up and said to me, "Are you going?" I said, "Well, it's not the greatest thing we're doing. There's no secrecy about it, and it will please him no end. After all, he is the *doyen*. Maybe we can get somebody from Ireland or the Netherlands." I think it was the ambassador from the Netherlands who came; [there were] three of us.

Q: The three of you went.

FARKAS: And we accompanied him. He was very grateful because the French Ambassador had said, "If the American Ambassador will come, I'll come."

Q: Do you feel that the American Ambassador is always the preeminent one in these places?

FARKAS: I think so.

Q: In Europe?

FARKAS: I think so. Well, it was. I don't know whether it is today. After that, it's very funny -- he called me up one day and wanted to talk to me about something, and I said, "Why don't you come alone? Don't you understand some French?" He said, "Not much." I said, "I understand some German." I did. I didn't speak it well, but I understood it. I said, "So, we can get along." He said, "Well, perhaps."

So that's when I said to Peter, "Look! Look out of the window. If he comes with his deputy, you're going to stay in the room. If he comes alone, you stay out." And he came alone, surprisingly enough.

Q: Well, that was quite a coup.

FARKAS: Yes. And he was talking about life in Russia, and how now you could buy an apartment and give it to your family but not if you had a lease. If you have a lease, you couldn't give the lease to anyone. And he had a son there and things were picking up a little better, et cetera, et cetera. And then [he] started to ask me something that had to do politically with our own government, which I tried to answer. After that, he was most cordial. I mean, I never had any kind of problem with him. Whatever he gave, he always invited me. You know, when Franco had these eight men electrocuted in Spain?

Q: Yes.

FARKAS: Well, the name of the ambassador was Alvarez, or something, and poor fellow, nobody spoke to him when that happened. I mean, as if it was his fault! I couldn't stand it. Nobody would talk to him.

Q: Is that right?

FARKAS: He lived on my street, so one day I saw him. He said, "It's getting very lonesome." I said, "Yes, I know." He said, "Would you -- " my husband was there at the time, "Would you and your husband come over and play bridge with us one night and have dinner?"

I said, "We're not bridge players." I said, "I haven't played bridge for so long, I forgot all about it. I'm sure my husband did too." "Well," he said, "We'll try." So we came. You know, the Spanish eat at 10 o'clock.

Q: Yes.

FARKAS: My husband, when we didn't have guests, liked to eat at 7:30. So I said, "Honey, have something before you go." He said, "No, I'm not hungry." Anyway, we go, and they had the table set up with cards, drinks, whatever you wanted -- sherry, wine. We played cards. It was about 10 o'clock, and I could see my husband passing out with hunger.

Q: Sure, sure.

FARKAS: And I said, "Ambassador (or Madam -- whatever), I'm sorry to ask you this, but do you think you could have some tiny little hors d'oeuvres, sandwiches, or something?"

So, in Spanish, he said to his butler, "You know, these are Americans. They eat early. They're very hungry. Maybe you could put something on that we can serve earlier than what you were doing." And the guy said, "Well, we do have some poultry we could serve, but", he says, "the roast is in the oven." I looked up at him and I said, "Well then, use the chicken; don't use the

roast." Well, the Ambassador was shocked. He said, "Do you speak Spanish?" I said, "Yes." "Oh," he says, "You're a spy." Kidding me.

I said, "You bet." He said, "I didn't know." I said, "Yes," so he started to talk Spanish to me. I said, "Let's talk English. My husband doesn't speak Spanish." He was very nice. He was there for a while after I stepped down, and after he left, he sent me quite a few letters. Just very nice.

Q: So you built up good rapport with a number of countries that way.

FARKAS: Yes, I did, and also with the Belgian Ambassador. He was a different -- he knew my sister-in-law's family. Didn't know the relationship, but he knew that we knew them. With the English, I had good rapport with all of them, you know. I didn't become too friendly. Nor with women. I was the Ambassador; I was the Ambassador's wife. I was both, you know.

Q: That's right.

FARKAS: You couldn't bother with the women very much anyway, because I had my own things to do, so that kept me from that end. They used to have these Luxembourg-American bridge tournaments. You know, I didn't play bridge anyway, but my husband had a secretary -- terrific woman -- who would come and stay with me two, three months, and catch up with a lot of things I needed. So I would send her out to this bridge stuff, and every time she won. I said, "Listen, Virginia, one more time you win, I'm going to shoot you."

She said, "Well, what shall I do about it? You have partners; you can't fool around." I said, "Fool around." The last time she came back she said, "You know, I fooled around. What happened was, I really took the craziest chances. I made a grand slam." She says, "You're going to kill me."

Q: She won anyway? Isn't that funny?!

Could you tell me about presenting your credentials? What you wore, and that sort of thing. What kind of occasion is it, anyway?

FARKAS: I don't have that picture, do? I wore -- oh, it was very lovely. You have to dress formal -- top hat for your chief officers. I wore a very pretty lace dress and hat.

Q: To the floor?

FARKAS: Yes, and a hat that went with it, and gloves. We were presented to the Court. The Chamberlain of the Court came down to meet us. We met the Grand Duke and Grand Duchess, and they told us they were glad we were there. They served some drinks and things like that; it was very nice -- really lovely. Nice affair. It lasted about an hour.

Q: That's a long time.

FARKAS: Yes, well, we were talking about a lot of things. I don't know what we got to talking about -- racial problems.

Q: Really?

FARKAS: Because they were having problems at that time. You know, they had on contract the Greeks and the Turks working in the steel mills, and they were all asking about what were the problems in New York.

Q: Can you remember your first day, when you arrived at the post? What happened?

FARKAS: Oh, Galanto came down to meet me, and Hollingsworth came down to meet me. People from the embassy came to meet me.

Q: This was at the airport, was it?

FARKAS: Yes. I was there with my husband. They gave me flowers -- very pretty. Then we went to the embassy and they let me alone because my help were there already. I sent my help ahead of me.

Q: I see, yes.

FARKAS: It was a very quiet first evening. Then I got a lovely call from the Prime Minister, telling me, "Welcome," and so forth and so on. It was very nice. Oh -- at the airport they had these Communist kids tutored, "Want the Ambassador to go home." "Ambassador buys position" -- stuff like that. And that's when I went to see the Prime Minister and told him right away. I wanted to get it straight, and then I never had any problem.

Oh, I went to see the Bishop, who is an elderly gentleman. I figured, "I'll pay my deference to him." So I called him up and asked him if I could have some of his time. He was very gallant. I came there at about 4 o'clock. He said, "Let's have tea." So we did. His first interest was with the problems with the blacks and the slums and what-not. I told him about it, and what was happening, and what would come to pass. About coming into this beam of political and educational life, my degrees, and so forth. It was very nice. I went to see him several times.

They had an eminent statesman by the name of Beckeri. Probably one of the most eminent statesmen they had, because he was world-renowned for his economics. He was one of Schuman's directors, and a very nice man he was. He was funny, too. I was wearing some kind of tea dress. He says, "Is that American or French?"

I said, "Now you wouldn't to be so foolish as to think I was going to wear a French dress when I was coming to see you. It's American." And he said, "Bravo!" It was very cute. He was very nice.

Q: Did you go to many functions where the Grand Duke and Grand Duchess were present?

FARKAS: They don't go to functions.

Q: They don't go to them?

FARKAS: They *have* functions. They have functions on the main holidays and things like that. I told you, I think mine was the only embassy they ever visited.

Q: Is that so?

FARKAS: Because they wanted to see the pictures.

Q: Yes. And then you had to do that sort of --

FARKAS: Yes, quietly. But they never, never, never visited anyone. That's taboo.

Q: Did you build up a good relationship with the Prime Minister?

FARKAS: With the both of them, because I had Pierre Werner and then I had Gaston Thorn.

Q: Oh, I see. Oh, yes, you mentioned him.

FARKAS: When Gaston Thorn comes here I always see him, one way or the other.

Q: So you had very good relationships with all these people. Could you describe briefly a typical day in the life of an American Ambassador in Luxembourg?

FARKAS: Well, you get [to the office] very early in the morning -- at least I did -- because I knew there were so many telegrams waiting. Don't forget that we were six hours ahead of the US, so you had to catch up, too, because some of them had to be answered before the close of day. I would come to my office about -- I was there usually about 8 o'clock, and I must say, my secretary was terrific; she was there, too. And then they all would be coming in about quarter to nine, nine o'clock.

Q: You got there first, eh?

FARKAS: Yes, she and I. Of course, the Marines were always around; they would be there night and day, as you know. You have raising of the flag and all those kinds of things. First of all, I'd go through telegrams and I'd answer anything that had to be answered. Then I would go through the things that had to be done in Luxembourg during the day. There were a lot of things that had to be done -- an ambassador wanted to know one thing -- the chief justice of Luxembourg wanted to know another thing -- I told you, I was active with their aging, with their retarded.

Q: Yes, you were; yes.

FARKAS: You know, they didn't do too much with their aging, and one of the institutions there really needed medical help. I offered to get some doctors from New York University to come. New York University said they would do it -- come and work in Luxembourg for a year.

Q: Really?

FARKAS: But somehow they didn't accept it, and I never pushed it. But they admitted that they really lack good medical help, because, you see, they don't have any universities there, so everybody's educated outside. A lot of them don't come back, and a lot of them who do come back are not really Luxembourgers any more. As I say, their hospitals don't have things for research, so it's really rough. I think that's why they couldn't accept the American doctors. American doctors were all in it for research and things like that.

Q: Do they have a Social Security system there? A health system, the way the French do?

FARKAS: Yes, they do.

Q: So you don't find people really destitute?

FARKAS: No, there's no poverty. The only people who don't have as much are those who come in on contract, the Turkish . . .

Q: And the Greeks, you said. How often did you have your staff meetings?

FARKAS: I had a staff meeting once a week, and usually that was on a Friday.

Q: And you'd go over the --

FARKAS: Whatever had to be done, or if something specially had to be looked into, or something had to be programmed for the following week that needed more work on it, and things like that.

Q: You sort of conducted these, and had everybody chip in?

FARKAS: They'd come into my office, a good-sized office, a good-sized table, and we'd sit around it and throw out ideas.

Q: You encouraged them? Collegial, in other words?

FARKAS: That's right. You know, having been a college instructor for many years, you're used to working with them.

Q: How long did it take before you felt really at home there?

FARKAS: I got there in April. By middle or end of June they'd be leaving for something or other. Luxembourgers would take their holidays.

Q: Oh, really, they'd all clear out?

FARKAS: By August, everybody's cleared out. Of course, April, May, June -- there's not that

much time. I figured it was a good time for me to get to know, not the political people, but the people in the country, and so, because of the things I knew I had to do for my own country, I got to know who was important and who wasn't, and I got to know the person who could do most for me when it came to doing a very needful, political thing for my own country. I had to choose between a Luxembourger and the consul from Monte Carlo whom I knew, but who, unfortunately or fortunately, had married the ex- daughter-in-law of the chief of Arbed, and they couldn't stand him. I figured either I have to cut him off out of my life. . .

Q: Yes?

FARKAS: Which I did. I did, and I became friends with the others. It paid off. I got to know the people from Arbed, then people from Thyssen who have interests with the cigarette manufacturers. I got to know them. And Thyssen -- I made sure I did something with that, not only the steel mills, but I got to know heads of these mills.

The head of one of the biggest metal international works in the world was living in Luxembourg, by the name of Henry Leir. He's a great philanthropist, too. It was really one of my own men who told me when I first got there. He said, "There's a man who is terribly powerful with the prime minister -- that was when Gaston Thorn was the prime minister -- and with the government, and also with the Grand Duke and Grand Duchess, and it would be wise thing for you to cultivate him.

So I cultivated him and invited him to my home, and it was very worthwhile. In fact, on his 75th birthday -- he had done me a big favor -- I asked him what I could do for him, and he said, "Give me my 75th birthday party in your residence." His wife said, "Now don't do that. You know she's got enough to do." To me she said, "Don't you do it for him."

I said, "Yes, I shall. Just give me the names of your friends." Which he did, a lot of people in government and whatnot, so it didn't do us any harm either. I gave him a wonderful party and I think he was most grateful.

Q: That's quite a compliment that he felt he could ask you.

FARKAS: Yes. We invited the prime minister. I said, "I think the prime minister's going to go off some place." He said, "Not before my birthday." And it was true, too; he didn't. He didn't go until afterwards. He came to the party. I can't tell you -- anyone who's who in Luxembourg or Belgium -- I invited them. He was so pleased.

Q: What did you see as the most important facet of your role as an ambassador?

FARKAS: Well, first of all, I think Luxembourg, as far as we were concerned, is not only part of NATO, but was very important to the EEC, and while we weren't part of the EEC, remember that we needed import-export, so it was terribly important for me to see what they were doing and to try to cultivate things so we could do something.

In fact, one of my biggest disappointments was that our government had asked me to see if we

couldn't get something really big going, and I became very friendly with the head of the steel mills. One night he called me up and said, "I have something to tell you. We are thinking of building rolling mills." Now, rolling mills are things that make the steel flat, and they cost $215 million a mill. He said, "This is the first time we're going to let the United States bid for it."

I said, "Oh, gosh. Isn't that something." He said, "We're very pleased with what you're doing here." I immediately called our Department of Commerce. Forget it! I said, "We need someone to give us some kind of financial basis for what we might be doing." That's a decision with an informational format. Nothing happened. Sent another telegram saying, "I'm waiting." Of course, France was bidding; Germany was bidding; another company was bidding. Why couldn't we? Finally, I thought, well, our biggest -- what was the steel mill that Shultz was active with? Blau-Knox and another one?

Q: I don't know.

FARKAS: Two big ones. Blau-Knox said it was too busy doing things in the East -- in the Arab countries. They couldn't bother with it. And the other one couldn't bother with it either. I really was mad.

Q: I wonder why. Why did they do this?

FARKAS: Because they weren't set up to do that kind of business with Europe. We never did before, and they didn't want to do it. They were already doing so much with the oil people that they didn't need any more business. Finally I sent a telegram to Kissinger and I said, "The ball is in your court. Do what you want to." We didn't get it.

Q: They didn't even bid?

FARKAS: No, never. I think Germany and France got it.

Q: Isn't that strange?

FARKAS: Not so strange. Our Commerce Department somehow was never strong. Maybe it is now -- I don't know. It certainly wasn't strong then.

I was disappointed. I was disappointed when I was trying to get these people to buy soft goods in the United States, because we certainly can compete with anyone -- except maybe with the Far Eastern countries, who weren't doing so much in those days.

Q: What do you mean by soft goods?

FARKAS: Well, I mean things like clothing, cloth, sheets, pillowcases, draperies, house goods, things like that. That's soft goods.

Q: Did you have a lot of VIPs?

FARKAS: No.

Q: They went to Belgium and Paris?

FARKAS: They would go to Paris, they would go to Belgium. They only came to Luxembourg when they needed something very special. Otherwise, we didn't have too many of them visit.

Q: So you placed your greatest emphasis on commercial affairs. Is that a safe thing to say?

FARKAS: No, I wouldn't say that.

Q: No?

FARKAS: No, I wouldn't say commercial affairs. I think, commercial and diplomatic, really, in that order.

Q: In diplomatic too? Building up good will, representing the US to other people?

FARKAS: Right, in as many ways as possible. That's what I mean. When I did this thing for the retarded, although I was personally interested, certainly they knew that we, as people of the United States, were not only interested in doing diplomatic work, we were interested in their people, their country. They appreciated it.

Q: What did you do, exactly, along these lines?

FARKAS: I went to visit the Institutes for Aging to see what we could do for them. Also, at the university, I gave two of the graduating groups graduation parties. I came and spoke to them. I was active with that, too. I'll tell you what else I did. You know, most of these students in Luxembourg used to go to different places for their education. So once a year, in May, when they'd all come back, I would have a big meeting and invite as many university students as I could get, and we'd have a big roundup. I would have sort of a buffet for them, and we'd sit down and discuss what was going on in other countries in education and so forth. They used to look forward to it.

Q: You were doing your own USIS work, weren't you?

FARKAS: Yes; well, in a way. We could have run three of them because, you know, we could entertain just the first 100, 200 that came, and that was it. We couldn't have any more.

Q: Was this open house?

FARKAS: Open house, right, right.

Q: Did you also have the retarded in your home?

FARKAS: Oh, yes.

Q: Oh, you did, as well as the elderly?

FARKAS: Sure. I had the retarded come and I'd give them a meal and we'd show them cartoons and give them funny little things to take home. They loved it.

Q: Did you get a lot of nice write-ups in the paper when you did these things? Did the press pay attention to the fact that the American Ambassador was concerned?

FARKAS: I didn't really care.

Q: No, but we do. [Laughs]

FARKAS: Yes, well, I must tell you, the woman who was head of the *Republique de Lorraine*, that's their main paper, was really very much touched at my interest in them, and so she gave me a lot of space. In fact, for the big gala, she printed up all the invitations and everything else. Then, of course, we had Luxembourg Radio, and Television Luxembourg was the biggest in that part of the world. The guy who was head of it, by the name of Felton, gave me all the space I needed.

Q: Oh, that's great!

FARKAS: All the time, all the space. He spoke to them in French; he spoke in every language you can think of, and they gave it to us all for free. The "Gala de Joie" was done to raise money for the Institution for the Handicapped. They needed therapy instruction and tools. We made $90,000 on that gala. It set up the institution as a teaching institute instead of a custodial home as it was before they got this money for therapy programs.

Q: This has been most interesting, Ambassador Farkas. I want to thank you for sharing your thoughts as well as your memories of a fascinating and worthwhile life.

KEITH P. MCCORMICK
Political/Consular Officer
Luxembourg (1974-1976)

Keith P. McCormick was born in California in 1944. He attended the University of California-Berkeley, the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy as well as the University of Geneva. He served in the US Air Force before joining the Foreign Service. Overseas McCormick served in Luxembourg, South Africa, Thailand, and New Zealand. McCormick was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 2000.

Q: So you went to Luxembourg?

MCCORMICK: I went to Luxembourg in the summer of ‘74.

Q: You were there two years?

MCCORMICK: I was there two years.

Q: Often I ask about the political situation, but I can't imagine that Luxembourg had changed much since the Battle of the Bulge.

MCCORMICK: The political situation would only be of interest to someone who wanted to study the advantages of social democracy versus market capitalism. But Luxembourg took its turn at the EC (European Community) presidency that year. It was an ideal situation in which to learn how to do political and economic work. I also enjoyed the consular work. I don't mind doing consular work at all, by the way; I just didn't want to be coned as a consular officer. I didn't trust assurances that you could always change.

Q: Who was the ambassador?

MCCORMICK: Ruth Lewis Farkas. She was appointed by President Nixon. Her husband owned Alexander's Department Stores in New York.

Q: Luxembourg has a reputation of being a controversial post, even today. How did you find working with someone who was a definite political appointee as opposed to somebody who got there for some other reason?

MCCORMICK: I found it difficult. I wasn't mature enough at the time to realize that this was the way life was. She had no interest in the work of the post or anything which the Department of State was interested in. Her interest was the social side.

Q: I assume it was a pretty small post.

MCCORMICK: It was a very small post, although at that time it was larger than many of our smaller ones today. The DCM (Deputy Chief of Mission) was Peter Tarnoff. He handled the ambassador very well.

Q: So was it mostly visas?

MCCORMICK: No, American Citizen Services. The largest problem was created by Icelandic Airlines, which lands in Luxembourg. That was the carrier of choice for the backpacking crowd.

Q: It is the cheapest way to get to the United States.

MCCORMICK: Young people prided themselves on bumming around Europe on no money a day, then came into the embassy under the impression that we would give them the money to get home. Much of my job consisted of breaking the news to them that that was not the way it worked. There were some genuine hardship cases, but an awful lot of them were middle class Americans who expected the embassy to give them a handout.

Q: I assume you would turn away the normal Iranian student visa shoppers?

MCCORMICK: A lot of those, it seemed to me, though I suspect it was only average for most consular posts. The most difficult situation that I faced was getting a phone call one night from the State Department desk saying, "I can't tell you what this is about, but when you get the cable tomorrow don't worry. Whatever happens, the Department will back you up 100%." I didn't find this very reassuring. When the cable arrived, it ordered the embassy to serve the ambassador's husband with a subpoena. A grand jury had indicted him for perjury relating to the relationship between his political contributions and her appointment.

Q: Just about that time I had to serve the top American business man in Greece; a consular officer has to do that.

MCCORMICK: I suppose so. It didn't occur to me that someone a little more senior than a new vice consul really ought to handle this, and the DCM felt this was strictly consular. So I talked to the ambassador, and we reached an agreement that I would come to the residence, he would be there, and we would handle it like civilized people. I went over with the legal papers which I was supposed to serve. She greeted me very graciously and we sat and waited and waited but he never did come downstairs. Eventually, when she couldn't imagine what was keeping him so long, we discovered that he had left by another entrance, gone to the airport with a suitcase full of paintings, and left the country. He didn't return to Europe or the United States for years.

Q: So was the ambassador complicit in holding you up?

MCCORMICK: She told me she was not. We went back and drafted a cable reporting the situation to Washington. My personal impressions of her veracity were not required.

Q: That is interesting, because it is easy to denigrate the position of ambassador to Luxembourg. The president of my organization is Ed Rowell, and he was saying how great being ambassador to Luxembourg was, particularly later on as the European Union became more important, because it was a wonderful entrée into the thinking of the European Union.

MCCORMICK: That was very true in Luxembourg. It should also be the case in Strasbourg, but we have reduced Strasbourg to a consular post, whereas it should be giving us greater insights into the thinking of Europeans through their MP's (members of parliament) who attend the sessions of the European Parliament there. We reported widely on these institutions. On the consular side, we stumbled across the fact there was a great deal of illicit narcotics traffic coming into Luxembourg where there was a very weak capability to detect it, then going on undetected to Amsterdam. When we reported this, the U.S. drug agencies were delighted and were suddenly there in Luxembourg in force. We opened up all kinds of programs. I remember being dazzled by how much money you could tap into if you touched the right theme.

Q: Were you able to make much contact with the people in Luxembourg?

MCCORMICK: It was quite easy. They speak both French and German and are very pro-

American, even in the Communist areas like the steel towns near Esch. I was there at the time of the thirtieth anniversary of their liberation by Patton's troops in World War II and there were constant events to commemorate it. The ambassador disliked giving speeches, especially in French, so I was frequently assigned to represent the embassy. The Luxembourgers treated me as a senior representative although I was just a junior officer, and they couldn't have been more kind. It was a wonderful opportunity. I can't imagine why she didn't want to do it herself. I learned another lesson about political ambassadors. I had briefly served on the Benelux desk before going out, and helped prepare Ambassador Leonard Firestone for his confirmation hearings as ambassador to Brussels. I was extremely earnest, I had just started out in the Foreign Service, and I was determined to help him succeed in his confirmation. I explained things to him, drafted all kinds of background memos, spelled out acronyms, predicted every question they might ask. Finally, he had to turn to me and say, "Look, I appreciate what you are doing, but I don't need any of this stuff." He had already fixed it with the senators. Later I saw him in Brussels on one of my visits, and he still didn't know anything about foreign policy and didn't care. I went to see him in his office and he said, "I'm so glad you're here. Shut the door because I don't want anybody to hear this. These hostage takers are my crisis at the moment, from the South Moluccas. Tell me, where in the world are the South Moluccas?" So I had to get up and show him on the map. He had no clue. On the other hand, this was a man who visited regularly all sections of his embassy just to keep morale up. He was well liked. He kept an eye on the overall functioning of the place and didn't try to do what he didn't know, but did very well what he did know. He reduced my tendency to criticize all political appointees as ambassadors.

Q: All of us have learned they come in all shapes and sizes, as do some of our professional colleagues, too. Sometimes they are the wrong people in the wrong place or they have gone sour.

MCCORMICK: Mrs. Farkas, as I said, was particularly interested in social concerns and I think she was very frustrated that she didn't manage to break into the court circles. The court circles in the Grand Duchy take themselves very seriously, and she was not their sort.

Q: I think it was Mr. Farkas who at one point made the remark, "You mean I paid $300,000.00 and all I got my wife was Luxembourg?"

MCCORMICK: You are precisely right; as the remark filtered through to us at the time it was, "You mean I paid $300,000.00 and all I got was," and he named a country in Central America. He then said, "I want Europe." As we heard the complaint, it was not that Luxembourg wasn't good enough, but that he wanted something in Europe, not Central America.

Q: When it is as blatant as that, it gets repugnant.

MCCORMICK: This is exactly the quotation that was referred to in the indictment. The other thing that we did that may have been of some utility there, Luxembourg is of no military significance (although it is a NATO member), but because of its geography it makes a convenient base for spying. Close to Paris, close to Bonn, close to NATO. So there was a very large Soviet intelligence presence in Luxembourg, both KGB and GRU, which didn't have anything to do with Luxembourg but was there because surveillance was more lax and it was better to be arrested there than in Germany or Belgium. A large and heavily guarded embassy

with diplomats who didn't have any apparent portfolios. When they began to bring in daily flights, nonstop from Moscow to Luxembourg, with no real passenger demand, this just became too obvious. That was something I was able to help with, because our station didn't have much entrée to the Soviets but their ambassador was a graduate of HEI, so I did. We helped Time Magazine write an article about the extent of the Soviet presence there, explaining the point about being able to operate against three targets, and the government expelled the KGB resident and the GRU head of operations. This was by far the most important thing that anyone cared about in 1976.

JAMES D. PHILLIPS
Deputy Chief of Mission
Luxembourg (1975-1978)

Ambassador Phillips was born in Illinois in 1933. He received his Bachelor's degree from the University of Wichita in 1957 and his Master's in 1958. After serving in the US Army from 1953 to 1955, he entered the Foreign Service in 1961. Postings throughout his career include Paris, Elizabethville, Luxembourg, The Gambia, Copenhagen and Casablanca. Mr. Phillips then became the ambassador to Burundi and Congo. He was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy on May 5, 1998.

Q: *You were DCM from when to when?*

PHILLIPS: I was there from July of 1975 to the late spring of 1978.

Q: *Who was our ambassador at that time?*

PHILLIPS: It was a woman named Ruth Louis Farkas. Her husband, George Farkas who is now dead, in fact both of them are now dead, played a minor role in the Watergate scandal. He was a very wealthy man who owned the Alexander department store chain in New York. He also owned properties in Brazil. When his wife was named Ambassador to Luxembourg he said publicly, "What, for $300,000.00, all I get is Luxembourg?" He bought the ambassadorship for his wife. She was a bright woman and had some talent and Luxembourg was not a very challenging place so she actually did all right. How he made the contribution became part of the Watergate investigation. At one time I actually had to serve a subpoena on him to appear in a U.S. District Court. He didn't take that too well but I really saw very little of him. He did not spend much time in Luxembourg.

I got along with Ruth Farkas very well. She was a kind of grandmotherly woman in her sixties. She had lost all interest in being ambassador by the time I got there. Nixon was gone and Ford was in the White House and Ambassador Farkas really wanted out. It was a delicate situation though. The person that her husband had paid off for the ambassadorship was a member of the House of Representatives from New Hampshire. He had resigned his seat and there was going to be a special election to replace him. The Ford Administration did not want Ruth to leave until

after the election because getting her name in the papers would inevitably recall all of the Watergate stuff. I went into her office one day and found her in tears. She said "Dan, you know I have a beautiful house in Monte Carlo and an apartment in New York and George is never here and I want to leave and the White House tells me I can't leave, what can I do?" I knew she had a good sense of humor so I told her to get George to give the Republican party another $300,000.00 and maybe they would let her go. She laughed.

As soon as the New Hampshire election was over she left. She was replaced by a political appointee named Rosemary Ginn who had been Republican chairwoman for the state of Missouri. She was close to Gerald Ford. She and her husband came and stayed on until after the elections in 1976 when President Carter won. In January as soon as he took the oath of office he let political appointees know they had to resign. Ambassador Ginn was gone by May. She was replaced by a career officer, Jim Lowenstein, whom you know.

Q: *We took Serbian together along with Larry Eagleburger. Let's talk about the state of relations with Luxembourg during the 1975 to 1978 period. What were our main concerns?*

PHILLIPS: We didn't have any serious bilateral issues with Luxembourg. We had an embassy there because it was a tradition. General Patton had liberated Luxembourg during the war and every year they celebrated "Patton Week." There is a large American military cemetery. It was a very pro-American country. What business we did have with Luxembourg was related to its membership in NATO and the European Community. I spent most of my time making sure that I understood what was going on in those arenas through my contacts with Luxembourg officials. Gaston Thorn was the prime minister. It was a Grand Duchy so there was a Grand Duke. As a Foreign Service assignment it was kind of a bird in a gilded cage. The work was boring but the social life was exceptional. There was the Grand Duke's court, the European Community institutions and the Luxembourg government. My wife and I had social engagements probably four out of seven nights a week.

There was only one time that the job became exciting. The presidency of the European Community rotated every six months among the member states. Kissinger and the EEC had worked out a deal that the state holding the presidency would be the focal point of diplomatic contact with the United States. This was an effort by the Europeans to stop Kissinger from using divide and conquer tactics vis à vis the Community. When Luxembourg was president for six months I happened to be chargé d'affaires and I was involved, at least in the sense of passing on information, in some very high-level discussions.

Q: *I have a feeling talking to some others that this was one of the trickiest jobs for the DCMs as this has traditional been a political appointment for the ambassadors' job. You have to be very careful. Obviously you did it well but others haven't because you have a political ambassador and then a trained professional in as a deputy and it doesn't always work out.*

PHILLIPS: That is right. I think maybe I was successful because the political Ambassadors I worked with were short term. I was with Ruth Farkas for about a year, then with Rosemary Ginn for another year and then with a first-rate professional, Jimmy Lowenstein, for my final year. With political ambassadors the DCM starts off as someone who can do no wrong. He is their

guide, leading them through the diplomatic minefield. But he is also telling them what to do, even who to invite for dinner. He speaks the language and often they do not. Now these are usually high-powered, successful people in their own fields and eventually the dependency causes resentment and tensions mount. Even if the Ambassador and DCM are personally compatible, tensions are built into the relationship. The DCM can also overstep the bounds and become a condescending twit. I tried to guard against it. My two political ambassadors were relatively easy to work with because they didn't have agendas of their own. They were just delighted to have the title of Ambassador.

Q: *What about Rosemary Ginn? How did she operate?*

PHILLIPS: She arrived totally unsophisticated about embassy operations. Before she left Washington she undoubtedly meet with President Ford who very likely told her he was counting on her in this very important post, and so forth. Then when she arrived she found that no one in the State Department above the Office Director level would even return her calls. At first political ambassadors think maybe they aren't doing the job right. I remember we went to the inaugural speech for the opening of Parliament. Gaston Thorn gave a very banal speech. Riding back in the car she said, "let's see if we can be the first ones to get this to Washington." I said " get what to Washington?" She said she had taken extensive notes and wanted to call in her secretary after hours to dictate a telegram. We ended up with fifteen pages. The desk office called me and said that he had gotten the thing over the weekend, that he was the only one who might possibly read it and that he didn't plan to read it. She was smart and she finally picked up on how things worked. She cultivated her relationships with Luxembougers and did a good job in building rapport with the Grand Duke. So she was happy enough to establish an active social routine and delegate day to day embassy business to me.

Q: *What about Jim Lowenstein? Jim was a Foreign Service officer who worked with Senator Fulbright for some time.*

PHILLIPS: He was probably the most overqualified person in the world for the Luxembourg job. He had been Deputy Assistant Secretary for European affairs. He knew NATO, he knew the Community and he spoke French. He was energetic and an activist. For some reason this was the Embassy he could get so he took it. He came out as a single person because he was divorced. He had a great rapport with Gaston Thorn. He was the first career ambassador assigned to Luxembourg since the war and the Luxembougers took his assignment as a compliment. He took the place by storm and would write these very thoughtful reports that were, of course, read only by the desk officer. He didn't need me or anybody else at the Embassy. He could have done the job entirely on his own. He took the boredom in good grace and did the best job he could. We got along very well. We split up what little work there was to do.

Q: *The head of my organization, Association for Diplomatic Studies, is Ed Raul who later was ambassador to Luxembourg, had been ambassador to Portugal, said that one thing he concentrated on was Luxembourg as a banking center and its role in the financial community. Is this something that you paid much attention to?*

PHILLIPS: Yes, there was something like ninety banks in Luxembourg. It was kind of like

offshore banking. However, once you had done a report on the banking sector, you had done the report. There wasn't much to follow up on. Believe me, they knew more in New York banking circles about what was going on in Luxembourg than we would ever know. Another major industry was steel and we reported on that. It wasn't really of great significance at that time.

ROSEMARY LUCAS GINN
Ambassador
Luxembourg (1976-1977)

Ambassador Rosemary Lucas Ginn graduated from the University of Missouri Law School and served a number of years in the public sector. She was appointed ambassador to Luxembourg in 1976. Ambassador Ginn was interviewed by Ann Miller Morin in 1987.

GINN: One Sunday morning, Stanley Ginn invited me to go out to breakfast with him. That was our usual practice. And during the course of the pleasurable time he said, "How would you like to be a United States ambassador?" I didn't have to think very long before I replied, and so I said, "Why, it'd be the most exciting thing I can imagine." We had been discussing the night before the fact that there would shortly be a vacancy in the ambassadorship to Switzerland. He and I had spent a month in Switzerland several years prior to that time, and we enjoyed it. We liked the people and felt like it would be a comfortable place to be. So he said, "Well why don't you just write your senator and ask him about it?" And I did. I also wrote -- at that time it was President Nixon who was in the White House -- and expressed my interest in that position, and in due course, the response came back through various channels that the position in Switzerland was to be filled by a career person.

You know how those things go, you write to all of the senators for whom you have campaigned, with whom you have worked, and all of the people whom you felt might be appropriate persons to recommend [you]. And they did. Then the word came back that the post in Luxembourg would shortly be vacant and that that might be a proper place for me to go.

Well of course Luxembourg would have the same quality of life that Switzerland would have had and besides, they had good hunting there, and that, I am certain, added a little desirability. So we said yes we would certainly be pleased to be considered for that post.

All of this took a number of months and by the time that the actual induction as an ambassador came about, why, Gerald Ford was then president. He confirmed the prior recommendations that had been made, so we went back for interviews at the State Department, and indoctrination, and so forth. They made it plain that they wanted us in position at the post by the 26th of June, which was the time for the celebration of the Grand Duke's birthday. That gave us about four weeks at the department. As you know, that's not very long to learn all of the things that I should have known.

Q: No, that's an awfully short time.

GINN: But we worked hard at it. We worked all day every day, and I worked back in the hotel at night. Up to that point there had never been any straight out man-to-woman look in the eyes saying, “You are going to be the ambassador for the United States to Luxembourg.” It was all around the corner. This was protective on the part of the State Department. They hadn’t had a chance to meet me, to know me, to see if I could absorb, if I could carry the job, and I’m certain that it was still in a case where they had not made a final commitment which would have been embarrassing for them to have to back away [from].

However, about three weeks after we got there, the time came, they said, for us to have a physical examination there at the State Department, so we went over early that morning and they started through all of the tests. You may want to expunge this part of your tape, but I think it should be known for the record that there is a part of the test where they give you a small bottle and you retire to the bathroom. There’s a small door on the left side of that little room, and pretty soon that little door flapped open and there was a bottle placed upon it, an empty one, and on the label it said "Ambassador Rosemary Ginn."

Q: Oh, no! [Laughter]

GINN: That was the first tangible, official expression that it was going to happen.

Q: That is a new one.

GINN: [Laughing] Well, of course, both Stanley and I are totally healthy people. So, there was no out for them through that point, and we have laughed about that, chuckled about that, ever since.

Q: When did you go before the Senate?

GINN: During that time, but not until after this had occurred.

Q: You hadn’t even been before the Senate?

GINN: That’s right, but nearly all of those men on that Senate committee were men with whom I had worked in government and politics, either on the same side or opposite sides, and when we did go, I’d have to give the department great credit for the people they assigned to us to brief us on what the committee would be likely to ask and what we should know about it. If there was anything that we should not say, they clued us in and they prepared us, and of course we tried to listen as well we could.

Q: Well, how many of these meetings did your husband sit in on with you as far as the briefings go?

GINN: Not very many. No, not very many.

Q: Did he help you study at night?

GINN: Oh, yes, he would. But you see where there is the reverse, where it is the woman who's the ambassador, the same kind of indoctrination for the man who goes as the spouse isn't provided as there where it is the woman who goes along as the spouse. I think there well could be.

Q: Now they do have the husband sit in on the spouse's lectures. There is part of a day set aside for the running of the embassy from the spouse's point of view, the embassy being the residence. The husband sits in on that as the wife goes off to her secret briefings.

GINN: Well that's good, because Stanley assumed those responsibilities there. He hired the chef, he hired the butler, and he saw to it that they did what they should -- sometimes to their consternation.

Q: What a relief for you.

GINN: Oh, my! It just made the whole job possible.

Q: Can you remember who was on your Senate committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, when you appeared? Any funny stories?

GINN: Well, of course, Senator Percy. Then, oh, a Democrat senator, Symington, Sr., Stewart Symington. I had gone to call on each of those senators before the hearings were held. During the hearings themselves, before I was called, there was a congressman questioned who was being appointed to be the ambassador to -- it was either Sri Lanka or the Maldive Islands -- and he didn't know anything about the Maldive Islands, period, and they turned him down.

Q: They did? Right then and there?

GINN: Right then and there. They said, "We regret we cannot accept your appearance at this time and we'll have to discuss this later." Well, of course, that was a bit of a scary thing to . Number one, that they'd turn down a congressman, but anyhow, they did.
At that point, Senator Symington got up from his chair, up on the raised level, and came down and sat beside me. Now he and I had been political adversaries ever since both of us had been in politics, [but] gentleman that he is, here was not a matter of controversy between us, here was a matter of two citizens of Missouri. He gave me quiet counsel there. He said, "Don't tell them everything you know. Just directly answer their questions." And yet there was another question that was asked and he said, "Don't answer that." He would say that in an aside.

Q: You mean he sat there while you were --

GINN: Right there during the questioning.

Q: So he didn't question you himself?

GINN: No. So I listened to him and answered their questions as best I could and there was no

problem. They immediately told me that they approved and that their recommendation would be forwarded to the Senate, and it was, and it was passed with no dissenting votes in the Senate.

Q: Was it? Unanimous.

GINN: Uh-hmm. I have a copy of the issue of the Congressional Record that shows the vote of confirmation in the Senate. It was May 20, 1976. It's framed. I thought it would be fun. The briefings that they'd given me in the State department, the counsel that they had given me, and the help that he gave me there in the hearing made it a smooth passage for me.

Q: Indeed, indeed. Were there several of you sitting at that table that day?

GINN: No, no.

Q: Just the two of you?

GINN: That time there was just Senator Symington and me.

Q: Really? After the other gentleman had been --

GINN: Oh, yes. The congressman stormed out in a great huff.

Q: I can imagine. Well, I can only think that he just hadn't gone to his State department briefings. Don't you think so?

GINN: I rather imagine that. He probably thought it would be a pushover and hadn't bothered to go find out about it. He should have known it's only nine feet above sea level. [Laughs] Of course, Sri Lanka is in such a mess anyhow. The Maldives -- who are served by the ambassador to Sri Lanka -- there's nothing there but fishermen, but it is in a strategic sector of the Indian Ocean, and I think warships. Not right there, because the water isn't deep enough.

Q: But right nearby, which is why we have the post.

GINN: Right. But after that, we continued with the indoctrination at the State department. They were very kind to me. There was strong support from the people on the Luxembourg desk, and then the people who were in the UNESCO office were delighted and pleased, and they were helpful.

Q: Did you know the people on the Luxembourg desk?

GINN: No, not ahead of time. When the time came for the swearing-in party and process why, of course, it was held there in the State department. We served Luxembourg wine. Part of my family came from Missouri for it. My two brothers came. It was a highly satisfactory, simple little ceremony, no great bells ringing or lights flashing, that sort of thing.

Q: Up on the eighth floor?

GINN: Yes.

Q: Who held the Bible?

GINN: Stanley. It was my Bible that he had brought for me, on my request, from Missouri. He had gone home to try and straighten out some business halfway through the briefings and when it became apparent that the swearing-in would occur shortly, I called him and said, "Please bring my Bible." So he stuck it in his little brown piece of carry-on luggage and got on the airplane and sat down next to two priests. When they were aloft, why, each of the Fathers opened his reticule and took out his Bible and started to read, and Ginn looked over and saw these two, so he reached down in his reticule and got out his Bible and opened it to read. He recounts the two priests looked and looked and looked, and finally one of them said, "Sir, are you a man of the cloth?" Stanley confessed that he was not a man of the cloth and told them why he was carrying the Bible. Stanley was to meet me in New York for the courtesy calls that are made there at some of the offices, and when I got to the Ambassador Club to meet Stanley, well, here were the two priests with Stanley, so I got to meet them, too. Oh, they laughed at great length about how they thought Stanley was a man of the cloth. Can you imagine any more non-man of the cloth than that boy? I can't.

Q: Who administered the oath? Was it the chief of protocol, perhaps?

GINN: A young lady, a nice young lady, about my height -- could have been the chief of protocol. Could it have been an assistant secretary of state?

Q: Yes, it could have been. I just wondered. Quite often, it's the chief of protocol or the deputy chief of protocol who does it.

GINN: Could have been either one of those, but I'll have to look it up.

Q: But it was a State department official?

GINN: Yes, oh yes. It was not Henry [Kissinger].

Q: And then you gave your little speech.

GINN: Yes.

Q: Were you able to have the ambassador from Luxembourg there?

GINN: No. Wait a minute. Was he there? He must have been. You know, I was pretty excited that afternoon.

Q: If he were in town, I'm sure he was there.

GINN: He was very kind to us when we were there in Washington. He invited us to his embassy

for dinner and we had a good relationship with him. Not only then, but later on through the years and since we've been back. I felt like he represented his country very well.

Q: Of course, they leave their people here a long time.

GINN: Oh, yes.

Q: What about buying clothes for the assignment? Was that a problem?

GINN: No, because everything in my wardrobe was going to be new to Luxembourg.

Q: A good point.

GINN: I think I took 16 formal dresses with me, and probably already had all but three of them.

Q: You had had to have so many in your lifestyle anyway.

GINN: Right, right. I did buy a new dress for the presentation of credentials to the Grand Duke. it was a peach-colored, floor-length, ultrasuede.

Q: Peach-colored, floor-length, ultrasuede? Sounds gorgeous.

GINN: It was, and I bought it at the Watergate shop in Washington.

Q: Was it a one-piece dress?

GINN: Uh-hmm. I really didn't have to buy any great wardrobe for it, 'cause when you've been in public life after so long a time, you're pretty well covered for any kind of a situation. There was one other navy blue, long-sleeved dinner dress that I think I got at Garfinckel's. But I didn't have to go into any great wardrobe.

Q: You already had suits, I'm sure.

GINN: Oh yes, except I don't wear suits. I wear long-sleeved, plain, trim dresses. Which Stanley chooses. He chooses all of my clothes.

Q: Oh, yes, that's what you were telling me. He actually goes with you?

GINN: Oh, absolutely. If he isn't with me, I take them home on approval.

Q: So he really is a help in your . . .

GINN: Oh, you better believe it; you better believe it.

Q: Were there any articles written by the press about this back in Missouri?

GINN: Yes, there were, and there was one newsman, Henry Clay Gold, who was the Washington correspondent for the Kansas City Star. Henry had followed me around for years and years and years, through the politics and he paid as high a compliment as any press person could. He said, "I've followed this woman for 20 years and she has never said the wrong thing." I count that as one of the highest compliments that I have ever had.

Q: I should say. I should say.

GINN: The St. Louis Post-Dispatch did a very nice feature article. They sent their people to see us after we got to Luxembourg. There was proper and adequate press coverage. Then the people in Columbia gave a reception for me one Sunday afternoon in one of the hotels, and it was received well.

Q: Well, now, you came back to Columbia after the swearing-in. Just to pack up?

GINN: Yes, we had five days to pack, but we had good friends in the moving business and my dear daughter Sally came down from Iowa, and we just threw together -- we took some Oriental rugs and the silver and our favorite dishes, and that sort of thing. Stanley took his hunting boots, of course.

Q: Did you go to the Art-in-Embassy place in Washington?

GINN: We did, and when they said, "What would like to have?", we said, "We would like to have pictures of wildlife in the United States." They looked aghast [and] said, "Nobody ever asked for that before." But they were extremely helpful, they got on the phone with some galleries in New York and they found us the American mountain goat, all kinds of big eagle pictures and wildlife stamps. Wonderful -- duck stamps -- the series of those. Of course -- Luxembourg is very interested in stamps and it made wonderful conversation for guests who came to the embassy. Then Stanley has a beautiful 23-lb. wild turkey mounted that has hung in our house over the fireplace. So, by golly, we just boxed him up and shipped him to Luxembourg and hung him in the dining room. And, of course, nobody over there had ever seen an American wild turkey before.

Q: 23-pounder! I never knew they got that big -- wild ones.

GINN: Oh, yes. The biggest one he's ever shot weighed 23 pounds. They're big birds, big birds. We took that as a part of us. Apparently, after an ambassador goes to a post, why there's a mild question as to whether or not the interior of the embassy suits, or whether or not this and that and the other should be done. Well, I didn't feel that it was my place to redecorate the whole thing. As Stanley says, "Every old hen has to fluff the feathers in her nest," so I moved the furniture around and we did paint the living room white, instead of pink as it was.

Q: It was pink when you came there?

GINN: It was pink. [Laughs] We took some Oriental rugs with us and that helped a little. But that is -- it's a modest-sized residence. Have you been in it?

Q: No, I have not.

GINN: It's a modest-sized residence, very homelike. The room in the basement level with the bars on the windows they said had been in place since before the war. It was the German embassy during the war, and there had been prisoners incarcerated there. We stored extra pans and canned food in it. We didn't tell people that they were supposed to have been killed down there and shoved [out] through the coal chute. So, the house itself had a history. In the front hall, the chandelier was the one that Perle Mesta had given to the embassy, a beautiful chandelier.

Q: Was it? Prisms?

GINN: Yes, great. And the hall was a two-story-high hall with a three-sided stairway that went around it.

Q: It sounds lovely.

GINN: And up on the second floor there was one, two, three, four -- there were five bedrooms. And, oh, what was that wonderful man's name who was ambassador there before? Oh, his name must come up. But he was very kind. He was very helpful to me. In fact, he and his wife gave a dinner party for us in New York. Oh, I'm distressed that I can't pull that up, but it will come up. When he and his wife had been there, she told us, there were no closets in the master bedroom at all, so they moved up and lived on the third floor for several months while there was a dressing room cut off of half of the master bedroom. So then, that made it very comfortable, because there was plenty room for clothes storage.

Q: How was the plumbing? Did you find it unusual?

GINN: No, no. It was civilized. And the house itself was very comfortable. There was no insulation in the attic though, and I reported that to -- not Buildings and Grounds, but when I came back to Washington after my tour of duty, that the United States could save a considerable amount of money if they just put some insulation up there. I'm sure they threw the report away.

Q: Not necessarily. You'd be surprised.

GINN: But it did need that. In the attic, it was full-sized. There could have been three or four more bedrooms put up there. The ironing room was up there in the attic, if you can imagine, of all places.

Q: How inconvenient to have to climb up and down. Well, did you take your books with you?

GINN: No, no.

Q: You didn't bother with that.

GINN: No, we didn't bother. Oh, there were a few that we took, but we didn't move the library

in any respect.

Q: Did you leave your home open back here?

GINN: We just walked out and locked the key -- left it, so we didn't have to dismantle it or put things in storage. Oh, in five days there's no way we could have done it.

Q: No, I didn't see how. Well, now, in that time, you could not have had any language training. You started that when you got there?

GINN: That's right. Wonderful French tutor. She would get up, come to me every morning at 8 o'clock. I'm very grateful for her. She was originally from the town of Le Mans, where the automobile race is run. That was her base. The people at the embassy said that French from that area was pretty overall accepted as the right accent to have, so I was very grateful for their perception and the fact they were able to find her.

Q: She worked for the Embassy?

GINN: No, she came in as a private tutor.

Q: Especially for you. Very good. One thing on this side of the Atlantic, were you received by the president, by President Ford, before you left?

GINN: Yes I was.

Q: Would you tell me about that?

GINN: Stanley, of course, went with me. We had known him for a long time.

Q: Oh, you already knew him.

GINN: Yes, because of the work at the Republican national conventions and the national committee and all of our political responsibilities.

Q: Oh, of course.

GINN: He was very kind and gracious there in his office.

Q: This is the Oval Office?

GINN: Yes. But he gave me no special instructions.

Q: No special instructions?

GINN: No, he really didn't.

Q: Did he have his picture taken with you?

GINN: Oh, yes. Which I have.

Q: How you fitted all this in that one month, I don't know.

GINN: I don't know how we did it either I really don't.

Q: When you went to Luxembourg, you went by plane, I assume.

GINN: Yes, TWA.

Q: Did you stop anywhere en route?

GINN: No, just went right through Paris and right on over.

Q: No stopovers.

GINN: When we got there, of course, why we were met by Dan Phillips and the chauffeur and the car and the young lady who was to be my secretary. We went right back to the residence. All of the members of the staff and the officers were there, and we had a little reception there together and got to meet them all at that point and so it was an easy beginning.

Q: Tell how you felt when you were sworn in and you heard those very solemn words and then you repeated those very solemn words. What went through your mind when you put your hand on the Bible and . . .

GINN: "Lord help me do it." Scary as all get out.

Q: Had the fear dissipated a bit by the time you arrived there and met the staff?

GINN: It wasn't really fear. It was concern that I do a good job of it. But I think the one experience that I had that probably will always stay with me was the time when the head of our Marine Corps's enlistment expired and he wished to re-enlist. Giving that man his oath I will never forget, because I wasn't Rosemary Ginn then. I was the United States Government.

Q: You were the government, yes. It's quite an experience to have had, quite a privileged experience to have had. You couldn't help but feel that you were the United States?

GINN: Yes, which is the traumatic part of that, because, "Oh, lord, help me from taking the wrong step, making the wrong, smart remark, stepping on the wrong foot." When I went to make my first call [on] another ambassador, to the man senior in time of duty, and it was the Russian ambassador and I went by myself. [Laughs] I thought, "Oh, little Rosemary, you're in trouble." But I wasn't. It didn't take me long to find out the man was a fisherman.

Q: Did you take your translator?

GINN: No, I had not. I had to use his translator, who spoke English very nicely and well. The ambassador pretended he did not speak any English, though I know that trick, too. So many of the things I would say to the translator, if he spoke any English at all, went directly to him. But it wasn't as traumatic as I thought that it might be.

Q: Had you worked out exactly what you wanted to say to him?

GINN: Yes, I knew. I knew what I should. Dan Phillips, of course, briefed me as to what was proper, and I was always careful enough to consult with him. I didn't have to go off on any wild goose chase and think I knew how to do it.

Q: Was it used as an occasion to "send a message," as they say?

GINN: Sometimes.

Q: In your case, was it?

GINN: It was not.

Q: Could we hear about the meeting with the Grand Duke? How soon did you present your credentials?

GINN: Oh, it was very shortly, because I really was not official until those had been presented. It was either the next day or the day following.

Q: That soon?

GINN: That soon. The Grand Duke sent his car and his chauffeur and his footman for us, to take us to the palace. The first thing I discovered was that the attaché highest ranking, whom he had sent, had been held in the arms of an American soldier when he was a baby, during the war. I knew that he had a strong feeling about Americans, which was very fortunate. All through the time that we were there we saw him any number of times that we'd go to the various functions. He was a Luxembourger, but he was also an American at heart, and that was good. But the actual presentation was a very simple kind of a ceremony. Have you been in that palace in Luxembourg?

Q: No, I've never been to Luxembourg.

GINN: It was in the city. The royal family has several, of course, several palaces. He was in residence at the city palace, which is in the heart of old Luxembourg. You ride through the great doors into the courtyard, and you get out under cover and go into the little waiting room. On one side is the gun room, and my heavens, there were cases twice as long as my arm can show filled with historic guns.

You go into the Gold Room, the little room on the other side, and sign the Gold Book, showing

that you were there. There was a stairway in that little palace with a great wide stairs of marble, wonderful railings that come down the stairway and curl out in the proper angle. And at the top of those were -- is malabar the green stone?

Q: Malachite?

GINN: Malachite. Jardinieres that were this tall of malachite at the top of this stairway, beautiful mirrors with gold frames up that stairway and then divided in back, and at the top you were in kind of a waiting hall. You waited there for a very few minutes and the footman came in and took you into the [waiting] area. And from there they came for you and took you into the next room, where the Grand Duke and the Grand Duchess waited to receive us.

Q: Did you take any of your staff with you?

GINN: No, no.

Q: Just your husband and you?

GINN: Just Stanley and I went.

Q: Did you withdraw the credentials of your predecessor?

GINN: Yes. Had to make it official, if I remember correctly. Isn't that right?

Q: It depends on the place.

GINN: Well, they warned me to be sure and do it, if I remember correctly.

Q: Yes, usually that's the way it is. But I have run across . . .

GINN: First you do that and then you give your own. They stood to shake hands with us, to receive the documents, and then they were seated and they invited us to sit down, and we did. They talked about their children, they talked about their family, they talked about their dogs. We talked our dogs, we talked about our children, we talked about how fortunate we were that our countries were such good friends and partners in this world, and it was a very gentle, low-key social visit. There were no innuendoes, no messages subliminally or otherwise to be delivered.

Q: Did you have a translator with you?

GINN: No, they spoke English, beautiful English.

Q: I suppose it lasted about a half an hour, maybe?

GINN: Maybe twenty minutes. And they stood, and we withdrew.

Q: Were they all decked out?

GINN: Well, yes. She had on a long dress, but he had on a uniform with full array of medals.

Q: Oh, yes. It must have been pretty impressive.

GINN: Oh! Can you imagine! Here, little girl -- country girl, from Columbia, Missouri, being received by the Grand Duke? Yes, ma'am. [Break in tape transmission]
Unbelievable trip, particularly coming in from the outside of that kind of officialdom. If I had been to a swearing-in before, like that in the State Department, it would not have been all so new and foreign. The whole thing was a new wonderland, so I had to be doubly careful because I had no past experience that I could rely on, make judgments from, or adapt. That's why I was so lucky to have James Daniel Phillips there.

Q: You got along with him right from the beginning?

GINN: Oh, absolutely.

Q: Yes. You had the opportunity, I'm sure, to select your own DCM.

GINN: Oh, yes, I could have.

Q: Why did you decide to take a chance on whoever was there?

GINN: Well, he knew the ropes. If anybody else were brought in who hadn't been there before, nobody would have known the ropes. He already had the good contacts with the men in the government and that kind of rapport can be very valuable. And I had no complex about his knowing more about it than I did. I was grateful to have him there as a counselor at my side.

Q: You just took it as a given that you would get along him, or that he would get along with you, I should say.

GINN: Sure, sure.

Q: You didn't meet him before?

GINN: No.

Q: Do you know how rare this is?

GINN: Is it rare?

Q: For it to work out?

GINN: I'd like to know.

Q: Well, I would say one in a million, maybe.

GINN: Really?

Q: The biggest problem is with the deputy chief for any ambassador, and particularly since the deputy is always career, if the new Ambassador is non-career, there is often terrible friction.

GINN: I can see why there would be. No, it didn't bother me. I was grateful he knew more than I did, because if all he knew is what I knew and less, then we didn't have a very good team.

Q: Did you select your own secretary? You mentioned the young lady being there to meet you.

GINN: No, she was there. She was wonderful. I still hear from her. Wonderful little girl, dedicated. She lives in a suburb of Washington. Even the day that girl's mother died, she came to work at the office.

Q: Really?

GINN: Yes, and we had to insist that she go home.

Q: Has she resigned from the service now?

GINN: Yes, she's out of the service now retired. She was highly recommended to me by the department, and I was very grateful. Really, it was a good team.

Q: For the record, what was her name?

GINN: Ellen Brugger.

Q: And you tell me that James Phillips has now become an ambassador?

GINN: That's right. And he, Dan Phillips' and his wife, they were not in good accord within their own relationship, and consequently, their little girl, Katie, was happy to spend time with us. She did, she spent lots of time, spent lots of nights with our granddaughter, Callie, who came to live with us there.

Q: Callie didn't come with you when you arrived? She came afterwards?

GINN: That's right.

Q: How did that come about?

GINN: Well, I just felt if there was any way I could share that experience with somebody else in my family that it would be worthwhile. Sally's daughters weren't old enough that they could have assumed a semi-adult responsibility, and Callie was her father and mother's choice to come. At age eleven, they're kind of both flesh and fowl, and she could be grown up if necessary but she could get out and play football with the boys if that was what she wanted to do. So it worked

out very well.

Q: Did she stay the whole time?

GINN: The whole time. Went to school at the European school of the Common Market that they had there. Had half of her classes in French and half of them in English. Did well in her studies.

Q: Did she have to have special training in French?

GINN: She had had French. She had lived in Switzerland for a year, before. Dr. Almond took his whole family to Geneva when Christopher was just a year old, and he went to establish the Heart Surgery Department at the University of Geneva.
Callie had been -- she went to a little village school there, in one of the suburbs so that she had enough French that she could . . .

Q: She could handle it.

GINN: Yes, yes.

Q: Who else did you have on your staff?

GINN: I am ashamed to admit that the intelligence people, the administration officer . . .

Q: Economic?

GINN: The economics officer, and Dan Phillips.

Q: How about a consular officer?

GINN: Yes, yes. There was one of those. But I won't go into intelligence. Economics was Hawkins, and his wife was there. There were a number of other secretaries.

Q: Yes. Was the admin officer also the economic officer?

GINN: No.

Q: You had two separate ones?

GINN: That's right.

Q: They were combined at one time in Luxembourg. Hawkins and administrative.

GINN: I'll have to look those up.

Q: Well, those names I can get. They list the officers but they don't list the secretaries.

GINN: Right after we'd been introduced to the chef and the butler they announced to us that the 4th of July was coming up very soon and they had invited 1,500 people for a picnic. Wow! Oh, dear! They had rented a chateau out, north of Luxembourg City, which was a chateau that had been taken over by the government -- the Germans -- during the war, and it had been used as a prison, and some of the officers of the Luxembourg wouldn't come. They told us later because they had been incarcerated there, and it had very sad and traumatic memories for them. We invited the mayor of every town in the country, all of the city officials in the country, of course, all of the government people who should be [invited], and many of the people who were supporters of the Americans, the American Women's Club and all of that. Eighteen hundred people came and four dogs. We drank up every coke that we could find from the Bitburg Army Base in Germany west. The cookies that the American Women's Club made were just in the hundreds. It was a beautiful day, sun shining, of all things in Luxembourg, which is kind of rare. It was in the garden of the chateau which had been built in the fourteenth century. There were great statues, four representing [and facing] the great sections of the world. There was one [that] was faced towards the building; [it] didn't face out into the garden, and that was [the direction] the United States is. They didn't know anything about it [when the chateau was built] so, it was turned away. But the band that came just played Luxembourgois music, American music and John Philip Sousa has never had his music played any more times than it was that summer in Luxembourg. Every week there would be a band concert some place and of course we would go, receive the flowers, make a short speech, admire the children and the music.

Q: Oh, the bicentennial, of course! Dan Phillips had set all this up?

GINN: Set it all up, had it all in order, and when I saw what they had done, I just said, "Amen. Let's go." The night before that big party we had a beautiful symphony concert for those that weren't the picnic types. The dear Prince Charles, the brother of the Grand Duke, who came to our concert with his wife, Joan Dillon --

Q: Of the American Dillon family?

GINN: Yes. She was there, too. And he confided to Stanley, "I've got my swimming suit on under this. I'm going to go home and jump in the swimming pool." He was a wonderful soul, wonderful soul, as was she. She brought her children to the picnic the next day. She said, "I wanted to have them have a feeling of something that's really American on this Fourth of July." Her chauffeur was off on that day, so we sent a car for her, and she came, and, oh, those little people had the best time. They could run and play with other little children with the freedom that in the royal apartments they didn't have.

Q: Yes, of course. It must be constricting life to them -- to live that way. When you arrived, what were U.S. relations with Luxembourg? Was everything going along well?

GINN: Everything was going along all right, except they had had some problems with the prior American ambassador and when my name was submitted to them they said, "We don't want her." So then the United States sent back the message, "We regret that you don't want this lady. We want her." So when I went, that was the kind of a situation that I went into in so far as the government. . .

Q: I see.

GINN: But they softened up and I didn't have any problem. I just played like there was none and there was never any attention paid to it.

Q: Did you get any feeling when you first arrived of this antipathy?

GINN: No.

Q: You didn't. They were polite. How long had it been since the last ambassador had left and you came? In other words, how long was Phillips chargé?

GINN: Must have been two or three months.

Q: He did not show any signs of being sorry you had arrived on the scene?

GINN: I never had that feeling, never had that feeling. Either he didn't have it or he concealed it well. Oh, he's a great person.

Q: Where'd you say he is now? Ambassador to what?

GINN: Burundi?

Q: Good for him.

GINN: But we loved his little daughter, Katie, and I loved his wife, Rosemary. Oh, she was a great girl. But she was caught in the beginning of when the wives in the department were feeling that their contribution to life, liberty and the pursuit of diplomacy were not particularly well-acknowledged. And they were right, of course. So it just somehow -- there may have been other reasons which I don't know anything about, but it magnified itself, and by the time he finished his tour of duty there and they came back to the United States, why they had decided to separate. The woman to whom he is now married was a widow from Baltimore. We went back to his wedding. She's an excellent woman. She's a scholar in her own right. She has children of her own. He brought her to see us at the Piney River house in Missouri and we all stomped up and down the river together. He's also been stationed in Casablanca since Luxembourg.

Q: Has he? One of his predecessors in Luxembourg was in Casablanca, too, as consul general. Isn't that a coincidence? Fred Gallant.

GINN: That's the name I've been trying to think of -- Fred Gallant. It was he with whom I worked in UNESCO. He was stationed in Paris when I was there.

Q: Fred was in Paris?

GINN: Yes.

Q: I didn't know that.

GINN: Okay. He is a first class character. He is so smart. The Lord better look out for him, and I know that if the devil isn't scared to death, he will be shortly.

[Break in transmission]

Q: How often did you have staff meetings?

GINN: Every Monday morning.

Q: In your office?

GINN: My staff, in my office, absolutely. The country team about once a month, because part of our people, like our military attaché, was over in Brussels and they'd come down. Of course we had no military problem, and the entire Luxembourg Army consisted of the band, I think, and four spare horses, or something like that.

Q: How many marines did you have?

GINN: About a dozen. Good, good boys. When my grandsons came to visit, Pierre Blanched, a marine, taught them how to raise the flag, let them participate in the ceremony.

Q: Oh, did he? How nice!

GINN: Oh, it really was. And my granddaughter, Callie, who lived there with us, lost a tooth while she was there. She buried it under the flag pole. [Laughter]

Q: Gave it a good Christian burial

GINN: On American soil. [Laughter]

Q: Aren't children wonderful?

GINN: Oh, they really are, they really are.

Q: How did you conduct these staff meetings.? Were these done on collegial lines?

GINN: Very, very informally. We all had coffee to drink. We went around the table and everybody could speak his mind, and we worked through what we had ahead of us in the next week, what there was that was special that would be coming up or could be coming up -- very informal, low-keyed; no formality or parliamentary procedure. It was just a good team meeting. (Reading): "Relationship with head of state, members of the cabinet." I was very fortunate to meet the members of the cabinet, to call on them, and the heads of the departments, and to visit with them. Fortunately, there, all of those men could speak English. I visited them in their offices

to call on them. They felt at ease and were relaxed. Of course, the war experience was so real and so near that all of those men were seriously involved, and some of their conversations were very frightening to hear.

Q: Yes, our war was so different from what they experienced. We were not invaded -- conquered.

GINN: That's right. One of the NATO projects that occurred while I was there was an exercise in which they brought German troops into Luxembourg, [as well as] French troops and American troops for kind of a NATO exercise. It was the first time any German troops had been on Luxembourg soil and there was great tiptoe-toeing around about it. The local people weren't comfortable with it and people were extremely glad when it was all over. They held it out south and west of Luxembourg City at a place where the Celts had had a camp 2,000 years ago, and where the archeological department of the University of Missouri had a dig, and here were these modern machines. Of course, I was there as the American ambassador, and I had on my heavy boots and my camouflage suit and my dark green cape, and I shook hands with every American soldier that was there. I told our marine sergeant when I got back, I said, "I was prepared for everything but the noise," and I said, "I had never really had any concept of what the noise of war could be." Because they were firing, the helicopters were coming in, the troops were moving. It was just a simulated exercise that they had, and here they were on this mountaintop that the Celts had fought on thousands of years ago, only in that battle their chief was killed and so they gave up. If your chief is dead, why then you're -- you've had it.

Q: Your side has lost.

GINN: That's right. But the dig was very profitable. They found lots of coins there and then, of course, they transferred them to the museum in Luxembourg City. It was interesting, especially that it had the Missouri connection.

Q: Did you get to meet a lot of the local people?

GINN: Yes, quite a few.

Q: Business people?

GINN: Business people -- well, not mainly.

Q: Not mainly?

GINN: No, just -- at least once a week, I'd go to market, down into the city market in the old area and I could converse in enough German which was the language there of the marketplace, to visit with people, and they knew who I was. I would buy things from them specially, to make a contact and that sort of thing. And then we were careful to go to all of the invitations of the local people that we could accept. The best thing that we thought we could do was in public relations -- people-to-people, because in a country where you have no great governmental problems, why then, that should come next from our point of view, and so that's what we did.

Q: How did you see your job when you went over there after your briefings by State? That your job was to maintain relations?

GINN: Maintain relations.

Q: And improve them?

GINN: Yes.

Q: On a person-to-person basis?

GINN: Right.

Q: Did you find the entertaining load and the going to parties to be very heavy?

GINN: It was heavy, but that's what I'd been doing all my life.

Q: Politics seems to work very well as a training ground for diplomacy, doesn't it?

GINN: Yes, I think it does. Because in politics, the name of the game is to convince people to do what you want them to do, and as I view diplomacy, it's practically the same thing.

Q: Yes and you have to think about constituencies.

GINN: Yes. Oh, I visited schools. I went to exhibits. Just the same thing any other ambassador would have done, or has done, or should do.

Q: Could you describe a typical day, knowing that all days are different?

GINN: Yes. I kept a journal. I kept notes on each day, and I've never taken time yet to transcribe them, which is too bad because, like the sunset, the color fades if you don't do it. I would set my clock for 15 minutes before I had to get up, and then I would write the notes for the day previous. Then I would get up. I generally ate breakfast with Callie, because sometimes that would be the only time of day that I could see her. Then she would go off to school. She rode the bus to school. At that time, there was some kind of a prohibition about [families using] the official vehicle. She had to walk a block sometimes when it was pitch black. Now, I think, I would be extremely reluctant for her to do that.

And then at 8 o'clock why I, would be in my office for my French lesson, and then at 9 o'clock, if it were Monday, we would have our staff meetings. Then, of course, it's the usual day: you have your cables, you have whatever appointment, you go wherever whose guest book needs to be signed at whatever embassy. Wherever you go for lunch in the afternoon, it's more of the same, and eventually you get around to dictating 15 or 20 letters, and then you rush home and change clothes and go out to dinner.

Q: Yes, or cocktails, I suppose.

GINN: We had a pretty good way that we handled that. We enjoy our wine and a light drink, but it's so easy to slip into the infusion of too much of that stuff. Before you know it, it slips up on you. So there would be maybe two days, or three days a week, we'd just cut it off entirely, and that way it wasn't a question of taking one drink and stopping. You just did or didn't, and you divided about a third, two-thirds, and we could account for it.

Q: And you found that system worked?

GINN: Yes. It worked; it worked. At that point we had not discovered any good California wine. We served Luxembourgish wine. Mr. Cravatt, who owned the big hotel there in Luxembourg City, had met Stanley at the Rotary Club. Stanley went to every Rotary Club meeting in the country, every week. That was a big help to you.

Mr. Cravatt said, "I'm going next week down to the vineyards. You may go with me. After I have bought all that I want for the hotel, you may buy some for the embassy." So Stanley would go pitty-pattying along with Mr. Cravatt and they would have a great day, and Stanley would buy the wine for the Embassy. So it gave us good Luxembourgish wine to serve to the Luxembourgers, which they appreciated.

Q: I'm sure they did.

GINN: There was this funny house next door to the embassy. We never saw any signs of family life. The only time we ever saw anybody come or go would be very few people early in the morning, and the lights were on long. We couldn't figure out who they were or what it was and so we made discrete inquiry and found it was a private Rothschild bank -- no sign outside, no nothing.

Q: My word! [Pause] What was your favorite kind of entertaining?

GINN: Dinners.

Q: You liked dinners?

GINN: Yes. We had a wonderful young chef whom Stanley had hired, a young French fellow, who was a superb chef.

Q: What happened to the previous chef?

GINN: Mrs. Farkas took her own help.

Q: Oh, she brought her own people. That's true. So Stanley hired a chef, and that chef was . . .

GINN: Was French, but he'd grown up in Switzerland, and that was where he had learned to cook. He had blond, very curly hair, and he was 23, and oh, how that boy could cook! Mrs. Farkas had had a new kitchen put in the main floor of the house -- proper cabinets, all that

business. He took one look at it, and he would have no part of it, and he went back down to the lower level with the old stove that had a hole in the bottom of the oven, [and] put a pan over that. Happy as he could be down there in that antique, antediluvian area.

Q: It's what you're used to. It's what you can cope with best.

GINN: That's right. One day I went down there and told him that I regretted to report that I thought I had seen a mouse in his kitchen. The next day I had a luncheon for some ladies, and when my plate was served to me, there was a ripe olive with two little ears cut in and a long string of a tail on my plate. [Laughing] I figured I'd better not criticize the boy's kitchen anymore.

Q: Oh, that's cute. Very subtle way of . . .

GINN: I got the message. Of course, every now and then, the urge to barbecue would hit Stanley. So he built one of his wild barbecues like he has here, and he would barbecue outside the door of the pantry. The chef and the butler couldn't stand it. They'd never seen such barbaric ways of cooking: it's terrible -- no sauce, no nothing. Terrible.

Q: I know, just plain meat.

GINN: Oh, just plain meat. They would sneak and watch, and then when he did that, at the same time, the marine on duty in the office would turn his television on so he could watch what was going on. [Laughter]

Q: Oh, isn't that funny.

GINN: Oh, it was, it was.

Q: Where did you place the most emphasis? Which department? On politics? Or maybe there wasn't that much activity in politics?

GINN: There really was -- there was activity in politics, but it wasn't the area where I had any expertise. I was strongly guided by the people who were there. They were people who had been at that post for quite a while. I didn't need to upset any arrangements. I was careful to try and seek counsel before I went to meet a new person. They would tell me if it was somebody that I should be leery of. Before I went, in Columbia, Missouri, I visited with a man who was a retired Army colonel for whom I had the greatest respect, and I sought his advice and counsel. He said, "Don't make close friends too quickly," and that was good advice, because there were people who sought to move in that would not have been as apropos as you well know. There's always some that try . . .

Q: Oh, absolutely. They move in with each new ambassador.

GINN: Oh, of course, of course.

Q: The economic work, certainly, or commercial work, must be quite heavy, because after all, Luxembourg is such a banking center.

GINN: Oh, yes, that is true, and there were always representatives from American firms who'd be coming over there. The banking business, of course, was growing by leaps and bounds. I visited every American factory that was in Luxembourg, went through it. Last winter, on board ship, the man who had been the manager of the Goodyear Tire plant was on board ship and was seated at our table, and reminisced. (We found out he knew the doctor with whom Stanley hunted, so we sent the doctor in Luxembourg a card via Jean Gerard's office because we couldn't think of his address.) I could tell him where I went in his factory, about one of the workers I saw, who was a little tiny woman managing the biggest machine I ever saw, about a design I saw in the computer of their computer room. He was surprised, to put it mildly.

Q: There are several hundred U.S. businesses, aren't there?

GINN: Yes, there are many. I don't know how many hundred, but there are good, substantial business plants. The Luxembourger is a good worker. They're work-oriented. They're as much like Americans not to be Americans. I guess there are more former Luxembourgers who live around the Chicago area than there are in Luxembourg.

Q: Did you have a very large program in USIS?

GINN: No, we did not. There was no library there, no great display of American information.

Q: No library?

GINN: No.

Q: So you didn't have a USIS officer? That's curious. Well, I suppose it was lack of funds.

GINN: Well, yes. Now then, there's a branch of Miami University there, the one from Ohio, and they carried a lot of that kind of load for us. We had a good relationship with them, with their [Luxembourg] students, with their students they had brought from the United States, who expanded their own interests out and made inroads in the Luxembourg community. That is a very good operation. And of course the man who then thereafter -- not immediately after me, but one man after -- John Dolibois, became the ambassador to Luxembourg. He was connected with Miami University, and I visited Miami University when -- who was the prime minister -- Thorn?

Q: Yes.

GINN: Gaston -- when he came to receive an honorary degree at Miami University, I went to Ohio to be there.

Q: Oh, did you? You must have known him then?

GINN: Yes, I did.

Q: Yes, Gaston Thorn has come up before in my interviews. Who was that man who became ambassador?

GINN: John Dolibois. He was a native Luxembourger, a very bright man, nice wife.

Q: Very good. How was your admin officer?

GINN: We worked all right. There was no great personal relationship there, but he was a competent man.

Q: He was competent?

GINN: Yes. He was competent. He looked after us well and that was that. There was no great social connection in any great respect, but his work was adequately done.

Q: Your social relationship was more with your DCM, of all of the others?

GINN: Yes, of all the others.

Q: Which is usually the way it happens. How about your secretary?

GINN: Such a delight.

Q: Did you have her the whole time you were there?

GINN: No, I had two. I had one who was there for a very short period at first, and then the other little girl came thereafter and had her mother. She had been assigned to an embassy, I believe in Switzerland. She had lots of relatives in Switzerland and she had been assigned there, and then left there and came to be with me. A totally competent young woman, delightful.

Q: And the other one's tour had . . .

GINN: Had expired or finished.

Q: So you didn't have any staff problems at all?

GINN: No, I didn't. Only the maid who insisted on moving the furniture back to its prior position. But we worked that out. The secretary was a tremendous help to me. You take a young woman like that who has had the skill and the training that those women receive, and the ultimate know-how of laid-back smarts. Sometime you ought to pick some of those secretaries and do an in-depth study on them.

Q: Yes, yes. They've led very interesting lives.

GINN: Who is an unsung angel.

Q: That's right. They are very competent.

GINN: Oh, my! Goodness gracious!

Q: I always think of them as very courageous women, too. They go to some of the strangest places, and they seem to accept anything.

GINN: And they don't have any great status when they are at their post.

Q: That's right. [Pause] What about the money? Did you find you were given enough money for your entertaining allowances?

GINN: No.

Q: You were not?

GINN: It wasn't. We would have a meeting every quarter and Dan and I would figure out what the needs were about to be, and then we would present that to the rest of the team and see if that took care of their needs as well as possible, and we would just juggle around. And when all else failed, why we'd call on Uncle Stanley for help.

Q: Uh-hmm, you had to use your own.

GINN: Uh-hmm. But we understood what the situation was and we went knowing what it was, so it was no great shock to anybody.

Q: Is that an expensive post? Right in the middle of Europe that way, I suppose it would be.

GINN: Well, you know that is a relative kind of thing.

Q: I know. How was the dollar at that time? Bouncing up and down?

GINN: Yes. It didn't ruin our family finance. We knew what we were getting into and we didn't go around to have the fanciest parties in the world but we entertained and we entertained a lot, and we entertained adequately.

Q: And you entertained the way you would have back here?

GINN: Sure.

Q: Did your husband have anything to do with the menus as well as the wine?

GINN: No. [I] had a wonderful little social secretary. She would meet with the chef and they would cook up a whole flock of menus, and they would send them over to me and I would say yes or no.

Q: I see. Was she a Luxembourger?

GINN: Yes. Very bright girl. She has since moved to the United States. She has married an American and lives in Washington. Bright girl. Sharp, sharp. Marian -- I can't pull up her new married name.

Q: Did you feel you had enough policy guidance from the department?

GINN: I would have wished for more. Dan Phillips was my only source with experience, really.

Q: Yes, I see. Did you ever have recourse to call on the president or on the White House?

GINN: No.

Q: Would you have if you had had to?

GINN: No, I would have called the Department of State.

Q: That is interesting, because one of the points that is made by many political ambassadors is that they have a clout that a career person wouldn't have, because they could go to the president.

GINN: But if I had felt that, I certainly could have. There was no problem with that. But from my point of view, my team route went through the department.

Q: You are very much a team player.

GINN: Yes. I can't imagine anything any worse than calling the president directly, bypassing the State Department, leaving them out sitting in the cold, not knowing what's going on in their own playhouse.

Q: But it happens all the time.

GINN: I'm sure it does.

Q: It happens to George Shultz.

GINN: Well, when I get to be president I will instruct my ambassadors.

Q: I hope you will.

GINN: Just tell them, by golly, if they've got anything to say, they go through the State Department first.

Q: Well, you know the excuse they use. They always say, "I am the president's personal

representative," which they are, but at the same time, they also represent the people of the United States.

GINN: That's right.

Q: It's a very interesting thing. How do you feel about the idea of a committee to look over the names of people being proposed for ambassadorships, the way you served on a committee to appoint judges?

GINN: I think it might be very satisfactory.

Q: You think so?

GINN: Uh-hmm.

Q: Might serve a purpose?

GINN: Uh-hmm. To have -- now these would be people who would be outside of the department?

Q: Correct. Oh, absolutely, they would be people like yourself.

GINN: I would think it could have merit.

Q: Some people say, "Well, a judge has to fit certain criteria, but an ambassador doesn't." But it seems almost as though you could set up criteria.

GINN: Oh, of course, of course they have to meet criteria. There's all kinds of criteria that an Ambassador should meet. Yes, I would think it would be useful to have that kind of a committee.

Q: Because there is quite a movement on for that.

GINN: Is there really?

Q: Yes. Yes. David Newsom at Georgetown University is one of the proponents, and Carol Laise is another. I don't know whether you've heard of her. She used to be the director general and was ambassador to Nepal. Married to Ellsworth Bunker.

GINN: Yes.

Q: I asked her about it, and she said, "Well, I think it's a great idea, but I don't think it will ever happen." Which seems to be the way with so many good ideas.

GINN: Well, that's true, that's true, but it just wouldn't hurt a bit. It would help. I wouldn't feel like I would have any real wisdom to offer in the choice of a career diplomat, but for a non-career diplomat, I would think it could be useful.

Q: Well, it is something that is talked about.

GINN: That's very interesting.

Q: But they always come back and say, "Well, a judge has to meet certain requirements of having passed the bar, and the various committees can look over his record and see whether he was good, bad or indifferent," as just happened to Judge Bork. "And there is no such thing -- no such examination -- that ambassadors take."

GINN: I don't think that's particularly relevant to the basic problem. What you're dealing with is, can this specific individual, as he is, do the best job at that post under these circumstances, and what talents does he bring? And where would he be short-changed?

Q: Sure, because, of course, the Senate is supposed to be the one that weeds them out, and in the case of the day when you were there, they did.

GINN: They did.

Q: But they don't always, you know, and then it's really quite embarrassing. For the career people at the post, I can assure you, it's very embarrassing.

GINN: Yes.

Q: Because foreigners don't hesitate to say, "What's the matter with you Americans?"

GINN: That is right. And I know. There have been some who have been sent overseas that were a little difficult to understand why they were sent there.

Q: What is your feeling about the political versus the career ambassador? What do you think the proportions there should be?

GINN: Well, hasn't it been about 12 percent?

Q: More like 25.

GINN: Twenty-five non-career people? Well --

Q: But now it's about forty percent.

GINN: Forty percent non-career?

Q: Which is one of the things, of course, that is crushing careerists at the department. There aren't many places for the top people anymore.

GINN: Okay. That would come as a result of the pressure of the ultraconservatives in this

administration.

Q: That's correct. They feel they want their own people in there in order to explain the president's policies.

GINN: Well, and to promote their own conservative ideas.

Q: I do certainly see where it is very valuable in some situations, where you have somebody who knows the president and can smooth the path and get things through without having to go through the red tape. I can see that.

GINN: But that's not the name of the game for me.

Q: No?

GINN: The name of the game is to go through the structure, because you sitting off here on the limb of this side of the tree may have no idea what the impact of what you're going to do is going to have on the other side of that tree, and that's what the State Department is for. They're going to sit there in the trunk and balance the limbs of the tree.

Q: That's a very good point, a very good point.

GINN: Has to be that way in this kind of a government.

Q: Because they have the whole picture.

GINN: Sure.

Q: It's interesting to have your views. I'm sure a lot of the officers -- the career officers -- would love it if there were only 12 percent non-career ambassadors. [Laughing]

GINN: I can see the opportunities for a president to acknowledge people who have been helpful. Somebody ought to invent a different kind of a super reward that he can give other than in a place where it's the most serious business in the world of the government . Let's invent one . . .

Q: What was the most important problem you dealt with while you were in Luxembourg? Or were there no real crises?

GINN: There were no crises. The consular problems, I guess, were boys that got put in jail for drugs, the woman whose husband died while she was there on a trip. Those were the human problems. One of the personnel in our office got sick and had to go to the hospital. The people problems were important. There were no major governmental problems.

Q: It's a very stable government.

GINN: Oh, the government is very stable. The South African problem began to heat up about the

time that I was ready to leave. And the government -- our government -- was making moves toward encouraging Luxembourg to take certain positions in regard to the problems in South Africa. Those were the problems of international importance as they filtered down into Luxembourg. The problems of business -- the people who represented business in the United States who came there, seeking help in the promotion of their products, that's a continuous flow in that kind of business. And there were interesting concerns about the deployment and the storage of ammunition in Luxembourg.

Q: Yes, I bet that was sticky.

GINN: That was. It was of interest because you could see their reluctance and their concern. But so far as heavy international problems, I remember having the feeling that I thought it would certainly be a great help if the secretary of state, when he was making his quick tours over there, if he would come to Luxembourg once instead of always going to Brussels. It would have a great effect, because here is a loyal ally. Luxembourg has always been on our side and we never pay them any attention at all your real leaders. And if the President should pay a formal visit to Luxembourg, those people would just . . .

Q: Wouldn't they?

GINN: Then they would have arrived. And, again, it's an understanding that you have to acknowledge all of your constituencies.

Q: Yes, and it's so close to Brussels.

GINN: Yes. Just a zip and a hop and there's a wonderful airport there.

General Haig came down to see us a number of times. He was well-received in Luxembourg. He came and made a speech to our businessmen's clubs one time. He's a fantastic speaker.

Q: So I've heard.

GINN: And so far as an associate to work with, I found him very comfortable to work with.

Q: Considerate?

GINN: Yes. A very bright man. I was always very grateful that he was on our team as an American.

Q: He had a lot of prestige in Europe, didn't he?

GINN: Oh my yes!

Q: Not taken too seriously by the party, though, as a presidential candidate?

GINN: There's just too many fine men in line ahead of him. Thank heavens. Not because I'd

want him to be at the back, but thank heavens we have that kind of resource.

Q: That's right. Did you ever have any CODELS, Congressional delegations?

GINN: Yes. Two or three.

Q: Was it hectic?

GINN: What lovely wallpaper we have. [Laughter] Because I think that when the congressmen do come, in spite of the fact that they present and seem to have a lack of serious mien when they're there, they probably pick up a lot more than we know. That can be done very easily by people that are as skilled with the public as the congressmen are. But there are many times when their actions are misunderstood.

Q: Yes. Especially by the local press.

GINN: Oh my yes.

Q: How were you handled by the local press?

GINN: Oh, comfortably. I only had one problem and that was when I invited a newsman to a dinner and he never replied. Never replied, never showed up, never said anything.

Q: Do you suppose it went astray? The invitation?

GINN: We don't know, but it was so delicate we didn't dare call up and say, "Where is so-and-so, and why haven't we heard from him?" We didn't know. He might not have had a tuxedo, and it would have been embarrassing if we had made that inquiry. So we just held the plate at the ready sign if necessary.

Q: And whisked it off at the last minute. Did you have Foreign Service Inspectors?

GINN: Yes, we did.

Q: And how did you make out with them?

GINN: Didn't have any problems. We didn't have any problems there that they found. At least none that they reported to me.

Q: Well, they would have, I'm sure.

GINN: The staff felt it was a comfortable visit and that the inspectors were pleased and that there wasn't any problem.

Q: Can you tell me about something that was your greatest success while you were there? Some occasion, perhaps, or some demarche?

GINN: I can't call it a success but I can call it a very moving experience for me. [As] part of the Bicentennial celebration Princess Joan wanted to have Luxembourg do something for the United States, something special, so she [asked] the parliament [to] pass a law, or a statement, saying that the earth underneath General Patton's statue at Eidelburg should be given to the United States as their token for the bicentennial. Well, by golly, the parliament passed it. I was talking to Uncle Stanley about it and he said, "Whoa!" I said she wanted me to accept it. He said, "That can only be a gift in token because the acceptance of territory by the United States can only be done through an act of Congress," which I didn't know. "So," he said, "let me write you a document." And he did. He sat down and wrote the document so that it was a gift in kind, a symbolic gift. And that was the way that she gave it and I accepted it. But to me, here was a piece of terra firma being transferred, even though it was in kind, from one country to another, given by one woman, received by another. And there was no war to get it done. That, to me, was probably the most exciting thing that I participated in, because I know that's never happened before.

Q: That is so full of symbolism.

GINN: Yes. The people over there are great admirers of the American Army [and] General Patton, and the number of people from America who come there to go to the Hamm Cemetery where he is buried, is astounding. The veterans' organizations from the United States that would come by the busloads.

Q: They must have that summer, particularly.

GINN: Many times they'd come by and we would greet them and give them cokes or entertain them in some way, lightly.

Q: Patton is really quite a folk hero to the Luxembourgers, isn't he?

GINN: You'd better believe he is! My goodness, what that man did for them!

Q: Yes, yes. Those were thrilling days in retrospect but a little too thrilling at the time. I know you remember as well as I do. Did you go back to the United States at all while you were ambassador?

GINN: Yes. I came back to receive a recognition from UNESCO. Flew over on one day, stayed two days, and flew back. And I didn't come back to Missouri because Stanley made the trip about every six weeks, back and forth, so he could keep track with what was going on here and back there. But there was never any calling back of me to Washington for any kind of problems, and besides, when I left, one of the directives that Larry Eagleburger gave me was that I should go to Luxembourg and stay there. He said the previous ambassador had been out of the country much of the time, so he said, "You just go over there and stay there." [Ambassador Farkas was called to the United States to testify at the Watergate hearings.] And I did. Every now and then I'd go to Bitburg for the market at the military base, but I stayed there and didn't leave the country for six months.

Q: I suppose you went to all parts of it?

GINN: Oh, yes, all over the country, from one end to the other.

Q: Made the presence felt.

GINN: That's right.

Q: When you left, did you feel there was anything that you left unresolved?

GINN: Yes. I would have liked to have stayed another three weeks so my granddaughter could have finished her school, and they said no. The State Department was getting ready to put a new man in place and they wanted him there in time for the Grand Duke's birthday, I guess, for the same reason they wanted me there at the same time. [James] Lowenstein do you know him?

Q: No.

GINN: He's an ambassador. He was in the State Department in Washington before I went over there. Oh, his family had the Wamsutta Mills. I met his mother on the *Queen [*The ocean liner "*Queen Elizabeth II*"*]* last year, year before last.

Q: You had no women officers, did you, while you were there?

GINN: No, no women officers.

Q: And as far as the wives go . . .

GINN: I'd invite them over to lunch every now and then. We talked about the problems of being a Foreign Service wife.

Q: Especially in that period. No longer were wives required to do things . . .

GINN: That's right.

Q: But they weren't given any credit if they did do them.

GINN: Yes. I was very careful when I needed help to be certain that it went as a personal favor to me when I needed them to come and help. We talked about that problem.

Q: How did you know this was a problem?

GINN: Oh, I don't know how I did, but I picked it from some place. But I had another concern, with the threat that I had there. I began to have a concern with the rise of the terrorism that was going on, that we had no plan at the embassy for the protection of the families of our official family. I insisted that we have a staff meeting and talk about it, the staff officers kind of played it down. They didn't want me to get excited and go overboard on that. I didn't want them to feel I

was excited, but, by golly, I wanted a plan in hand as to whose family would go where with whom, whether they would come to the embassy, how we would handle our things.

Q: Did you get anywhere in these discussions? Were you able to work out a plan?

GINN: No, we were not able to work out a plan, but we created the awareness among the officers that such plans for each individual family were necessary, and left it to them to handle it in accordance with their own best judgment, which is really as far as I felt we could go under those circumstances.

Q: Were you thinking in terms of these Middle Eastern types who pop up all over the world?

GINN: Yes. There were a couple of terrorist attacks in West Germany at that time and it just made good sense to me to be prepared.

Q: It isn't on the tape, but you did tell me about the time you went into your office soon after you arrived. Would you relate that for the record?

GINN: Early on in the time when I was there, when I got to my office, why, all of the officers were there and it seemed that there had been a telephone call come into the embassy saying "We're going to kill the ambassador." The men didn't know me very well and I didn't know them very well, and I had been threatened once before in my life, so it wasn't a new experience, and I said, "I've been threatened before. It doesn't bother me a bit. Just go about your work and don't pay any attention to it. I'll be careful where I go, I'll never go the same way twice, and I'll use due caution and care, and keep me advised of what happens." But I was a little scared. [Laughs] But you can't let your team know you're scared.

Q: I can imagine. Did you have any health problems while you were over there?

GINN: Yes. I once had a sore throat.

Q: Is that the most you can dig up? [Laughter]

GINN: And the doctor who came told me not to drink ice water. He said it sears those tissues in there. It isn't good for them, and of course when you have a little fever the first thing you want is a cold drink of water. That was all.

Q: How did you spend the Christmas and Thanksgiving holidays?

GINN: Oh! It seems to me like Thanksgiving we had a big reception for all of our officers and their families, complete with turkey and such. That was Thanksgiving. And for Christmas all of our family came over. Both children and grandchildren and everybody, and we just had a great Christmas there.

Q: So the whole family came over. That must have been lovely.

GINN: It was; it was fun. But one of the fun things was the discovery that there's an extra holiday in December for children, along about the fourteenth I think it is, when Kris Kringle is supposed to come and bring toys for the children. Callie and I didn't know about that. We discovered it very late on, so we said, "Well, goodness gracious, we can't let this go by without celebration." The two of us went to town together and each of us bought something for ourselves that we really wanted. [Laughter] Oh, it was a fun time. It was a happy, gay Christmas.

Q: Oh, I bet it was.

GINN: The house was full of giggling children. We had lots of friends who came to see us over there, and they were always welcome. I felt that the more I could share that experience . . . it would be as unique for most of them as it was for me.

Q: I'm sure they all still talk about it.

GINN: This couple that are coming this weekend, the man who's coming for cocktails tomorrow night, he and his wife and sons had been hunting in South Africa and they came up to see us on their way back to the States. And then the man who's coming on Sunday came to see us -- Tony -- in Luxembourg. And, oh, just -- Virginia, my good friend Virginia, that I went to China with, came to see me over there. Lots of people, and they were always welcome, 'cause that kind of an experience doesn't become available for very many people and I was glad to share it.

Q: You put them up at the residence?

GINN: Sure, right there.

Q: This leads me to ask you what the impact of this power was on your feelings of yourself?

GINN: I think maybe kind of like I said in the beginning, when I said, "Lord, help me." That I had the feeling, "Lord, I hope I haven't made too many mistakes." [Laughter] But it was a wonderful experience. It was a great growing experience and I know it, because you can't have that kind of opportunity and exposure, and not grow.

Q: Did you try to include your staff in official dinners?

GINN: Always. Rotated.

Q: You rotated them.

GINN: To their convenience. Sometimes who's available, who would like to come, and that kind of a thing.

Q: And if it concerned that person particularly.

GINN: Right. Yes, oh yes.

Q: Did you ever have occasions when your officers would say to you, "Would you invite so-and-so to the residence?" Some businessman, say, that they were trying to get to know?

GINN: Absolutely. They were free to make any kind of request like that and I was glad to do that, because I felt that was part of my responsibility to help them do their job.

Q: It seems to me from all the things you've said, that your husband did a great deal toward making your tour of duty successful.

GINN: He did entirely.

Q: Not the least of which were the hunting trips.

GINN: That's right. That was so funny, and that has carried on. After we came back, the Count of Anselberg and his daughter Vanciann came to see us, spent a couple of weeks with us, and we took them down to the Piney River in the Ozarks and gave them the general treatment, had a big party for him in Columbia. We visited their hunting lodge in Belgium and their fourteenth century castle when we were in Luxembourg and we're great admirers of their family -- still enjoy them. His 86-year-old mother, the one that shot the boar that I was telling you about. Wonderful Countess Maggie.

Q: Countess Maggie?

GINN: Countess Maggie. She wrote and told me she wanted me to call her Maggie. [Laughter] The highest compliment she could pay us.

Q: You were able to have a closeness with people like that that you wouldn't have had had you not had that interest in common. Were hunting and fishing your main sources of recreation?

GINN: They were Stanley's main source of recreation. It gave him something to fill his time, to keep his mind active. Then he engaged in a considerable and continuing physical program: he walked. Of course, everybody walks over there in Luxembourg and that was, of course, good. His interest in the Rotary clubs. He played poker one night a week. And when he left, they gave him a plaque, from the Luxembourg Poker-Playing Girl-Watching Society.

Q: Were these American businessmen?

GINN: American businessmen. Dan Phillips from our own tribe, and businessmen.

Q: But no Luxembourg businessmen?

GINN: There may have been. There may have been. There was Dan Phillips; there was a Williams, who was from Texas, and I can't remember who [were] the other two men. They really had a good time.

Q: It's nice he had that.

GINN: Yes, he needed that, because a man who is as active and as full of energy as he is, if he didn't have anything to do, he would be miserable.

Q: He's very gregarious, so I am assuming that he enjoyed the entertaining . . .

GINN: Oh yes, oh he did. No problem.

Q: . . . and went as your escort to all of the parties so that never was a problem. You always had your host built in. Of course, you didn't suffer from loneliness, then. You had your granddaughter and you had your husband. Sometimes that can be a problem.

GINN: Can loneliness -- ? Do you have some -- ? Well, I would not have that problem, because I always have so many more things that I'm dying to get to do than I ever get to do. So loneliness would never be a problem for me.

Q: What they have explained to me is that being an ambassador separates you from everybody else at the mission. You have to keep that little distance, and unless you have a circle at your level, you find yourself stranded up there.

GINN: Yes, that's right.

Q: The ones who aren't married have mentioned this. When you look back on your time in Luxembourg, from what do you get the most satisfaction?

GINN: That's a very hard question to answer. Because there's all kinds of satisfactions. From the feeling that I didn't fall flat on my face, and the feeling that I did make lots of friends for the United States, that I looked after the people who were responsible for me. And the expression of cooperation that I tried to project to the Luxembourg government on the part of the American government, the support of the military that was in Europe. I went to Bitburg and made speeches for the Army clubs there. I'd go to Strasbourg and speak to the wives of all the officers there in the European command, trying to express support from our position on the team to theirs. And the efforts that I made to show support for the government that was in power in Luxembourg. The business of the trust of the people, their government. Maintain the support back home to keep the home folks here in this country advised as to what I saw that the situations were in the various aspects of our government's relationships. I'm hard-pressed to say that one was the greatest contribution, but it's a whole package that I tried to provide and project.

Q: And as you look back, you have a feeling within yourself that you succeeded in doing what you wanted to do.

GINN: Yes, I did. I was content.

Q: Good, good. Well, you've obviously given it a great deal of thought both before, and while you were there, and afterwards. How did it rate, this ambassadorship? How does it rate in the totality of all the things you have done?

GINN: Tops. The most satisfying, heaviest responsibility, most rewarding.

Q: It seems to be a unique experience.

GINN: It is a unique experience. It just -- I couldn't have asked, as I said, for any better experience, any more rewarding time -- great opportunities -- just a dream.

Q: And your husband's feeling about it is a good one?

GINN: Good one, good one.

Q: Well, it was his idea in the first place. [Laughter]

GINN: It was his idea in the first place. You have to watch these young fellers. They're apt to have some pretty wild ideas. But he was totally supportive of this.

Q: Yes, sure. Well, if he hadn't been . . .

GINN: Well, I couldn't have done it.

Q: It would have made your task impossible. It would have torn you apart.

GINN: There was no way.

Q: He didn't want it for himself, though. He wanted it for you.

GINN: Correct

Q: And went all out to help you. Did you have any embarrassment when you were there over the national trouble we had just been through with Watergate?

GINN: No. If I remember correctly, they were all very polite and never brought it up.

Q: Of course, the Vietnam war was over, so you avoided all of those dreadful times people had in the early '70s at posts, of pickets and bricks and that sort of thing hurled. It seems to be a part of your charmed life, doesn't it, that your ambassadorship . . .

GINN: Isn't that the truth?! Didn't you know that my guardian angel is white-haired, decrepit and in a wheel chair? [Calling out] Take your vitamins, honey. [Laughter] Oh, goodness.

Q: The last question I want to ask you is what advice would you give to another young woman starting out today who had ideas of wanting to serve her country in the diplomatic field? Or we can even add in the political field.

GINN: Pick your country. Zero in on it. Get to be an absolute expert on it, learn the language,

visit it, find out everything you can about it. And then hope that if you ever have the chance that you will be sent there, and not some place on the other side of the globe that you don't know anything about and can't speak the language. [Laughter]

JAMES G. LOWENSTEIN
Ambassador
Luxembourg (1977-1981)

Ambassador James G. Lowenstein was born in New Jersey in 1927. He entered the Foreign Service in 1950. In addition to Luxembourg, his career included service in France, Sri Lanka (Ceylon), and Yugoslavia. Ambassador Lowenstein was interviewed by Dennis Kux in 1994.

Q: Let's talk about Luxembourg.

LOWENSTEIN: When I got to Luxembourg I found a number of things. First of all, I remember the first day I was there...the DCM was Dan Phillips who I asked to stay over, I had known him before, and he agreed to do so for another year...the first day he walked into my office he said, "I have to tell you that except for you and me, this is the biggest bunch of losers I have ever seen in one building in my life." I said, "Well, that is okay, we can do it all and won't have to worry about anybody else." In fact, it was just a total bloody mess. Everybody was fighting with everybody else.

Q: How big was the staff?

LOWENSTEIN: Well, it wasn't that big. There was myself, the DCM, economic officer, commercial officer, couple of other agency types, Marines, Defense Attaché who was there half time, admin officer and admin assistant, couple of communicators. There was no USIA. I guess that was it. At any rate there were a lot of personnel problems, which never got resolved. They resolved themselves when people were transferred. I decided that in fact Dan Phillips and I could do everything and it was not necessary to make a big deal out of it and it was not necessary to try to find people to come there. I would work with whoever showed up and see whether there was some way to make the place work. The personnel problems revolved around the administrative officer and some of the agency people. It was just a god awful mess.

The other thing that was bizarre was that the whole communications setup was totally inappropriate. There was no direct connection between the embassy switchboard and the residence, which was right next door to the chancery. There weren't enough lines. Nobody really paid much attention to getting messages to anybody after hours. It was not, let's face it, a very efficient operation.

There were some problems within the Marine group. That was one thing that struck me. Another thing that struck me was there was an extremely low representational allowance since all my predecessors had been people of independent means, to put it mildly. My immediate predecessor,

who had only been there a year, was a Republican National Committee woman from Missouri whose name was Rosemary Ginn. Her husband had been head of the state police. Her predecessor had been Ruth Farkas and Dan Phillips had been the DCM through it all. One day I had to call up Dan Phillips when I was still deputy assistant secretary, and say, "You are going to receive a message asking you to serve a subpoena on the husband of your chief of mission and you have to do it." He said, "I can't do that. How do I do it?" I said, "You go over to the residence. You ring the door bell and if he answers the door, you hand him the subpoena. If he doesn't answer the door, you find him and just give it to him." He said, "I just can't do that." I said, "Some day history will record this as a first. You have to do it." At any rate, those were the two predecessors.

So, those were the immediate practical problems. In substantive terms, the Prime Minister, who subsequently became President of the European Commission, was totally frustrated. He felt he was far more important than the size of his country and he had a very close personal relationship with Helmut Schmidt and a difficult but very frequent relationship with Giscard. His predecessor, Pierre Werner, had been the originator of the Werner plan which in fact subsequently was adopted and changed somewhat by Schmidt and Giscard when they proposed the whole business of the EMS.

Q: What is the EMS?

LOWENSTEIN: The European Monetary System.

So these two men felt that they had been ignored by the United States, especially Thorn much more than Werner, and that they had a role to play. In fact, later Thorn became head of the EC Mission to the Middle East and did a lot of other things. He turned out to be a very interesting source of insight because he would see Schmidt on Monday, Giscard on Tuesday and we would have dinner on Wednesday. So for anyone who was interested on what was going on in Europe, it was...

Q: Previously, nothing happened?

LOWENSTEIN: Well, he wouldn't talk to the others.

Q: He wouldn't talk to the DCM?

LOWENSTEIN: He would and he wouldn't. He was rather protocol conscious. The British had for years been sending to Luxembourg their brightest stars on their first ambassadorial assignments. The British Ambassador who left just before I got there went on to be Ambassador to Spain and Permanent Under Secretary of the Foreign Office. The British Ambassador who then arrived, Patrick Wright, now Lord Wright, became Permanent Under Secretary of the Foreign Office. And his successor, now Sir Jeromy Thomas, was ambassador to three or four other places. So the British had very high quality appointees there.

The French had a man named d'Ornano who came from a very old and distinguished French political family. He had been High Commissioner in Djibouti and other places. He was one of

their best political/military trouble spot type fellows.

I found the whole thing unlike what I thought it would be like. I thought it would be a lot of fun but not very interesting and after two years I would try to leave. In fact it wasn't much fun at all, but it was very, very interesting.

Q: Oh, really?

LOWENSTEIN: No, it is not much fun. There is no cultural life. The upper stratum that you deal with, who head the government and the major companies, are terrific, but underneath that it tends to get a little slow.

Q: What was the population in the town?

LOWENSTEIN: It was small, 60,000. Everybody is always amazed when they go there to find out later what the population is because it looks much larger.

Q: I had an experience before that. We were in Bonn and we went over to Luxembourg for a week to visit a good friend who was in graduate school some where. He took us over the Foreign Ministry and I remember there were nine people working for the Foreign Minister.

LOWENSTEIN: Thorn was the Prime Minister; the Foreign Minister was a lady named Collette Fleisch who had gone to Wellesley and Fletcher; the Deputy Foreign Minister, the State Secretary was a guy named Paul Helminger, who had gone to Oxford and Stanford; the Minister of Energy was a fellow by the name of Josie Bartel who had gone to Harvard. Both Fleisch and Bartel had been on the Olympic team and Bartel had won a gold medal. The Minister of Finance was a graduate of Cornell, etc. They were a very well educated, sophisticated group of people.

Q: All business, no fun.

LOWENSTEIN: Well, fun in Luxembourg...there was an article in the Wall Street Journal last week, I don't know if you read it. It was about Luxembourg and it said that it had the highest standard of living of any country in Europe, highest per capita income, highest quality of life, etc., except for two things. One thing was it had the lowest rating in terms of culture of any European capital. Secondly, in the list of favorite occupations, where other countries it would be theater, opera, sports, etc., in Luxembourg it was sleeping, and the second one was resting. Well, that was a bit of an exaggeration, but the government people and the heads of the companies...the banks, steel companies, radio stations, etc....were people who led exactly the same kind of life as their counterparts in other capitals. That is, they were constantly traveling, very stressed, worked all the time, over worked and under staffed and had a tough stressful life. Everybody else relaxed.

The routine was that every night there would be a dinner party either given by somebody in the government or by an ambassador or by me or one of the bankers, etc. So I was at a dinner party almost every night. But that is all there was, that was it.

There was a lot of going to graves and decorating tombs and cutting ribbons. There was an American/Luxembourg society full of 75 year old people who still constantly talked about World War II. So there wasn't much fun.

It happened from my point of view that there was great tennis and squash, so I was able to do either one or the other practically every day at some point. So that made things tolerable. Also, I was a bachelor at this point. So I had to go through all of this myself. I had to run the household budget, do the seating, do the menus, keep everything under control financially. I didn't have a wife to help me with all that and I had to do all the entertaining, of which there was a great deal. I can't remember what the figures were, but it was something like when I arrived my entertainment budget was $14,000 and when I left it was $60,000. I established a rule in the embassy that no one was to spend one single dollar out of their own pocket for representation. Whenever we ran out of money...George Vest was Assistant Secretary...I would send a message saying there was no more money and if we don't get any more money there isn't going to be any more entertaining, which was perfectly okay with me. I was perfectly happy to stop it, but there wasn't going to be any. I always got what I needed.

I hired a wonderful household staff who understood the situation so that they were able to stretch the entertainment dollar very effectively. We had a list posted in the kitchen of prohibitive items that were never to be seen in the house...caviar, lobster, etc. And we had a list of ingredients that were to be used for hor d'oeuvres.. tomatoes, eggs, cucumbers. The butler was such a genius that he used to fill drinks with far more ice than was necessary in order to cut down the amount of whiskey. So that all worked perfectly well.

One thing that I felt was missing and badly needed there was a USIA function and I knew I would never get a USIA officer. Anyway there was a fantastic local journalist, a lady, whom I thought could do this with her eyes closed. She knew everybody in town, very well connected, very good political mind, wrote wonderful political stuff and was willing to do it. So I got authorization to establish I think the only local USIA post in Europe. It was a one person post and we did the entire gambit of stuff...Amarts, Leader Grant Program, Fulbright, everything. We did everything that other posts did and we did it with one local employee.

The issues were principally, obviously, multi-lateral issues. One of them was strangely enough the AWACs issue because all the principal countries of NATO got into a fight about who would be willing to register the AWACs. Eventually we got the Luxembourgers to register the AWACs. Then there was another question of storing what was called M+60 tanks. The army wanted to put an enormous number of tanks into a storage unit that wasn't any further from the front line than Luxembourg but was far enough so that it wouldn't be overrun in the first attack. Anyway, they came out with Luxembourg as the ideal place to do this. Luxembourg had never had a foreign military installation, so we negotiated that. It took about a year and a half. The storage cite was built, the tanks were moved in and when it was all over, Luxembourg ended up with the highest proportion of tanks to people of any country in the world, including Iraq.

Q: Did you have a lot of trouble with the negotiations?

LOWENSTEIN: There was a lot in parliament. The government had changed by the time the site

had to be built, there was another Prime Minister, Pierre Werner and a Conservative Party led government. So there was quite a lot to do. It was very technical. The principal military person involved was a general named Groves, who was the son of General Ernest Groves of nuclear fame. An extremely nice fellow. The Defense Attaché involved was very smart.

The other issues really were the question of what kind of information could be gotten in Luxembourg that couldn't be gotten any place else. European Council summit meetings were held in Luxembourg, at least one of the three was always held in Luxembourg. Very often it was possible to find out much more from the Luxembourgers than from the others. Every NATO issue or EC issue, the same thing was true. It was a very good place for information. And it was possible to use Luxembourg as sort of a friend in court the way the British had been used at the beginning.

Q: What was their relationship with the French?

LOWENSTEIN: Well, they had lots of problems with the French, including the nuclear problem because one of the big nuclear installations of France, sits on the Luxembourg border. It is called Cattenom. It was a tremendous issue in internal politics. The relationship with the French was very difficult on certain things. In fact when the question arose of who would become the President of the European Commission and Thorn became President, Giscard's support was very important and there was a lot of dirty work at the crossroads at the last minute, which I won't get into. Thorn almost didn't make it.

Q: Who were the other candidates?

LOWENSTEIN: One was Martin Bangeman, the German politician. And there was a lot of fancy footwork there between Bangeman and Thorn. And there were some other candidates, but I can't remember who.

Then there were people who would be coming in and out for European Parliament sessions. In those days it met in Luxembourg half of the time and the other half in Strasbourg. The parliament staff was in Luxembourg. The European Investment Bank was there. The accounting office for the EC was there. So there was a lot of EC institutional work. And they were also in the middle of the steel crisis because of Arbed which in past years had been responsible for 60 percent of the GNP of Luxembourg and had been the fifth biggest steel company in the world. When I arrived it was still the key to their economy, but by the time I left, it was much less important. The banking sector and the Radio Television Luxembourg, which belonged to a holding company called CLT had became more important in terms of revenue produced for the country.

The banking sector exploded. There were a lot of American banks there. There were a lot of other funny little things. There was a huge Russian embassy. Nobody could ever figure out what it was doing. I kept saying to our friends across the river, "I thought you were here to find out what these people are doing. What are they doing?" They could never find out. The Ambassador was an Armenian, so he was doing a lot with the Armenian communities all over Europe. But, other than that, we could never find out. It was absolutely enormous. There was a very good

Chinese Ambassador there who spoke impeccable French. He had gone to the Lycee in Shanghai. There was a lot of stuff relating to Libya. Luxembourg is one of the transit points for planes going to Libya and to Cuba. There was a lot of funny stuff at the airport. There were a certain number of terrorists who would cruise in and out, including the most wanted international terrorist, Carlos. Anyway, it turned out that he had spent his vacation in Luxembourg and rented a Hertz car at one point. So he had been running around. So there were all kinds of things going on, especially when there was a small staff. I did all the political reporting and everything else except the technical economic reporting.

There were a lot of disputes on bank secrecy too. There were a certain number of visits from attorneys and law enforcement agencies trying to get the Luxembourgers to release records of certain transactions. The Luxembourgers had a law on bank secrecy that was just as strict as the Swiss. So that at times was a bilateral issue.

Q: Did you stay there three and a half years?

LOWENSTEIN: Well, I actually stayed over four years. At the end of three years, there were two important Democratic Party contributors who had announced their attention to arrive. In fact, at one point I was back in the United States for something and up on Capitol Hill, I guess with the Prime Minister, and Senator McGovern came up to me and said, "Well, since my friend, so-and-so, is going to Luxembourg, what are you going to do next?" At any rate the Prime Minister preferred that I stay so he took it up with Vance and I stayed, to make a long story short. At this point there was only a year left for the Carter administration and he did not want to change. So, in fact, I stayed for a little over four years.

Another contribution that I made was that it seemed to me that intellectually they didn't have a forum for any discussion of international affairs. So I decided to form something like the Council on Foreign Relations, which was called the Luxembourg Society for International Affairs. It was a group headed by a former cabinet minister that met once a month and had a speaker with a question and answer period. I funded it by going to a very wealthy American citizen who spent six months of the year in Luxembourg, originally a German who fled to the United States during the war and went back to Luxembourg after the war but kept an apartment in New York and split his time between New York and Luxembourg. He was a reliable source of funds for the American School and American charities. He agreed to fund this. We got whatever speakers were around in Europe and brought them down. The organization exists to this day.

An unusual experience that I had was that I had to deal with the Grand Duke of Luxembourg on a political matter. The Grand Duke is enjoined from dealing with political matters by the constitution. He is not permitted to participate. However, he was a member of the International Olympic Committee, the only chief of state who was a member of that committee. When President Carter decided that the Moscow Olympics should be boycotted, I had to take up this matter with the Grand Duke, who wanted to take it to the cabinet but he couldn't because the cabinet wouldn't take jurisdiction. He was not very sympathetic to this idea of President Carter's. That was a unique experience.

Q: What role does the monarchy as an institution play?

LOWENSTEIN: It's a symbol of the country, of its continued existence. It is very popular with the people. It performs a ceremonial role and that is about it. It is a way of representing Luxembourg in places where otherwise it might not be represented. No one questions the existence, the wisdom of having the royal family exist. They comport themselves with great dignity and do very well. I don't think there has ever been a scandal involving the royal family. The children of the Grand Duke, when I was there, were all attractive, well behaved, well educated, very conscientious about their duties. So, I would say that it is a model monarchy.

A lot of people want to be ambassador to Luxembourg because they think they are going to have a glamorous court life. But there isn't much court life that doesn't involve other royal families. This is a royal family that spends most of its time with other royal families. Except for a couple of receptions a year, that is it. There were a few of my predecessors who had personal relationships with the Grand Duke...Kingdon Gould and Wylie Buchanan...but I didn't and most people didn't.

There were a lot of CODELs that came out. I had Chief Justice Burger for a week staying in my house, sitting up talking until 2:00 in the morning. Whenever there was a European Council meeting, the entire press corps from Paris would show up from all the major newspapers and magazines and I would put up as many of them as I could and give a large dinner for the American press corps and invite whoever was around in the Luxembourg government.

So there was always quite a lot going on, but as I say, not a million laughs.

Q: That comes across. You were probably ready to leave.

LOWENSTEIN: Well, I was ready to leave Luxembourg. I think four years was enough. But I made a lot of good friends and enjoyed it. If the offer had been made to stay another two years, I wouldn't have wanted to do it, but I was glad to have had the four years.

CHARLES HIGGINSON
Deputy Chief of Mission
Luxembourg (1978-1983)

Born in Massachusetts, Mr. Higginson graduated from Harvard University and entered law practice before joining the Foreign Service in 1961. During his career he served in Brussels, Algiers, Rome and Luxembourg, dealing primarily with international organizations such as the European Community (EC), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the OECD. In Washington Mr. Higginson again dealt primarily with international organizations and issues.

Q: As you said before, you went north from Rome to Luxembourg as the deputy chief of mission. That's a very different sort of embassy than either Rome or Saigon. Tell me a little bit about that embassy and what you did there.

HIGGINSON: The embassy in Luxembourg is in the city overlooking the Kirchberg Plateau. It has about 20 Americans. That includes the Marines, which I guess were the largest single element. I was asked to come there by Ambassador James Lowenstein, who was a career Foreign Service officer and really knew European foreign policy and NATO. He was a wonderful leader who I got to know very well. In such a small post, basically, I was the only person he had to talk to really on the policy level. So, I appreciated that. He was quite clear. He wanted me to run the embassy and he would take care of the diplomacy. That worked out very well. The reason I was assigned to Luxembourg was that, shortly after I arrived, Luxembourg became the President of the European Communities. This is a rotating presidency at the present time. For six months, each member of the European Communities has the presidency. Obviously, for Luxembourg and its minute foreign office, this was a major strain.

Since I am not a linguist myself, I looked with awe at the Luxembourgers. They are truly multilingual. As they explained to me, they spoke Luxembourgish on their mother's knee; they went to primary school in German; they graduated in French; the newspapers were in French or German; the movies and about half the television shows were in English. They were truly multilingual. I felt there was one person in the Luxembourg Foreign Ministry who I spoke better French than he spoke English. Otherwise, they all spoke English very well. At that time, Collette Flesch was the Foreign Minister. She had gone to Wellesley College and then had been employed by the U.S. embassy in Luxembourg. She knew Americans and English extremely well. My chief contact, who was also the Secretary of the Political Committee of the European Communities, when I'd come in to see him, he would speak English perfectly, switch to Italian to talk to the Italian Foreign Office, talk to his wife in Luxembourgish, and then come back to me in English with never even a mix-up between the various languages. He and I saw each other quite frequently. Since they are so undermanned, I used to collect a week's supply of instructions from Washington and go in to see him with maybe 20 instructions and then go over them bang, bang, bang. He appreciated this. I think he knew I knew his instructions, which I never saw him writing, but I'm quite sure it was "Never so 'No' to the Americans. You can divert them, but never, never say 'No' to them."

Luxembourg is a wonderful country. It's extremely small: 278,000 people. But they are very rich. At that time, they were the second richest country in the European Community. Now they are by and far the richest country in the European Community on a per capita basis. The U.S. is the largest foreign investor there. They still truly appreciate our having liberated the country in the first world war and the second world war. They are true friends of the United States and treat you extremely well in the country. My predecessor, Dan Phillips, whom I mentioned earlier as my co-junior Foreign Service Inspector, said that if I were too bored, I could go down to the railroad station and watch the trains go in and out. I didn't find that true at all. Luxembourg as a member of the OECD, NATO, the European Communities, and also bilateral relations more than kept the embassy very busy.

Q: That was especially the case when they were for six months the President of the Community, where we were discussing all sorts of international political cooperation kinds of issues with them, I suppose.

HIGGINSON: Yes. This was also when we were trying to free the hostages in Iran, so a lot of those conversations would be started in Luxembourg to the presidency. Obviously, we also approached all the other member states at the same time.

Another virtue of Luxembourg is that it is a small country; you do know the individuals well. So, when there was a European Communities summit and Washington desperately wanted to know what was agreed to, it was quite difficult for the ambassador in Paris to get to see the Foreign Minister, but in Luxembourg, you know the Foreign Minister plays tennis next to you on Mondays or you can get to see the Foreign Minister at any time. As I said, they've been instructed, I was quite sure, not to say "No" to you. So, you could frequently find out what occurred and get early report in on these major meetings.

Q: The headquarters of the Coal and Steel Community was still in Luxembourg.

HIGGINSON: It depends on what you call "headquarters." When I was there, all of the staff of the Coal and Steel Community, the Secretariat, is in Luxembourg, but the High Authority no longer met. They're basically the commissioners. They met in Brussels, which is the headquarters. The European Communities is sort of a headless organization. You've got the International Board of Justice in Luxembourg. You've got the Parliament Secretariat in Luxembourg. You've got the Commission in Brussels. You have an agreement with the French that the Parliament will meet in Strasbourg a certain number of times. This is a very inefficient and expensive way of keeping a number of countries happy. They're going to try to decide sometime as to where to permanently locate the heads of these organizations, which will probably be Brussels.

Q: But you were not really particularly involved with the Secretariat of the Coal and Steel Community or anything else that was in Luxembourg?

HIGGINSON: No, I wasn't involved at all with them, except for the International Board of Justice. Being a lawyer, that interests me. Also, the first high level visitor to Luxembourg while I was there was Chief Justice Burger. He came to meet with his equals, the European Court of Justice. When we began to look into it, we found that Burger was the highest ranking U.S. official to officially visit Luxembourg in a long time. The most vivid memory I have of that was, we had a meeting because Burger wanted to show some wonderful movies he had made of the major constitutional law cases, which was all fine, except in Luxembourg, there aren't that many people to do things for you. So, I was responsible for the projector and the filming, which was all upside-down. I remember aching arms because my only solution was to hold the camera or the projector upside-down so, therefore, the picture was right side-up.

Q: You never know quite what's going to happen. You were the DCM. Ambassador Jim Lowenstein was the ambassador part of the time that you were there. You were presumably chargé after he left.

HIGGINSON: Yes. I was chargé. It's a tricky situation. Jim has recently separated. Luxembourg is a very small town. You would like to go to other places in Europe. Technically, to leave your country, an ambassador needs approval of the Assistant Secretary for European Affairs. He had

an exception made for Luxembourg. I always knew where he was. I was there most every weekend. It worked out fine. Usually, he would be staying with the ambassador in France, Arthur Hartman. That worked out quite easily. Ambassador Lowenstein did get remarried while I was there. That was also part of my DCM activities, to arrange the wedding, which was a great success. Then he was removed back to Washington and I was chargé for about nine months until Ambassador Dolibois arrived. He was the first because he was actually born in Luxembourg and raised as a young boy in Luxembourg, so he spoke Luxembourg. He was by far the first U.S. ambassador to speak Luxembourgish. With Ambassador Dolibois, my role shifted in that he made it quite clear that he was interested in the public relations aspect of the embassy, but not in the foreign policy and would I take care of those events, which I was very happy to do.

Q: In some ways, he was kind of a stereotype of a U.S. ambassador to Luxembourg, different in some ways because he had originally come from Luxembourg. But one has the idea that we've usually had political appointees, often without a lot of foreign affairs experience serving there. But Jim Lowenstein is not the only career Foreign Service officer who has been ambassador there.

HIGGINSON: He is not the only, but there haven't been very many. The Luxembourgers had pleaded for a career Foreign Service officer. It raises an interesting issue in that the government of Luxembourg could deal with Ambassador Lowenstein. It worked out very well. They very much appreciated him. But the public image... He would go on the Luxembourg public radio station, talk in Luxembourgish. He was much closer to the people and was a very popular ambassador there. That's an important function, too. It takes a lot of time. It's difficult to do both. It shows where a political ambassador, if he uses his strengths, can be very, very capable.

Q: I think Ambassador Dolibois had been a university person in Ohio.

HIGGINSON: He was the vice president of the University of Miami of Ohio, which has its Center in Luxembourg and sends over about 120 students a year. Luxembourg doesn’t have any universities itself. It sends all its citizens abroad for higher education. It has negotiated agreements with France, Belgium, etc. to take their students with the belief that it's good for Luxembourg being so small to make sure that all of its citizens have this experience of getting out of Luxembourg. But it gave Miami University of Ohio a special aura to be the only institution of higher education in Luxembourg. It was nice for them. It was nice for the embassy to have the university there and it was especially nice for me because my wife could teach art history there so that she was quite happy.

Q: Did Miami University of Ohio establish the European Center in Luxembourg because of Dolibois' background?

HIGGINSON: I don't know about the "because," but he certainly was involved in it and was very active in creating the institution. The vice chancellor's sister was a secretary to Vice President Bush. That was probably why he became ambassador.

Q: I went through the Ambassadorial Seminar with him. We were on friendly terms for the two weeks or so that we were together. I thought he was rather low-key, but a fairly open person.

HIGGINSON: That's exactly right.

Q: He was certainly not pretentious or pushy.

HIGGINSON: That's right. He just flat out said, "You handle the diplomatic issues and I'll take care of the public relations issues."

Q: And he expected you to run the embassy, too?

HIGGINSON: Yes.

Q: You also mentioned Miami University and the large American investment. Luxembourg in many ways has been sort of a gateway to Europe for the United States - not the only one, but an important one, partly with Icelandic Airlines, which goes to Luxembourg.

HIGGINSON: Right. This is the cheapest flight to Europe, or was at one point. It produces a fair amount of activity for the embassy with people who run out of money or miss their planes and don't know what to do. We found that lots of our children's friends had our names and we were their last stop in Europe and a very convenient washing machine for all their clothes.

The other thing that Ambassador Lowenstein took advantage of in the closeness of the relations was, the U.S. was just trying to store military supplies in Europe. That way, you wouldn't have to have so many soldiers in Europe. We negotiated with ARBED, the Luxembourg steel company. ARBED is more than the Luxembourg steel company. ARBED at one time was 1/3 of the gross national product of Luxembourg. They were darn near Luxembourg. Their importance has reduced, but it's still a very large corporation and has a great deal of influence. We negotiated with them to build a storage place so that Luxembourg has now more tanks per capita than any other country in the world, which is a relationship you don't usually consider in Luxembourg. It helps in little ways. To test their bridges, you have to put 100 tons in the middle of a bridge and see whether it sagged. Well, how to move 100 tons is difficult, but if you just take two tanks, you've got it. Could they borrow two tanks for a day to check their bridges? Again, in Luxembourg, you could do that.

Q: I don't think this particularly applies to Luxembourg, but the question comes up sometimes about whether the United States should be universally represented in every capital with an embassy, an ambassador, flying the flag, and so on. My question is, did quite a few other countries have an embassy in Luxembourg or were we fairly unique? Could we have covered and done much of the work out of Brussels or The Hague?

HIGGINSON: I believe 23 other countries had embassies in Luxembourg. A lot of countries were represented by their embassies in Brussels. Could we have done it as well? We couldn't have done it as well. If Luxembourg were just another foreign country, the embassy was not necessary. It's expensive. But given the NATO role and Luxembourg's sensibilities, removing the embassy would be a disaster as far as our relations with Luxembourg were concerned. Little things like when we were putting in the radar airplanes for NATO, AWACS, the problem was

how to register them. NATO doesn't have a civil air force. All the rest of the members of NATO had their own military air forces and rules for their planes. How were they going to register the AWACS? The final solution was to register them in Luxembourg. I remember a very pleasant evening with the Foreign Minister designing insignia for AWACS. You couldn't do this unless you were resident in Luxembourg and got to know these people very, very well.

I'd like to finish off with some conflicting memories of Luxembourg. One was of the colonel in the Luxembourg army. He was remembering back in 1939 or 1940 when the Germans occupied Luxembourg. He was a young kid, about nine years old. The first thing the Germans did was to gather all the young boys his age together and offer them shiny new bicycles if they would join the Nazi Party, which he thought was a wonderful deal and signed up to do. He went home and boasted to his father, who sent him right back to get that paper to end his association with the Nazi Party. It does bring to life that you've got to look at the circumstances in which people sign up for some of these things. It seems absolutely atrocious now, but at the time, it may come down to just a shiny bicycle that you can't see beyond. The Germans are a very large country. Luxembourgish isn't that far away from German. I was interested early on... I was at a cocktail party in Luxembourg overlooking Germany. We were talking about the weather. There was the comment that all bad weather comes from the east. It was indicative of their concern.

Finally on the Luxembourg embassy, I would say a fair amount of my time was spent on Marine Corps affairs. Having 10 young Americans in a city can lead to considerable activity as far as the embassy in concerned. We took care of two marriages and a number of fights that were not animosity so much as just young people's excess energy. I still remember coming to the embassy one morning a little sleep and saying, "Something is wrong." I looked very careful and realized that the American flag was upside-down. I was trying to figure out if this was because the embassy had been taken over or if it was just an inefficient Marine. I decided the latter was very right.

EDWARD M. ROWELL
Ambassador
Luxembourg (1990-1994)

Ambassador Edward M. Rowell was born in Oakland, California in 1931. He obtained a B.A. from Yale University. In addition to Luxembourg, Ambassador Rowell served in Recife, Curitiba, Buenos Aires, Tegucigalpa, Lisbon, La Paz, and Washington, DC. He retired in August, 1994 and was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy on September 10, 1995.

ROWELL: I was appointed by the White House to go to Luxembourg on March 30 or 31, 1990. I left Lisbon about April 1 or 2, 1990. I can get the exact dates from the record. I went back to Washington, was sworn in as Ambassador to Luxembourg, and arrived in Luxembourg in the third week of April, 1990. It was a very quick transfer. It took less than three weeks, including my time in Washington.

Q: *I would like to get this straight. You were in Luxembourg from when to when?*

ROWELL: I arrived in Luxembourg at the end of April, 1990, and I departed Luxembourg at the beginning of August, 1994. So I was there for over four and a quarter years.

Q: *Obviously, when you were in EUR [Bureau of European Affairs], Luxembourg came across your radar, but probably not as a major concern.*

ROWELL: No career officer ever thinks of going to Luxembourg. It is notoriously one of those places where administrations send a non-career Chief of Mission. As a career officer I couldn't refuse the offer of another mission without retiring from active duty. So when Luxembourg arrived on my radar, at the end of August, 1989, I accepted the appointment. Luxembourg is in a pleasant part of Europe, and I couldn't complain about that. But I did wonder, "What am I going to do there? What does anybody do in Luxembourg?"

The first feedback that I got came from my brother-in-law, an Exxon executive. He said, "Well, it's a major financial center." I said, "Oh." And then, of course, I got in touch with the desk in EUR which, in the case of Luxembourg, is a half desk. The desk officer also covers another country. I asked the US Embassy in Luxembourg to start sending me material on the country. My assignment to Luxembourg became known almost immediately, because this was a rare case in which the request for agrément went out before the security background check had been conducted. I'm sure that it happened that way because both of us were career officers. Each of us had had the full background check done before taking up our then positions.

Q: *You're talking about Ted Briggs and yourself?*

ROWELL: Yes, Briggs and myself. So there was plenty of confidence that our background checks would work out. So after having been informed about the change in August, 1989, the request for agrément arrived within two weeks and was accorded by the Luxembourg Government. In other words, virtually instantly. Each mission in Lisbon and Luxembourg knew who the new Ambassadorial candidate was. In the case of Embassy Luxembourg they immediately began to send the Embassy in Lisbon information copies of all of the principal messages they sent, so that, by the time I arrived I would be well read in on whatever was going on.

So what did I discover? I discovered that Luxembourg is extraordinarily friendly toward the United States. It is indeed a major financial center in Europe. It is properly jealous of its right to participate in all of the major international organizations, including NATO, the European Union, the Western European Union, the Council of Europe, and other organizations.

Luxembourg takes seriously its role as a facilitator and plays it well. If I were a mechanic, I would say as a lubricator. It is a facilitator among its partners in all the international organizations it participates in, especially the European organizations. In NATO the facilitative role hasn't had to be played very often, but I can cite one example.

In NATO the example arose when we wanted to deploy the AWACS, the Airborne Warning and

Control System aircraft. This happened before I arrived in Luxembourg. The question was, "Where do you register these airplanes?" Each country has its own rules on aircraft registration. Neither Germany nor any other country wanted to have to register all of the AWACS aircraft. If some of the aircraft were registered in one country and some in another country, that would have meant that some planes had certain technical criteria to meet, while others had other technical criteria. And NATO didn't want to have different technical specifications for different aircraft in the AWACS fleet. The argument was going around and around. Then the Luxembourg representative suggested a coffee break. While the other members of NATO were busy getting coffee, the Luxembourger went to a corridor telephone, talked with his Prime Minister, and said, "I think that Luxembourg ought to take all of these aircraft." When the NATO meeting resumed, the Luxembourger came back into the room and told the other NATO delegates, "Luxembourg will host the AWACS fleet." That is typical of the way that Luxembourg can make decisions. That was a conversation between the Luxembourg representative to NATO and the Prime Minister. The whole decision was made in 15 minutes. There were no problems within the Luxembourg cabinet or with the Luxembourg legislature.

Q: *Before we move to your time in Luxembourg, was there any problem in the withdrawal of an Ambassadorial appointee to be chief of mission in Luxembourg? Often what happens is that political appointees are sort of picked out of almost nowhere and, as things go, for one reason or another they become less enamored of the appointment or the administration becomes less enchanted with them.*

ROWELL: In the case of the nomination of Frederick Bush, some questions were raised in the Senate about some aspect of his work. I think that it was with HUD, the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Just as in the case of my transfer to Lisbon as Ambassador, I hadn't been paying any attention to that, and I decided that it didn't make any difference to my role as the prospective new Ambassador. So I didn't inform myself on whatever it was. But whatever these considerations were, they were sufficient to convince Frederick Bush either that he didn't want to drag all of that through the Senate hearing process or maybe that he might not be confirmed. Whatever it was, Frederick Bush simply didn't want to go through it, and so he withdrew. He later was appointed, I believe, to a position that didn't require Senate confirmation, as the administration's point man on US participation in the Seville World's Fair.

Q: *You arrived in Luxembourg shortly before the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, as we mentioned before. Did Luxembourg become involved in what became known as the Gulf War of 1990-1991?*

ROWELL: Yes. Two really big things happened in 1990. First, was the Iraqi seizure of Kuwait in August, 1990. Second, was the physical collapse of the Berlin Wall in November, 1990.

In the governance of the European Union, then called the European Communities, there is something called a troika. The troika consists of the current President-in-Office (Prime Minister of the Presidency County) of the European Union, his immediate predecessor in the Presidency and his immediate successor. Each Presidency term lasts for six months. The Presidency rotates among the member states of the European Union on a fixed schedule. Luxembourg entered the troika in July, 1990. That first six-month period, as I said, saw the onset of the Persian Gulf crisis which led to a shooting war in January, 1991; the collapse of the Berlin Wall in November,

1990; and the dissolution of the Soviet Union almost immediately after that.

Q: *We're also talking about Czechoslovakia, East Germany...*

ROWELL: And the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and of the Eastern European economic arrangement called COMECON [Council of Mutual Economic Assistance]. Luxembourg was President of the European Union during the first six months of 1991, when all of these things were impacting. Those were the same six months when the Treaty of Maastricht was being drafted which converted the European Economic Community into the European Union. Luxembourg presided over that effort as well. So if ever you wanted action, Luxembourg had it -- and I had it.

It was an intensely active period. We were dealing with Luxembourg on a daily basis, first in its role as a member of the troika, and then as Presidency Country of the European Community on the European relationship to the military buildup in the Persian Gulf. The US was handling much of the coordination of Persian Gulf preparations in NATO, but we had to work closely with the European Union, because it is in the European Union where the European powers coordinate among themselves on their policies, including foreign policy (when they want it coordinated, as in the Gulf case) and assistance policy. Even today, in connection with the Middle East peace process, the West Europeans' very substantial assistance to the Middle East is coordinated through the European Union, not NATO.

Our Embassy in Luxembourg was deeply engaged in terms of managing US-European solidarity vis-a-vis Saddam Hussein during that five-month August-January period Secretary of State Baker was attempting to persuade Tariq Aziz, Saddam's Foreign Minister, to withdraw from Kuwait and not to force us to get into a shooting war. During that period France kept wanting to talk separately with Saddam Hussein and also with Iran. Luxembourg played a central role, its facilitator role, if you will, in maintaining European solidarity and cohesiveness, a cohesiveness that paralleled our own approach. That was intended to ensure that Saddam Hussein would have no illusion that somehow the United States might try to do something in the Persian Gulf area which the European countries wouldn't support. It was also intended to make clear that he could not count on the Europeans to prevent any serious measures from being taken against Iraq in response to his aggression against Kuwait.

Then, with Luxembourg as Presidency Country during the first six months of 1991, we had the Gulf War, the immediate reactions to the dissolution of the Soviet Union, including German unification, and the beginning of civil war in what was then Yugoslavia. We were talking with the Europeans in NATO but also directly and on a bilateral basis with the Europeans as they coordinated their policies on assistance to Central Europe. We began to think about the relationship of Central Europe to the European Union and about how to deal with a separate Ukraine, Belorus, and the newly independent Baltic states. We were doing all of that through Luxembourg. On the Yugoslav front, the Germans were insisting on recognizing Croatia and Slovenia as independent countries. This recognition triggered the flight to independence of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and the Serbs' effort to create a "Greater Serbia". There was major confrontation between the Albanians and Serbs in Kosovo, Montenegro, and between Macedonia and Greece. We saw the start of ethnic conflict in Moldova and in the Caucasus. And a frantic

scramble to use every device available -- for example, the Council of Europe and the Conference (now "Organization") on Security and Cooperation in Europe, CSCE -- to contain and deal with the emerging problems. It was a very busy period.

The Embassy in Luxembourg was very small. There were three substantive officers in the Embassy: myself; my DCM, and the economic officer. During my first two years there the DCM was an FS-OC [rank of Counselor Foreign Service Officer], and during my last two years he was an FSO-1 Foreign Service Officer.

Q: *Who were they?*

ROWELL: The first DCM was David Dlouhy. He was there during Luxembourg's period in the troika. The second DCM was Bill Harris, William Harris. Dlouhy went from Luxembourg to be DCM in La Paz, Bolivia. Harris later went to be DCM in Asuncion, Paraguay.

Q: *Let's talk about your relationship with the Luxembourg Government. In the first place, perhaps you could describe the Luxembourg Government -- the Foreign Ministry and how you felt about them. Say something about their competence and how it worked. Each country has a different way of working.*

ROWELL: Right. Luxembourg is a constitutional monarchy. The monarch is a Grand Duke. The government is Parliamentary in structure. The legislature is unicameral. There is a Chamber of Deputies but no Senate or House of Lords. There is a Council of State that performs some of the functions that, for example, Britain assigns to the House of Lords. The members of the Council of State, I believe, are appointed for life by the Grand Duke, on the recommendation of the government.

Luxembourg's governments have been coalitions since the 1920's. They are extraordinarily stable. Typically, a prime minister will serve for three and sometimes four five-year legislative periods. As in all parliamentary governments, a vote of no confidence can force an election, but there have been no forced elections within memory. Governments have served the full five-year period that the constitution allows governments to serve. The dominant party is the Christian Democratic Party. Until 1980 the leading opposition party was something called the Democratic Party, a liberal party in the sense of the British Liberal Party. Since the mid-1980's the second largest party, and the coalition partner, has been the Socialist Party. The Luxembourg Socialists are social democratic in their policies.

When I arrived in Luxembourg, the Socialist leader (who was not the president of the party) had taken over the Defense as well as the Foreign Ministry following the 1989 elections. His name was Jacques Poos. In the previous 1984-89 government he had not held the Defense Ministry and he had criticized Luxembourg's defense expenditures. I had a sense of deja vu, because I remembered how Henry Kissinger had worried when a quintessential Socialist, Mario Soares, became Foreign Minister and then Prime Minister of Portugal. I knew also that my predecessor in Luxembourg had worried that the Socialists were moving in, and maybe this would complicate NATO's life. She feared they might even dismantle their army altogether.

I told the DCM that I was going to talk with this man. My experience with Western European socialists is that they are patriots first. They are democrats second. And they are socialists third. I didn't think that we had to worry. I talked with Poos and I knew immediately that we didn't have to worry. Besides that, he was in a coalition government with Christian Democrats, about whom no one was raising any questions. I told Washington immediately, "Stop fussing. This country will do whatever is necessary to preserve NATO's integrity, to preserve the integrity of Europe's defense, and to preserve Europe as a modern, market economy, democratic structure." I was correct.

Luxembourg is a country that prepares its leaders extremely well. It picks them way ahead of time and grooms them. All of their leaders hold advanced university degrees. All of them have worked in the political vineyards for an extended period of time. Beyond that there is a degree of national consensus that is rare. That comes from being a very small country, a country slightly smaller than Rhode Island in area and with a population of 400,000. They all know each other personally and talk when they bump into each other on the street. Take the man who was the Embassy's driver. I'm being very careful not to call him my chauffeur, although he drove me on occasion. He did all of the other driving for the Embassy, too. It was not an Embassy which had two or three drivers. There was just the one driver. He had gone to high school with the Prime Minister. They talked with each other on a first name basis. It's that kind of a country.

When they were preparing to fill the Presidency of the European Union, they called in their Ambassadors from all over the world. Their Foreign Ministry at the time had 60 people working for it, including all of their overseas diplomatic representatives. That's the worldwide figure. They handed to each one of their Ambassadors a portfolio. Somebody would watch the Latin America account for the European Union. Someone else would watch the African, Near East, or Asian account. They divided up the world and told their Ambassadors that during Luxembourg's Presidency of the European Union, their sole priority was their European Union portfolio. They handed out these portfolios a year before Luxembourg assumed the Presidency of the European Union. Those Ambassadors were already preparing for it when Luxembourg entered the troika. When Luxembourg was in the Presidency, the Ambassadors were either in Luxembourg or in Brussels. They were wherever they needed to be to chair the necessary meetings. They had done their homework, they had learned their briefs, they had internalized them, and Luxembourg ran a very tight ship.

Luxembourg's present Prime Minister, Jean-Claude Juncker, was Finance Minister at the time Luxembourg was President of the European Union. He is still Finance Minister, in fact. During the first six months of 1991 he chaired all of the meetings of the European Communities' Finance Council. Those were the meetings at which the Treaty of Maastricht’s provisions on Economic and Monetary Union were drafted. The bases for monetary union, the rules for a European Monetary Institute, the criteria for eligibility to be in the monetary union, the rules for how to monitor the criteria were all written under the direction of Luxembourg's present Prime Minister. He won enormous kudos from all of the other Finance Ministers of the European Community. He was always fully prepared for each meeting. He knew the agenda. He talked with each of the other Finance Ministers privately before each meeting, understood the limits of their flexibility, where there was consensus, and where there were differences. Altogether, he ran a very constructive process.

He is one of the people whom the Luxembourg political establishment spotted 20 years ago and started to groom. He is from an old political family. The Luxembourg leaders bypassed several older members of his family who held important, elective office. They said, "This is the one who has the real talent" and they brought him along. He is also Minister of Labor and spends a lot of time worrying about the welfare of ordinary working people.

Other cabinet ministers have been equally well prepared, and certainly all of their Prime Ministers, Foreign Ministers, Defense Ministers, and Finance Ministers. It's a very serious place. They know that they are small, and the only way that they can perform any kind of credible role is by preparing well ahead of time. They are the antithesis of Mediterranean improvisation.

Q: *I can see also that Luxembourg has this role. It's not a threat to the prestige of France, Germany, or Britain. That sort of thing just wouldn't intrude because here is somebody who, nobody can say is against them. Someone could say that Germany is one up on the French or vice versa. However, no one could say anything like that about Luxembourg.*

ROWELL: One of the roles that Luxembourg has played is as a go between between France and Germany. They play this role by force of personality, not by power. You are absolutely right. Luxembourg can't threaten anybody. So when Luxembourg plays a facilitative role, you don't have the other parties, say, France, Germany or Britain, immediately asking, "What's in it for them? Which national benefit are they busy trying to scoop up now?" Even if there were a national benefit involved, it couldn't be big enough to take anything significant away from anybody else, anyhow.

Q: *Did you find that you were able to interpret this role of Luxembourg into an understanding back in Washington that we could help Luxembourg be a tool? You mentioned a number of things.*

ROWELL: No, we don't have to help Luxembourg be a tool. Its way of operating is in Luxembourg's national interest. They look after it. Their effectiveness depends on their credibility with their European partners. They know it. There is no way that we could make any difference in that. They have to deal with that themselves. They retain their credibility by being a serious country, by having competent people who are well prepared. They send good people to conferences and meetings.

They proved their utility within NATO on such things as the AWACS registration issue. They proved their seriousness in the Yugoslav case, when the Europeans finally decided that they had to send peacekeeping forces to Voivodina in Slavonia, in eastern Croatia, on the frontier between eastern Croatia and Serbia. The Europeans were having trouble deciding who was going to provide troops, how many, and all of those kinds of things. The US was not participating at all. Luxembourg participated in the Belgian battalion with a platoon, which isn't a big unit. But they maintained a platoon there for two and a half years. Relative to the size of their Army, this was a major contribution. When eventually they had exhausted their manpower pipeline, they had to withdraw from that participation for a year and a half or two years before they had trained new forces to do the job. During the hiatus in their participation, they made a cash contribution to

Belgium to defray the cost of an additional Belgian platoon. When we were in the Gulf War and were asking for contributions from our European allies, I went in and asked the Luxembourgers to contribute to the transport of forces to the Persian Gulf and then their return. Immediately, they came back and said, "Yes. Here are $5.0 million." This was from a country of 400,000 people. They gave us the $5.0 million and said, "If you can, try to use our cargo airline's airplanes Boeing 747s. But if that doesn't work for any reason at all, you're free to use it wherever you have to."

Luxembourg has maintained an assistance program in Africa for many years. For example, we had some significant programs going in West Africa. Their contribution to one project was in-country transportation for the USAID mission. They leased an airplane and provided the pilot, fuel, and maintenance, so that our people in that country could get around to the project sites and monitor them properly. In East Africa Luxembourg provided more direct assistance of one kind or another. Typically, they provide assistance in cooperation with other countries -- again, because the size of the country doesn't permit them to run a program all by themselves. Where they consider it important for Europe or the world to do something about a problem, they put their money where their mouth is. That is another way of earning credibility.

Q: *What was their role in the events that led to the fall of the Berlin Wall, the end of the Soviet Bloc, the end of the Soviet empire and all of that during the time that you were there?*

ROWELL: The Berlin Wall and the Soviet empire fell because of internal rot. What NATO had done was to maintain a containment vessel around the Soviet empire so that eventually rot could resolve the matter.

Luxembourg had always supported the integrity and cohesion of NATO. It had always been positively disposed toward US initiatives in NATO. When there were problems with the deployment of Pershing surface-to-surface missiles in Germany to counterbalance Soviet SS-20 missiles, Luxembourg was not a problem, even though there were people who worried about our transiting Luxembourg with equipment for the Pershings'. Luxembourg was always on the side where Britain and the US found themselves. If there was an intervention to be made and a vote was involved, they always took the right side, although on strategic issues like that they were not big players and they knew it. They tended not to say anything. However, if we needed permission to transport nuclear materials across Luxembourg, we got it. If something was going to have to remain in Luxembourg for a few days, somehow or other it could always be arranged.

The US maintained a major maintenance and storage depot in Luxembourg. It did not include atomic material, but it had big tanks, heavy artillery, and that kind of thing. There was never a problem with that. In fact, they were always very helpful in terms of selecting the right site and making sure that the transportation net was adequate and suitable. In the negotiations in Vienna on conventional forces in Europe; in what was happening in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which has since become the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe; in the surroundings and internal discussions in Vienna on nuclear negotiations with the Soviet side -- the Luxembourgers were consistently helpful in terms of what we wanted.

Q: *What was your role in this? You were talking about an extremely competent government*

which was doing just what we would want it to do. What did the American Ambassador to Luxembourg do during this really important period as relationships were changing in Europe?

ROWELL: First of all, my role was to convey to the Luxembourg Government the information that we had on what was happening behind the Iron Curtain or in the Persian Gulf -- and how things were moving. Secondly, it was to solicit what their views were. Thirdly, ask how talks were moving within the European Community and among the European ministers as they were concerting their position -- what problems there were and what we could do to enable them to stick to positions that, from our point of view, would be most helpful. They discussed the issues frankly, openly, and honestly with us. Things worked well.

You know, in late 1990, as the Persian Gulf crisis became tighter, Saddam Hussein of Iraq dug his position in deeper, and the French became more anxious to deal directly and unilaterally with Saddam. A series of ploys emerged within the European Community that, under the rules of the Community, forced the French to concert with the other Western European countries -- with Germany, Britain, and others. The French finally broke out and sent a unilateral mission to Baghdad only 24 hours before the bombing started. Up to then, by one device or another, the French didn't send this mission. I attribute much of this to the internal workings of the European Community and the way it managed its external affairs on the political side within the European Council. In that regard the Luxembourgers knew the rules of the game within the European Union and played them well.

Q: *Did you sense any feeling that the Luxembourgers at the official level would prefer to have a professional Foreign Service Officer sent to them as American Minister, as opposed to a non professional Ambassador? One always thinks of Perle Mesta former American Minister to Luxembourg -- in other words, social type Ambassadors. Or were they too polite to say anything?*

ROWELL: The Luxembourgers want a serious American Ambassador. They want somebody who can get things done in Washington and who can make sure that their views are taken with some degree of seriousness. They want to be seen as a serious player on the European scene. Lord knows that their status as a financial center makes them serious to their European partners. The way that they have played their role in the troika and in the Presidency of the European Union when it has come up also makes their partners take them seriously.

I think that it is not so much a distinction between a career and a non career Ambassador as between those Ambassadors who understand what role Luxembourg can play and who support that kind of a role and other Ambassadors. Given the range and complexity of issues we were confronting, it was important that the US Ambassador be able to discuss the issues with the Foreign Minister in depth and with substantial knowledge, confidence and insight. I played that role. I have every reason to think that they felt that their relationship with the United States was excellent and serious during my stay there.

My successor is a non career Ambassador. However, he is extremely well connected politically and has been effective in getting the Luxembourg Prime Minister in to see President Clinton and the Secretary of the Treasury, his opposite number, since he is also Finance Minister of

Luxembourg. I think that they have had a serious American Embassy to deal with as well.

Luxembourgers also appreciate Ambassadors who get out into the countryside, who talk to the mayors, visit the villagers, and that sort of thing. I did that, and my successor has done that. I know that some of my predecessors did that. Incidentally, Perle Mesta did that when she was Minister to Luxembourg. Because she was known in Washington as a socialite, people tended to underrate her role. Perle Mesta was a serious political figure in the United States. She happened to play politics via a social mechanism. However, since she was a serious political figure, she used that particular style very effectively as Minister to Luxembourg at a time when that style was rare among diplomats. That upset a lot of people, including people in the Department of State and our career diplomats. There was a lot of friction between her and the career officers assigned to the Legation in Luxembourg. However, in retrospect, she should be given a lot of credit for what she accomplished.

Q: *Probably one of the most divisive developments between the European Community and the United States has involved agricultural issues. Did you find yourself up to your neck in soybeans or the equivalent thereof?*

ROWELL: Yes, although that's a field in which Luxembourg plays almost no role. Under the Common Agricultural Policy of the European Community a farm had to operate at a certain level before it was eligible for Community subsidies. Luxembourg's farms were too small to qualify for many of those subsidies. They benefited from the price supports in a general way and received some subsidies from the Luxembourg Government. However, total agricultural production in Luxembourg is quite limited, even though it is a generally green country. Over the years since World War II, for example, the area of Luxembourg that is forested has risen from 10 percent of its surface to over one-third -- 35 percent. Luxembourg has long had an agricultural subsidy program which allowed farmers to do nothing more than just to keep agricultural land green.

Luxembourg farmers grow rape seed, they have dairy cattle and hogs, although lately hogs have been unprofitable and the farmers have been getting out of the business of raising pork. Luxembourg hams, Ardennes hams, are a famous European commodity, although production of them has been going down because they haven’t been profitable enough. Luxembourg just isn't big enough to be a major actor in that field. When we were busily engaged in fighting with the European Community in the Uruguay Round of trade and tariff negotiations, and the critical sticking points dealt with the Community's Common Agricultural Policy, what we got from Luxembourg was some insight into what was propelling the French, German, Dutch, and Belgian positions. Our enhanced understanding of the internal dynamics on the European side, the realities on the European side of the equation, helped the negotiations to conclude successfully. However, Luxembourg itself was not a heavy hitter in those negotiations.

When I speak of internal European dynamics, I mean something like the following. The French would say that proposed reductions in the way the Common Agricultural Policy was helping them would be catastrophic for France. The other European countries would understand that without some concessions to the US on agriculture, the negotiations would fail. They also knew there were many other high priority European interests that depended on Uruguay Round success

-- especially industrial and urban interests. So the other European countries would begin to discuss with France how they could compensate for the expected losses to its agricultural sector. That enabled the Europeans to arrive at a consensus that allowed them and us to negotiate a successful conclusion to the Uruguay Round.

Q: *What about the ties between the United States and Luxembourg? During World War II the two major battles in Europe where American troops were involved were D-Day the landing in Normandy in June, 1944 and then Bastogne the defense of a vital road hub during the Battle of the Bulge in December, 1944. Did Bastogne, which is in Belgium, about two miles from the Luxembourg border and the area around it play much of a role from your point of view?*

ROWELL: Luxembourgers have a fondness for Americans that literally exceeds anything anywhere else in the world. It is a country in which half of the villages fly American flags because they want to. Virtually every village in Luxembourg has a monument or a plaque dedicated to some American soldier who died there, as the Luxembourgers see it, helping to liberate Luxembourg and to save its children. United States forces have liberated Luxembourg three times: once, during World War I, again, in September, 1944, and once again at the conclusion of the Battle of the Bulge. That is to say, January-February, 1945.

Luxembourg has had a history of being dominated for roughly 500 years from the 15th to the 20th century. As they put it to me, and to many other Americans, the United States Army is the only liberating force that ever left the country voluntarily. They really appreciate that. Luxembourg is a country in which a uniformed American serviceman can go into a small village and discover that he will not be allowed to pay for his beer. This is still the case today. Luxembourger families that adopted the graves of American servicemen at the American Military Cemetery in Hamm in the 1950s still maintain that adoption and that commitment to this day. The grandchildren are brought to the cemetery and told that every year you put flowers on this grave on the serviceman's birthday. They may send postcards to the serviceman's family -- although now they are sent to the serviceman's grandchildren. So you see them decorating American servicemen's graves there every year, with the whole Luxembourger family participating, including grandparents, parents, and grandchildren. They are still building monuments and putting up plaques to American servicemen.

The Battle of the Bulge was a cruel experience in Luxembourg. The country had mostly escaped damage in World War II until the Battle of the Bulge. The American force that was in Luxembourg at the time of the battle was very thin. It was the Pennsylvania National Guard Division, the 28th or Keystone infantry Division. It had suffered grievous losses in the Battle of the Huertgen Forest, which is East of the German-Belgian frontier in the vicinity of Aachen. It was pulled out of the line and sent to Luxembourg to regroup, receive reinforcements, and do a little refreshment training before going back into battle. That Division was guarding a line 45 miles long, when the Germans came through on December 16, 1944, in their final assault of the war.

The German plan was to be past Bastogne in 24 hours. The American 101st Airborne Division, the Screaming Eagles, Brig Gen McAuliffe's division (McAuliffe was actually the deputy division commander but on scene and in command when the battle started) is famous for its

defense of Bastogne. But it was in northern France on December 16 and didn't arrive in Bastogne until a day or two later. The Pennsylvania 28th Infantry Division delayed the German assault by 96 hours and was virtually destroyed in the process. That delay enabled the 101st Airborne Division to get to Bastogne. Without control of Bastogne, the Germans were unable to move enough supplies to the panzer tanks to enable them to get all the way to the English Channel coast. The order came down from General Eisenhower's headquarters to Division and Regimental levels, "You will hold at all costs," meaning, "Die if you must, but hold on."

The Pennsylvania 28th Division doesn't get nearly the credit it deserves for its initial defense of Bastogne. It was an amazing feat, and the Luxembourgers recognize it every year. In the end elements of some 28 US divisions were involved in the final liberation of Luxembourg. They have the most moving military museum that I have seen anywhere that focuses on the Battle of the Bulge. It has incredibly realistic dioramas based on photographs taken during the battle, plus letters and photographs of participants in the battle. American veterans go to Luxembourg every year. They are received with incredible warmth. Luxembourg is a very special place.

Incidentally, since we're talking about World War II, the Grand Duke of Luxembourg, who is a Colonel in the Irish Guards, landed with the British forces in Normandy 24 hours after D-Day that is, on D+1 and was with those forces all through the European campaign. It was an enormous risk for a royal house to take with the heir to the throne.

Q: *Could we talk about the precipitous recognition of Croatia by Germany and that whole development from your perspective as one of the nearby observers of the breakup of Yugoslavia?*

ROWELL: The Federal Republic of Germany has had a sort of crisis of conscience with regard to Yugoslavia and particularly with regard to the role which German or Nazi forces played in Croatia and Serbia during World War II, especially in Croatia. When Croatia was pressing for recognition as an independent country, the German authorities felt that the demand from its electorate to recognize Croatia's independence was irresistible. They felt that they had to do it. They had wanted to recognize Croatia's independence as early as July, 1990.

Then began a long, long process of trying to persuading them to hold off. Just as Luxembourg and the other European countries had managed to keep France from going unilateral in the case of Iraq in 1990, they kept holding the Germans back on Croatia. During Luxembourg's presidency of the European Union they held the Germans back until the middle of 1991. Finally, the Germans said that they were going to recognize Croatia anyhow. All of the other Europeans understood that the Germans were going to do it but had held off as long as they could until they had to go ahead. Virtually everyone, including the US, told the Germans, "Don't do it." The Germans replied that for their own domestic, internal reasons, they would do it, and they did it.

When Germany recognized Croatia and Slovenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Montenegro declared their independence. That created a situation in which Serbia became the rump Yugoslavia. Part of the assertion of Serbia's independence and integrity then became a battle to extend its territorial domain, a thrust that Croatia aped simultaneously.

Now, I was Ambassador to Luxembourg, not Yugoslavia. There are others who know

Yugoslavia much better than I. However, I would say that Milosevic, the President of Serbia, was driven primarily by political power and not by nationalist motivations. However, he used nationalism as a device to gain power. Similarly, President Tudjman in Croatia was using Croatian nationalism and independence as devices to consolidate his own power. So once German recognition had come, the collapse of Yugoslavia, the civil war, and the engagement of the United Nations -- all of that became inevitable. Who knows. Maybe it was inevitable in any case.

Q: *Did Luxembourg see the problem as it was developing?*

ROWELL: Absolutely, as did everybody else. I must say that I had long conversations with Luxembourger officials, and their appreciation of what was happening in Yugoslavia was no different from ours. I think that we helped to inform them. At a later stage, as things got worse, the European Union sent negotiators to the newly-independent states of the former Yugoslavia. These negotiators were trying to persuade them not to engage in a civil war and were offering economic assistance as inducements. That happened during Luxembourg's presidency of the European Union.

A young officer in the Luxembourg Foreign Ministry became THE principal note taker for these conversations. He was on the ground in the former Yugoslavia week after week. When the European Union appointed Lord Carrington to be its chief negotiator, Carrington insisted that the young Luxembourg diplomat be seconded to him as his de facto aide de camp and head of office, or chef de cabinet, in the French phrase for it. It's like a senior internal executive for this matter. It was a tribute to the quality of the people that Luxembourg appoints to its government service.

Q: *Is there anything else that we should cover on this? I'm not trying to stop this. We can schedule another session.*

ROWELL: I think that we need another session. I had hoped to finish this time but I need to talk to you about Luxembourg's role in drafting the Treaty of Maastricht.

***

Q: *Today is May 15, 1996. This is a continuation of the interview with Ambassador Ed Rowell. Ed, could we mention money laundering, COCOM, and plain bilateral relations between Luxembourg and the United States?*

ROWELL: Let's start with money laundering. Because Luxembourg is a major financial center, we needed to look at how funds derived from drug trafficking might have been channeled into or through Luxembourg. The United States Government was trying to crack down on drug traffickers partly by interdicting or seizing their financial assets. In fact, from information which DEA got by infiltrating drug trafficking organizations...

Q: *DEA is the Drug Enforcement Administration.*

ROWELL: The Drug Enforcement Administration obtained this information by infiltrating drug

trafficking organizations inside the United States. They were able to track the origins of certain bank accounts in the US From those we were able to go to the Luxembourg authorities with specific bank account numbers.. Under their law, when you came to them looking for particular accounts you could then have access to the information. We then managed to track down over $40 million in drug trafficking assets. When we brought this to the attention of the Luxembourg authorities, they promptly impounded them. Subsequently, they indicted and prosecuted a couple of people related to the Colombian drug cartel for money laundering. The persons indicted were convicted and served jail time in Luxembourg. The Luxembourg authorities have cooperated in a large number of ongoing indictments inside the US, providing some hard evidence and certainly going through the deposition and letters rogatory process with persons whom they had jailed in Luxembourg when they were caught for drug trafficking. This has proved of inestimable value to various United States attorneys in different districts of the United States.

Luxembourg was a member of the Financial Action Task Force that drew up guidelines for a new set of rules governing bank procedures and bank policy among the members of the European Union. In the Luxembourg case they passed the law well before the guidelines were approved. I might point out that the Financial Action Task Force included representatives from the United States Treasury Department. Even before those guidelines were developed and approved, Luxembourg had changed its own national laws on the responsibility of financial institutions to make it possible to certify to the bona fides of the ultimate beneficiary of any account that might be opened inside Luxembourg. Their rules on reporting transactions above a certain level were also very tight -- tighter than US rules, because in the Luxembourg case they included deposits of anything of significant value, including gems or monetary metals -- platinum, silver, gold, and that sort of thing. If these items of value were deposited within a certain time frame, this could constitute a significant amount of money.

Because the ultimate Luxembourg unit of account in terms of transactions is the European Currency Unit, the ECU, which is worth substantially more than the US dollar, the reporting thresholds in their guidelines were lower than ours according to the way the formulas worked -- but don't ask me what the formulas were. The Luxembourg guidelines were more comprehensive in terms of what constituted value.

Their system for enforcement is rather informal, but it works. Included in the office of the Director of the Luxembourg Monetary Institute, which in essence is the Luxembourg Central Bank, are persons responsible for monitoring banking operations. These people call in the president of any Luxembourg branch of a financial institution which is beginning to have deposit records that look unusual or suspect. These officials of financial institutions are required to show why the deposits are not unusual or suspect. The financial institution officials are then cautioned and told that the banking authorities are going to watch very closely both their activities, the transactions of the bank involved, and so on. This has a chastening effect on bankers. I cannot tell you how many times I received complaints from the heads of a number of financial institutions, saying that they really did not enjoy the almost carte blanche right of the Luxembourg monetary authorities to look over their shoulders and second guess their judgments as to who is a bona fide depositor and who is not.

What put teeth in this practice is the fact that the bank officers were considered criminally liable

if their institution accepted a non bona fide deposit. In this case bona fide means that the ultimate beneficiary of the account is a person of good repute who did not derive the sums of money deposited in an illegal fashion.

In fact, subsequent to my departure from Luxembourg, the Luxembourg authorities brought charges against the heads of a couple of banks in cases where the DEA and the US Government were not involved. The charges stuck. So they take this very, very seriously. Seriously, because Luxembourg depends on its reputation for probity and as a safe environment in order to attract deposits from very conservative people, like rural Germans. Luxembourg also offers bank secrecy, reasonably attractive interest rates, and no tax withholding at the source. But in the Central European psyche probity and conservatism are very important, too.

The Luxembourg Government supervises the financial community as well as it can with its limited resources. To help maintain a high reputation for probity, the government has been anxious to cooperate with the United States and with its European partners in fighting money laundering.

There was another case that involved the United States. That was the BCCI [Bank of Credit and Commerce International], which was owned by one of the Arab Emirates.

Q: *Abu Dhabi, I think.*

ROWELL: That's right. It had branches in many parts of the world. Its original charter in Europe was in Luxembourg, because it was an easy place to set up a bank. In fact, its main operation center was in London. The office in Luxembourg had perhaps 20 or 30 people. The one in London had over 500 people, to give you some sense of scale. Nevertheless, under the old rules that prevailed within the European Community, and now I'm speaking about the late 1980's, the country that hosted the principal seat of a financial institution was responsible for monitoring and supervising all of its activities. So technically Luxembourg was responsible for monitoring and supervising the operations of that 500-person branch office in London, as well as elsewhere in the world. Well, Luxembourg couldn't do it and they asked the British authorities to help them. The British were reluctant voluntarily to change the rule because they thought that it had lots of implications for their relations with other countries and for the burdens it would place on the British authorities. The formal British responsibilities were less clear. I suppose that there was potentially room for a counter suit or some legal defense against that kind of supervision.

Since that time the financial authorities within the European Union have addressed this issue. I believe that they now have agreed that when a bank has branch offices that are very large the country that hosts such a large branch will aid the country that houses the theoretical headquarters in supervising the bank, if asked to do so. That agreement came too late to save us from the BCCI problem.

Q: *Would you explain what the BCCI problem was?*

ROWELL: I don't remember all of the details. There were a number of illegal transactions involving the bank. It had interests in several US banks. Somehow the pyramid collapsed.

Depositors lost huge sums of money, and some of the shareholders lost large amounts of money. There were banks in metropolitan Washington, DC, that were involved, as well as banks in the State of Georgia. The whole thing started to fall apart when US banking authorities closed in on what appeared to be strange transactions. That triggered the collapse of the rest of the house of cards and brought people to Luxembourg to deal with the issue.

The question of compensating the depositors is still being considered in the courts in various countries, including in Luxembourg. That's as much as I know about it.

Q: *Would you tell us what the term, money laundering, meant, particularly in the context of the 1980's?*

ROWELL: If somebody deposits money in a bank, and the money has come from a criminal activity, the government has the right to impound the funds and may even seize and confiscate them. The procedures for confiscating differ from country to country and even from state to state in the United States. Money laundering is the process by which money derived from criminal activity is moved through the banking system to make it look as though it comes from legitimate business. The aim is to make it easy to use the money in daily transactions without attracting suspicion or investigation.

Drug trafficking is clearly illegal, and money derived from it is subject to confiscation.. Now, on the whole nobody pays much attention if you come into a bank and deposit $500, a couple of thousand, or even $3,000. However, the large, drug trafficking organizations handle tens of millions of dollars, even hundreds of millions of dollars. Those are huge amounts of money to move, so they have to find some way to make sure that the money cannot be traced to illegal activity. To do that, they typically establish false front businesses that appear to be legal -- such as laundries, restaurants, transportation companies, commodities dealers, almost anything. The false front businesses appear to pay large sums for goods or services that in fact are never delivered. Those sums become laundered money. Or the false front business will appear to have large receipts for goods or services it never delivers. The apparent profit represents the laundering of illegal funds. Then they pass the funds through a series of bank accounts so that ultimately the money winds up in the account of somebody who holds the funds for a drug cartel.

Suppose, for example, a fictitious company which has nothing but a brass plate on a door in a tenement building. It maintains two or three bank accounts in Miami. The company deposits money in the bank accounts. It appears, say, to be in the air cargo business. Then it appears to pay for the supplies or services it receives. Perhaps aircraft maintenance, fuel, oil, and so forth. This will be falsely invoiced by other store front companies, and then they go through a money laundering process. The companies are not all in Miami. There will be companies in New York and Chicago. Eventually, they will have a fictitious relationship with some companies in Europe which have accounts in Luxembourg, London, Paris, Frankfurt, or wherever. So the money goes through a whole series of bank accounts. Of course, the longer the chain between the point of origin and the ultimate bank account the harder it is to track.

You have no idea of the enormous volume of the funds involved in regular transactions that take place every single day. If you had a computer printout, it might take more than the entire

population of the United States to be able to read every line of these transactions each day. That's the volume of the transactions we are talking about. So how do you distinguish the bad ones from the good ones which, in terms of the whole, represent an infinitesimal proportion?

It's tough to do this. I guess that my point is that virtually all of the funds that arrive in Luxembourg's international banks -- not their domestic banks, which are really very small in size -- come by Electronic Financial Transfer [EFT]. There is a steady flow of modest deposits physically carried into the Luxembourg banks by persons from neighboring countries who typically are from the professional classes, including doctors, dentists, lawyers, architects, and civil engineers. They maintain personal accounts to avoid taxes in their countries of residence. That's what's involved. But those accounts are easily identifiable and have nothing to do with money laundering. Everything else comes by an Electronic Financial Transfer. With the help of the Luxembourg authorities, we were able to interdict some money laundering involving Electronic Financial Transfers from US banks.

I make that point because very often, in our frustration in getting very few results from interdicting the financial resources of drug trafficking, we have passed laws demanding that countries with which we deal force the banks to report deposits above a certain level. The way the laws are written, it's clear that the intent of Congress is to make sure that the bank reports CASH deposits above some level, say when someone walks in with $5,000 or $10,000 in cash -- something like that. That's not the way that trafficking or money laundering works. So the law is pointed at an irrelevant target. It complicates things but it doesn't really do any good, the way it's written.

When you try to interdict Electronic Financial Transactions, as I said, the farther from the point of origin that you get, the harder it is to know the bona fides of the persons involved in the transaction. What the Luxembourg bank has to do, for example, is to go back to the bank, say, the First National Bank of Chicago, and ask, "Can you certify the bona fides of this transfer?" Then the Chicago bank has to go back to identify whoever transferred the money to it -- maybe a bank in Singapore. Or the chain goes back to a bank in San Francisco, and then back to a bank in St. Louis. Eventually, the chain gets very fuzzy, and nobody can swear absolutely that the funds involved were legally or illegally derived. That's a big part of the problem. So that's money laundering.

Let's talk a little bit about nuclear non proliferation, controlling the export of certain goods. COCOM [The Coordinating Committee] was created during the Cold War to prevent the export of valuable technology or goods to the Soviet Union or Warsaw Pact countries. Then these controls were applied to some countries such as Communist China and later, but with much more difficulty and in a much more limited way, to some other countries with which the US had poor relations, such as Iraq, Libya, and Iran. The purpose was to stop terrorism or to reduce the risk that weapons of mass destruction could fall into the hands of unscrupulous and conscienceless persons.

During the Cold War the Soviet airline, Aeroflot, used Luxembourg as a principal transit point to the Western Hemisphere and occasionally to Africa. It also stopped in Lisbon, for the same purpose. Luxembourg was apparently chosen by Aeroflot because it had no transoceanic

international airline of its own, except for an air cargo line, and it was easy to get to from any point in Western Europe. It had long been a landing point for odd-ball airlines. The one best known and beloved to Americans was Icelandic Airlines, the backpackers' airline that allowed hundreds of thousands of American students to get to Europe for a price that they could afford. The same thing that helped Icelandic Airlines, the same lack of a national investment in a particular airline that made it easy for Luxembourg to become the haven for NATO AWACS aircraft, also made it a transit point for Aeroflot.

From time to time the Russians attempted to pass through Luxembourg, often via Aeroflot, certain goods that probably were on the COCOM list. I personally don't have much in the way of details, as what we detected in this regard came from intelligence sources which I can't talk about.

The fundamental point is that there was probably always some trickle of goods prohibited by COCOM. We paid a lot of attention to it and wanted to make sure that nothing really significant was escaping through that hole. Again, we had full cooperation from the Luxembourg authorities, but their ability to police, monitor, and investigate was really very, very limited. So, from time to time we would become active on that front in Luxembourg, whenever there was any potential movement that might have been significant.

Q: *Were there any cases that came up during your time in Luxembourg which you can talk about?*

ROWELL: I remember a couple of cases, though I don't remember their names. I remember a shipment involving some computers, for example, and something else. In each case the tendency of the Luxembourg authorities, when properly alerted to a problem shipment, was to send it back to the point from which it had been shipped to Luxembourg. So they never seized anything. Luxembourg was not a manufacturer of these goods, in any case, so there was nothing coming from a domestic Luxembourg company. It was always material in transit. By sending the goods back to the point of origin, they made their point to the shipper. Beyond that, I don't have a whole lot to say. My recollection is that Luxembourg didn't play any sort of large role in COCOM, precisely because it didn't have any manufacturers and basic producers of the goods in question. Luxembourg companies were not major world traders in any of the commodities or goods involved in COCOM controls.

Q: *On the banking side, did Luxembourg stand in any contrast to Switzerland at the time, which was sort of the preeminent bankers' state?*

ROWELL: Yes, but not in terms of law enforcement. Well, I don't know how to make the comparison in terms of law enforcement, because I never served in Switzerland. I was in Luxembourg. So I can't do that.

As far as being the tax haven that it is, Luxembourg, of course, is a member of the European Communities, now the European Union. Switzerland is not. Switzerland has an age-old reputation as a tax haven for persons from other countries, off in other parts of the world -- in the Western Hemisphere, Asia, Africa, or wherever. Switzerland is notorious for producing only

modest returns on capital deposited in its banks. In some cases it has had a domestic tax of one or two percentage points on the capital on deposit in its banks. This was the case precisely because the Swiss knew that people were depositing these funds to escape the authorities elsewhere, and these were very rich people.

Yes, there are some rich people who are depositors in Luxembourg. But if you just look at numbers, probably the largest share of depositors there are professional people who are citizens of neighboring countries.

Q: *Whose deposits would be modest, say, compared with...*

ROWELL: That's right. And the rates of return paid by Luxembourg financial institutions have typically involved low, real rates of return. They are significant, not outrageously high the way you sometimes get in the Cayman Islands or the Channel Islands, where people understand that you run the risk of associating with a fly-by-night institution. So you get a premium on the return on the money you risk. There aren't any fly-by-night banks in Luxembourg that I know of. It's to the interest of Luxembourg to make sure that such institutions stay out of the country. However, the Luxembourg financial institutions do pay a serious rate of interest which compares favorably with the rates paid in Germany, France, the Netherlands, Britain, and other countries like that. Whether Luxembourg rates are as favorable as rates paid in the US really depends on the way you want to bet on the movement of the US dollar in terms of European currencies. That is, the exchange rate parity, as well as how you want to bet on forthcoming actions of the Federal Reserve Bank compared to forthcoming actions of, say, the Bundesbank, the German central bank. That is a different set of gambles. Sometimes, the return on long term deposits in Luxembourg has been better than in the US and sometimes it has been not quite as good. If you're a European, you probably tend to keep your money in Europe. If you're an American, you probably tend to keep your money in the United States.

Other bilateral issues. The Luxembourg cargo airline has long wanted a long term license to operate certain regular routes to the US. The US Department of Transportation has regularly granted them a temporary license, renewable on a year-to-year basis. The fundamental reason is that no US airline had had any particular interest in scheduled flying to Luxembourg. The US Department of Transportation doesn't give away licenses to foreign airlines unless it can get a quid pro quo that is valuable to a US carrier. So that remains a permanent problem in terms of our bilateral relationship.

There are occasional investor problems where a US investor has put money into a company registered in Luxembourg. There may be complaints about whether the investor is being treated fairly or not. I don't recall any reverse cases, with Luxembourg investors feeling unhappy with what happened to money that they'd invested in the US. However, I think that you could count on the fingers of one hand the number of problems in this respect that arose during my four and one-half years in Luxembourg -- although one of them was quite large. So that's how that went. Now, what else did we have on our agenda?

Q: *I can't think of anything else. You certainly talked about the NATO and UN role. Perhaps it's time to talk about your retirement. When did you leave Luxembourg?*

ROWELL: I retired at the end of August, 1994. I left Luxembourg at the beginning of August, 1994, after being there as Ambassador for four years and four months.

End of reader