

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

AMBASSADOR ROBERT ANDERSON

Interviewed by: Horace Torbert
Initial interview date: March 12, 1990
Copyright 1998 ADST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background	
Early interest in the Foreign Service	
Andover and Yale	
Army service in WWII	
The Foreign Service Exam	
Shanghai	1947-1949
Auxiliary vice consul	
Reopening posts in China	
Political and economic work	
Transfer to Nanking	
China Relief Mission	
Temporary retirement from the Foreign Service	
Chieng Mai/Bangkok	1950-1952
Thailand in the 1950s	
Establishing the U.S. consulate	
Political reporting	
CIA activities in Thailand	
New Delhi	1952-1956
Political officer	
Ambassador George Allen	
State Department	1956-1959
Ceylon Desk Officer	1956-1957
Asian affairs	
Maxwell H. Gluck	
Public Affairs Office	1957
Reorganizing State correspondence	
Charles Whitehouse and CIA	

Bordeaux/Paris	1959-1961
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Political/Economic officer Learning to speak French Kennedy visit Special assistant to General Gavin General Gavin as ambassador 	
Special Assistant to Undersecretary George Ball	1961
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean Rusk as secretary Assassination of President Kennedy Role of the Undersecretary 	
France/Benelux Country Director	1962-1968
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Gavin Ambassador Bohlen De Gaulle's withdrawal from NATO Vice President Humphrey 	
Experiences in Nanking	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> George Ball and Spoapy Williams Relationship between Rusk and de Gaulle 	
Paris	1968-1972
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Political Counselor Ambassador Sarge Shriver Reorientation of embassy Lack of senior people with French background Ecole National d'Administration (ENA) Changing method of reporting Couve de Murville French weapons sales to Libya President Nixon's visit 	
Ambassador to Dahomey (Benin)	1972-1974
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Situation in Dahomey Kerekou takeover Operating in a traditional French country Relationship with France under Kerekou U.S. – Dahomey relations 	
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs	1974-1976
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nature of spokesman position Origin of appointment Contact with Kissinger Shuttle diplomacy 	

Ambassador to Morocco	1976-1978
King Hassan	
U.S. presence in Morocco	
Kurt Waldheim and Algeria	
Westinghouse contract	
Carter policy toward Morocco	
Relations with Algeria	
Impression of Al Haig	
CIA as a channel to Washington	
Advisor to CINCLANT	1978-1982
Nature of assignment	
Admirals Train and Crowe	
Involvement in Navy policy	
U.S. military organization	
NATO policy	
State-Defense coordination	
Role of political advisors	
Ambassador to the Dominican Republic	1982-1985
Origin of appointment	
Situation in the Dominican Republic	
President Gunman	
Jorge Blanco as president	
U.S. assistance to Central America	
1965 intervention	
Invasion of Grenada	
Political stability in the Dominican Republic	
U.S. policy toward Latin America	
U.S. diplomacy toward Latin America	
Conclusion	
Retirement from the Foreign Service	
Consulting work	
Director of the Atlantic Council	
The role of an ambassador	

INTERVIEW

Q: Ambassador Anderson, we're very glad, indeed, to have you with us this morning. You have a very long career and it's going to take a while to do this, I think. But it's also a very fascinating

one that covers the whole world. I wonder if you'd like to start in by telling me something about how you got into the Service, and how your interest in foreign affairs started?

ANDERSON: Tully, I'm delighted to be here. I think it's a very important thing for all of us to try and contribute whatever we can, because the Foreign Service plays a tremendous historical role that often isn't recorded for history's sake. And a few, I think, are worth it.

How did I get interested in the Foreign Service? My father operated a very small business outside of Boston and he purposely kept it small all his life. It was a company with maybe 50 to 60 employees, and he used to travel six months a year. And he was able to do it because of that. He became a tremendous friend to the Foreign Service.

I guess the closest friend he had was Jim Penfield. And Jim would come to our house when he'd come back on his infrequent visits to the U.S. at that time--because the government never paid the way back for anybody. I had many chances to talk with this Foreign Service "god," as it were. There was another one, named Andy Edson, whom, my father knew. I can't remember where he was posted; I think it was out in the Far East. And then, from that time on, my father always kept talking about the Foreign Service, what a wonderful way to serve your country and have a beneficial career, in terms of fulfillment, intellectual and otherwise.

I went to school in England during the Depression. I got a scholarship and went over to a prep school for a year, and then on to a public school for another year until World War II was about to come along and my father decided to have me back to the States in 1937, when I went to Andover and then Yale. I focused on foreign affairs even back then, at Andover and at Yale. I remember Henry Stimson, a very important trustee at Andover, came up to Andover to talk to a group of us. I was allowed to be one of the young shavers to meet and talk with him. He impressed me tremendously as a statesman and as such a wise man, who was trying to help President Roosevelt at the time.

And then at Yale, I took the first Japanese language course that Yale ever offered; and ended up in military intelligence in Washington, in Japanese language work, with some very wonderful people.

Q: Well, did you have a war class at Yale?

ANDERSON: No, I was in the class of 1944. I went to school in the summer, before I went into the Service, in January '43. And I took extra courses. The result was that I did not have to return to Yale after the war; there were a few of us that did that. I had to complete one course; it was in international law, actually, which I did at George Washington University, with Francis Colt DeWolfe. He was my teacher and he was a celebrated official in the State Department for many, many years. You probably knew him. A result of that, Yale accepted that one, final credit and I didn't have to go back to receive my degree.

I went into the Foreign Service while I was still on terminal leave from the Army. I must say, I took the Foreign Service examination right after the war. It was the first one they'd given in a

number of years. All I can tell you is I failed it absolutely miserably, because I'd been out of college for three years and I'd been focusing on 3,000 or 4,000 Japanese characters, and that's enough to send anybody to the loony bin.

Q: Well, you're in very good company, because I have many friends who reached the top of the Service and failed the exam two or three times.

ANDERSON: Yes, well, I'm among those. I wouldn't say I reached the top, but I did have a career that I absolutely loved. I never had an assignment I didn't like.

So what I did was sign on to the Foreign Service. Because despite the fact that I failed the exam, I wanted to get in and do this. And I signed on as an auxiliary vice consul, at that time; where they took a number of them, and even though I knew Japanese, they sent me to China. I suppose that's typical of our government.

I went to Shanghai. As you and I discussed before this interview, your early posts are essentially training; that's when the Service finds out if you've got it or not, and if you can develop and progress. So I started out in Shanghai, in the General Services section, as the fellow that was told to move all of the household and office equipment that was arriving in Shanghai--to reopen all of our posts in China. There were about a dozen of them. And there was no commercial transportation whatsoever, air or sea. So I had a problem. What I did was make friends with our Air Force people. I would find a space on this C-47 or this C-46, and go and have drinks with them. And I had all of our things moved at no expense to the State Department, to establish all of our posts.

Q: Sounds like a first-class dog robber. [Laughter]

ANDERSON: That's what it was. They gave me my first job in the political work. And at one point they sent me on a trip to prepare an economic report.

Then a very unusual man showed up one day. His nickname was "the walrus." He became one of the closest friends I ever had in the Foreign Service. He was William Walton Butterworth, whom I absolutely adored, and his wife, Virginia. He had sent word, before he arrived as our Minister in China, that he would appreciate it if his lift vans would not be dropped in the Yangtze River, and would not be pilfered by anybody. I was told that this was a rather formidable person, and that it might be a good idea if I saw to it that his lift vans arrived from Shanghai to Nanking with no mishaps.

I went down on the Yangtze River, at the harbor in Shanghai, and I stayed with those vans until they arrived in Nanking. Nothing was broken; no damage. The Minister came down to Shanghai afterwards and said he wanted to meet the person who shipped his effects to Nanking. This is not a very nice thing to say, but I have to say it. Our Consul General was Monnett B. Davis. I had never met Monnett B. Davis, though I had been in his Consulate General for damn near a year. And Butterworth asked him, "Would you find out the fellow who got my effects up to Nanking?"

I'd like to meet him." And I was escorted, for the first time in my life, into the consul general's office. And I had never met Monnett B. Davis.

Q: My gracious! How big a consulate general was it? I mean, how many American officers were there?

ANDERSON: Put it this way, Tully, it wasn't that big. [Laughter] I think it was the personality of the Consul General. I introduced myself to the Consul General in front of Mr. Butterworth. And I said, "I'm delighted to meet you, Sir."

And Butterworth said to me afterwards: "You never met this man before?"

I said, "No, Sir, I haven't." And then he told me: "Look, I want you up in Nanking. You know, this is ridiculous." I guess the only reason I'm mentioning this little story is for younger people who come into the Service. I maintain that every officer gets a chance, gets an opening, but a lot of people don't recognize it. If you meet a challenge successfully, something is going to happen and you're going to go up. And that was the first one I had; it was getting those lift vans to Nanking. I did the job.

There's a fellow named Jim McKenna I have to mention to you. He was the first Foreign Service officer I ever met in Shanghai, when I arrived on a weekend. I was all charged up and said, "Boy, they can't wait to see this young, vigorous vice consul come to set the affairs of Shanghai and China straight." And I walked into this fellow's office. And he had a hat on at his desk. He was the number two in the Consulate General. He's smoking the biggest cigar I've ever seen--Jim McKenna, from New England. He was there with a big pile of telegrams, going through them.

He looked up over his glasses at me and wondered what I was doing there. And I told him I was assigned here. And he didn't know who I was. I didn't have a room; they didn't have a room for me, nothing. I slept on a couch at the Cathay Hotel; at the foot of twin beds, where two other officers were sleeping. That's how tight things were. I found out later that McKenna spent as much time as he could in his office, because his wife wouldn't let him smoke cigars at home. He was a wonderful guy.

I went up to Nanking. Butterworth, a very foresighted man, felt that we should start a major biographic data program for China. And I was put in charge of that, started it right from scratch, had a full-time gal working who was a specialist and who came from Washington. And we built up a mammoth biographic program for all of China.

I went around to different offices and taught people how to make reports, and not just these old-fashioned, formal full reports, but little squibs; cutting out items from newspapers and other publications. I was sent over to Taipei in Formosa to get things started. Later we managed to get all that information out, which gave us a tremendous amount of background on the Communist regime that eventually took over. We wouldn't have had anything but for that.

Washington still hadn't figured out whether the Chinese Communists were agrarian reformers or communists. So they split the embassy in half. And seeing that I was young, single and expendable, I guess, I was told to stay behind with John Wesley Jones, who was one of the dearest friends I ever had.

Q: Still is.

ANDERSON: And who was partially responsible for my marriage. He was very close to the Italian ambassador in China, whose daughter I married. But Johnny was sort of a father to me out there. He was a dear, dear person.

We stayed behind after the communists took over. They took over on April 21, 1949, and we were essentially locked up until we got out in October. When we tried to go to the office a couple of times, they'd ram bayonets through the radiators of our cars. So a couple of us were dumb enough to say the heck with this, and we'd creep around and go through back alleys, because we wanted to get over the chancery so we could send a telegram or two. We were finally evacuated in October, that year, from Shanghai.

Now, there were two other people in Nanking I wanted to mention to you. One was Livy [Livingston] Merchant. He was a very close friend of Walt Butterworth; they went to Princeton together. And Livy had been a very, very successful investment banker, living in New Jersey. And then he, as you probably know--you know him better than I do--decided to get into the Foreign Service at a rather advanced age.

A lot of us couldn't figure out why a successful investment banker, with everything in the world, would come out and live in Nanking, China, with a beautiful wife, Betty, and children.

He told us that he just got absolutely fed up with spending most of his life on the train, between his house and his office. He said: "I would leave in the morning and wouldn't see my children before they went to school. And I would come back at night and they'd already be in bed. That's no way to live." Well, of course, he turned out to be one of the top people, we've ever had in the Service; I think he's just absolutely wonderful.

The other fellow is Philip Crowe.

Q: I hadn't realized he was out there.

ANDERSON: Phil went there as Roger Lapham's man. Do you remember the China Relief Mission?

Q: Yes.

ANDERSON: Phil was the head of it in Nanking. That was our first post-war aid program, really; right after the war, as I recall. Phil was administering that. We became very close friends. He managed somehow to have an embassy every time the Republicans came into power; I think he

had five throughout his career. He had his first heart attack when he was out there, just as the communists were coming. The question was how to get him out.

We had an old Army ambulance, that we received from the military a while back--and I drove him through the retreating Chinese Kuomintang lines to the last plane to leave Nanking. I must say, I wasn't worried about the communist troops coming in, but I was very concerned about the retreating Kuomintang troops. They were much nastier than the victors coming in, who weren't quite as nervous, they were on top of the world, as it were. And it was a fairly hairy little ride in the ambulance, but we got Phil there, thank God, and put him on the plane. We waved goodbye and off Livy and Phil Crowe went.

But after that, I came back to Washington with a rather bad case of amoebic dysentery. There were no medicines left in Nanking so it was pretty well advanced, and they, the doctors, were concerned about it. So I spent about three months or more, every day of my life, at Walter Reed Hospital. I became the second guinea pig, if you will, for aureomycin, the medicine they were just developing.

Q: Thank God for it. They used it on me some years later.

ANDERSON: They hadn't really figured out the right mixture. I went through more courses than you can shake a stick at. But I finally got rid of it and then got married in February of '50, in Florence, Italy.

Q: At that time, was your father-in-law in Washington by then?

ANDERSON: No. He didn't come until the 60s.

I came back to Washington. I worked temporarily in the Far Eastern Bureau, where Walt Butterworth was Assistant Secretary. Livy Merchant was the Assistant Secretary for Europe.

I resigned from the Foreign Service from about May or April until August, 1950, because my father came down to Washington and he said that he really had to have me take over the family business, that he was getting too old and he couldn't do it anymore. He really was quite emotional about it. My dear wife, who didn't marry me to go and live outside of Boston to run a paper box business she said: "Well, look. Your father needs you. You go and do it. Come on, we have to do it."

So I did. But it was quite apparent that he was still running it and wanted to run it. And it was not a challenge for me. It didn't work out and he finally said: "Well, you better get back into the Foreign Service."

So I came back to Washington and saw Livy Merchant. I bought back my retirement that I had collected on, so I wouldn't have a break in service. Then Walt Butterworth said to me: "Well, you and Elena are married now. I know just the place for you two. We're setting up a bunch of

listening posts around China. And there's one up in northern Thailand, called Chieng Mai. That'll be just the place for you. And you can open the first American consulate."

And so I did. Elena and I went there and it was the happiest time I could have imagined. The ambassador there was Ed Stanton. Edwin and Josie Stanton were a wonderful couple. I learned about as much from them, on how this Foreign Service really should work, as from anybody--the Butterworths and the Stantons and Johnny Jones and a few others.

But opening the first American consulate up there was quite a trick because, you know, it was up in the jungles and no official presence ever. And that was quite a thrill. And you were on your own.

Q: How much of a city is Chieng Mai, or was it then?

ANDERSON: It was the royal capital of the north. As far as the city's concerned, well, it was a very backward town. It had the Bombay-Burma Company, Borneo Company--huge teak operations, so there were a few Brits up there, but it wasn't a city in any sense of the word. We leased the palace of the former ruler of Chieng Mai, which is very, very nice and with a beautiful garden. Incidentally, I had one American helper, a male clerk. Between us, we did everything; we did the coding, I was my own USIS officer. My wife and I went out into the jungles with a projector. I had to learn how to do that and operate a generator. We showed movies to people out in the countryside. And it was just great. Today, they have three or four USIS people, AID people, and all sorts of others. I don't know what the hell they all are doing up there, frankly.

Q: What did you do for language?

ANDERSON: It was English.

Q: English was generally spoken?

ANDERSON: In Thailand, yes. It's amusing, but it shows the stupidity of the administrative world at the State Department, in my view--I got my only official reprimand in my career when I was in Chieng Mai. I did not appreciate it, to put it mildly. The embassy, before I ever heard of Chieng Mai, had gone into the State Department, and they estimated that \$2,500 would be needed to furnish the residence of the new consulate. And so I arrived in Bangkok and the ambassador and the administrative officer said, "Here's \$2,500 for you to furnish the new consulate."

I then went home and I said to my dear wife, Elena: "Dear, here is \$2,500 for you to furnish the consulate," because she was going to buy and choose. She ultimately had the most beautiful teak furniture you've ever seen specially made. And I said: "Now, don't spend over \$2,500 or I'm in trouble. If you can save some money, do it."

Well, she saved \$800, so we only spent \$1,700 instead of \$2,500. I got an official reprimand for that because the \$2,500 had not been spent. I had seldom been angrier. Ambassador Stanton went

back with the biggest rocket that you've ever seen. I just thought this ought to be noted for posterity's sake. [Laughter]

I was up there in Chiang Mai for about six or seven months. Ambassador Stanton and his wife, they loved it up there and kept coming up to visit us, not just to open the consulate, but to work with us in the area. He followed everything I was doing, finally said: "Look, you've had enough of a vacation." [Laughter] "I need you. I want you down there. Josie and I love Elena, and we want you to come down and come into the political section."

And I said: "Yes, Sir." I guess that's another thing. You do a fairly good job and then another thing happens. And I ended up in the political section with Norm Hannan and Rolland Bushner and Bill Turner was the deputy, whom I'll talk about a little bit later, and later knew in Bombay, India.

And I was down and spent a year and a half in Bangkok--left in December, 1950. Our first daughter was born in early December, in Rome, and I returned just in time. I had a wonderful time in Bangkok, learning for the first time how to be a line officer in a political section.

Ambassador Stanton was so perfect in guiding us. There were three major political figures and three political officers. We each took one. I was the junior one and so I was assigned the toughest, the one most unlikely to succeed. But he did! He became Prime Minister.

Q: It's always fascinating.

ANDERSON: We all worked together so well, thanks to the leadership of Stanton. There was a successful coup; they captured the prime minister, Phibun Songgram. We were at a ceremony for a barge we were giving to them. Bill Turner, the chargé d'affaires, was on the barge. I'll never forget it.

We were standing in the middle of a bridge and Mrs. Turner, who was deaf, was there near us. And all of a sudden, Siamese Marines started popping up from under the bridge, I don't know where they came from. Poor Mrs. Turner, they had fired a few shots in the air, but she couldn't hear anything.

So I picked up the chargé's wife and just tucked her under my arm. And I patted her head and I said: "Now don't worry, Mrs. Turner. Come on, off we go," and got her the hell out of there before we were going to have anything happen to us. [Laughter] And from then on, the Turners and the Andersons were very, very close friends.

One other item, regarding my stay in Bangkok, that I do want to put on the record here, was our very great concern over some of the CIA activities in Thailand. That organization was still pretty new, let's remember, and the people they had out there were very indiscreet. I felt so strongly that I made a very detailed report, backed up with nothing but facts, of all the breaches of security that they made; talking in bars, etc., about things they were doing. Many of them talked too much, and I felt that this had to be brought under control. So I did this report, and it went to

Ambassador Stanton. He was disturbed by it, but it was sent in. I must say, the Agency was very, very unhappy with me. But on balance, I think it was something that had to be done because they not only cleaned up their act there, but I think it probably made them more conscious eventually to be more careful elsewhere around the world. And when I get to the Paris days, later on, there's a story there I want to talk about, also.

I left Bangkok in late 1950 for Washington and work on the Southeast Asia desk. The reason for that, incidentally, was because dear Phil Bonsal, was the Office Director for Southeast Asian Affairs. He had come to Bangkok when I was there and we became very good friends.

Unfortunately, that was a very bad period. Because of financial considerations, the Department was having one of its periodic reduction in force, freeze hirings, and what have you. And for a while there it was touch and go if I was even going to get another assignment, which disappointed me somewhat after the job I'd done in China and Chieng Mai and Bangkok; I thought I'd started off a fairly respectable career.

But finally, a very good friend of mine found an opening in New Delhi, India, and I was sent out in 1953 and had a wonderful assignment there. It was absolutely fascinating, in the political section. George Allen was one of the more imaginative ambassadors I've ever met. He made me his special assistant. I also was told to cover internal politics, to serve as the acting labor attaché for my two years there (because a very colorful gentleman, named Henri Sokolove, became ill, and had to leave, the AFL and CIO couldn't agree with the State Department on who could come out as the labor attaché until just before I left).

So I had three jobs, all of which were absolutely fascinating because India was still a very new country. As you know, it's a country that has many different languages. The linguistic-states problem, under Nehru, was a very difficult question. How Nehru managed that, I will never know, but he did and he was able to form a single nation out of such disparate groups. And I had to try to cover all of that.

And incidentally--and this is an historical fact of interest--while I was there, the first communist government that ever came into power through a democratic election was elected in the state of Kerala, in south India. But I don't need to say any more about that. I can assure you there's plenty of reporting on that one, if anybody wants to read it.

Q: Did you see Nehru some?

ANDERSON: Yes. George Allen was thoughtful. He had me with him on every single thing that you could imagine. He introduced me to Nehru, I went with him a couple of times on his calls. Nehru was a fascinating human being and very calm, unassuming, quiet, but with a mind like a steel trap. He and George Allen got along absolutely beautifully.

Q: Nehru and George Allen?

ANDERSON: Yes. And then John Sherman Cooper came out as ambassador three months before I was due to leave. He told me that I was not to leave until July 5, 1955. My wife and the children had left in March and I was anxious to join them. But he said: "Look, we don't know anybody. We have this July Fourth reception and you're about the only one left that knows anybody," which was true. So I stayed through that and we became very, very close friends as a result of that and saw each other through the years, after he joined the Senate.

Q: Was he a pretty good ambassador? Of course, he didn't stay in India very long. I knew him later, as a senator, of course. He was a great guy.

ANDERSON: Yes. He did not stay there very long and there's a little story about that I want to tell you. I can't say that he stayed there long enough to make any particular mark on United States interests with India; I can't recall any. I was back in Washington as the Ceylon/Nepal Desk Officer and the assistant India Desk Officer, after I left India.

We might jump to that right now, because it involves John Sherman Cooper. He came back shortly after I arrived in '55, and he asked if he could talk with me alone. We went into his office and shut the door and he said: "Bob, I have a difficult problem. I don't know what to do." "President Eisenhower wants me to run for the Senate from Kentucky. But I haven't been in India long enough. What's this going to do to our relations, and what's Nehru going to think of me and think of us, with my leaving so soon? I don't really know what I should tell the president. I really don't know what to do."

And I said: "Mr. Ambassador, if you don't want to run for the Senate, that's one thing. If your concern is about what Mr. Nehru is going to think, I don't think you should be worried about that, because Nehru is very much of a politician, and he knows that if the President of the United States asks you to take on a political assignment, such as being one of 48 senators, he's going to understand that. I don't think that you need to worry about that aspect at all. Plus the fact you haven't been there a year yet, almost. You go back, it'll be another six months before anything really happens; you know that. Then you'll have time to campaign. And I really think that you've got to make up your mind on what the president has asked you to do. And if you want to be a senator, I think you ought to do what the president wants you to do."

And he put his arm around me, thanked me and walked out. He went back, saw Nehru, and eventually came back, to become a senator.

Q: That's fascinating.

ANDERSON: He asked for my thoughts, and that is why we became very, very close. There are so many fascinating things that happened when I was back in the State Department, from '55 to '59. There's no point in talking about many of them, but one event that changed the traditional way of handling ambassadorial appointees happened, when I was the Ceylon desk officer.

There was a gentleman named Maxwell H. Gluck, whom Jack Javits had persuaded Eisenhower to name as Ambassador to Ceylon. He owned a clothing store chain called the Darling Stores. He

also had one of the largest racehorse establishments in America, the Elmendorf Farm in Kentucky. In those days, an outsider, as you will remember, could not come to the Department and receive any briefing whatsoever until he was confirmed by the Senate. He went before the Senate--Fulbright was the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee--and he was asked the name of the prime minister, and became flustered. By the way, nobody from the State Department was ever up there, to help these guys; they were on their own.

Q: Fascinating. We did it, of course, totally differently.

ANDERSON: He became very flustered, and told the Committee: "I don't know." And the press and Fulbright jumped on it, and that was it; the fat was in the fire. Now, the prime minister's name happens to be Solomon West Ridgway Díaz Bandaranaike. Well, you know, you either know that or you don't. He said "I knew his last name, but," he said, "I was afraid that if I didn't say it all, or that if I made a mistake I would be insulting the prime minister that I was going to have to deal with."

Now, for a fellow who ran a lingerie department store chain to think like that, I thought was pretty damn good. And I thought the press and Fulbright were very unfair to him. But there it was. And John Foster Dulles, to put it mildly, was very disturbed. Butts Macomber and Rod O'Connor, who were the Secretary's two special assistants, and also happened to be classmates of mine at Yale, saw me and asked: "What the hell is going on here? Should this guy go to Ceylon?"

I said: "I don't know. I'll tell you later, I first have to meet him" My wife and I spent one month with Mr. and Mrs. Gluck, arranging briefings, day and night, on Buddhism, on cultural life, on political and economic conditions and the history of the area. Nobody has ever had briefings like that fellow.

And at the end of the month, I was summoned by Bill Rountree and George Allen (George was the assistant secretary and Bill was his deputy). Bill Macomber and Rod O'Connor came down from the Secretary's office. They said to me: "Well, should he go?"

And I said: "Well, first of all, he has to go. You can't, six weeks later, suddenly say no. He's been confirmed by the Senate and everything else now. Secondly, just to give you some peace of mind, he's not going to be a disaster; he can go. And we've probably had others who were worse than this guy. He'll be fine and he's a very decent person." The conclusion to this is very important. That was the last time in our history that an outside political appointee ever went up to the Hill without a State Department briefing. It was that case that did it. And I made that recommendation to Dulles, because Macomber took me up to Dulles afterwards and I said: "Mr. Secretary, I think, this business of you and others not seeing these people before they are confirmed, because of our fear of treading on the toes of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is wrong. We have to do it." And so that is a little historical vignette.

Q: Well, you just finished talking about the famous Gluck case, which, of course, the whole world heard the opening of, but very few people heard what a success he made of himself.

ANDERSON: Ambassador Gluck did a passable job out in Ceylon. He didn't drop any major balls and the Ceylonese liked him. They had a couple of flood catastrophes, and he was flying around dropping bags of flour. It was fine. And above all, he cared and he tried to do a good job.

I was in this job, in the South Asian office, for a couple of years. Then in '57, Bill Macomber, who was John Foster Dulles' special assistant got hold of me. And he said: "Look, the Public Affairs Bureau has a disaster on its hands. They have an office there, which is the public correspondence office. The Secretary's letters aren't getting answered. And the Secretary is receiving increasing criticism." Andy Berding, who was the assistant secretary and very close to me later on, was so busy being the Secretary's press chief that he had to rely on his staff to run the Bureau and needed a new staff assistant. Bill and Andy asked me if I would reorganize the bureau, which at that time, incidentally, had the cultural affairs. Al Lightner was one of Andy's deputies, and Burt Wilkinson was the other deputy on the domestic side.

And so I went over there and did reorganize the bureau, particularly with regard to the handling of correspondence that came to the Secretary of State, either from Congress or from the public. Everything was under control; we managed not to lose letters; we answered letters on time; we coordinated with the different bureaus to make sure that the substance was correct.

Q: Record keeping, probably, was a part of it?

ANDERSON: Yes. Record keeping. It was an enormous operation. We didn't have a lot of these modern tools they have now in the State Department. That was a wonderful challenge, which I enjoyed very much--working with Andy Berding--because that led me into the press business for the first time. Linc White was the spokesman. Joe Read was his deputy. And Bob McCloskey was hired as a magazine officer. I came to know them well. It was a challenge which I enjoyed.

There's one Foreign Service case that came up while I was there, that I fought for because I felt very strongly about it; and fortunately it came out the right way. It involved Charles Whitehouse, who was back as Doug Dillon's Special Assistant. He had applied to enter the Foreign Service laterally. He'd been in the Central Intelligence Agency at one point, served with very great distinction in some foreign posts, including Africa, as well as Belgium. And there was an effort by the establishment not to take him in, which I did not appreciate. And part of it had to do with his family background; the fact that he was-

Q: A little too much "Newport?" [Laughter]

ANDERSON: A little too much "Newport," a lot too much money. Why should this guy get in? I didn't like that attitude, and the fact he was working with Doug Dillon was even held against him. But this fellow had shown his mettle. So Bill Macomber and I and a couple of others went after this.

I told people, I said: "I'm going to blow the whistle on this if this fellow isn't let in. Unless you have some legitimate reason that in his past career with the Agency or someplace else he wasn't able to perform well, which I am unaware of, he should be accepted." He became a Foreign

Service Officer, and has been one of the more distinguished members of our service. I think you'd agree with that. He's done a hell of a job. He did an outstanding job in Vietnam and he's taken on some of the toughest assignments we have; he hasn't been in the cushy ones.

Q: Including the American Foreign Service Association. [Laughter]

ANDERSON: Yes, he was president of it, wasn't he, for a while?

Q: Yes, and during a difficult--

ANDERSON: And during a very difficult period. So that was something that I did enjoy doing while I was there.

Then it came time for me, finally, to go abroad again. And William L. Blue--dear Bill Blue, with whom I served in India, was in personnel at the time--this was in '59, when it came time for me to go out--and I decided that I really ought to learn a foreign language, preferably French. And so we figured that I'd spent ten or eleven years out in the Far East, and I was gradually moving westward, but not fast enough. And so my dear wife said: "Look, let's go to France where you can learn the language."

Phil Crowe, whom I mentioned earlier, was back in Washington, and it was time for him to get another embassy, because of the change of administration. And so South Africa came up, and he wanted me to go there as his political counselor. It would have been a great promotion and all that, but I preferred not to go. And so whom did I get to take my place? Charlie Whitehouse. And Charlie loved it. He and Phil got along well and it was a great assignment for him.

So Bill Blue found two assignments in Paris. They weren't in the embassy, they were with international organizations. And I said: "No thanks." And he looked at me as if I were half mad. I said: "If you have an opening in one of the consulates, anyplace, that is where I'd like to go, because I would like to learn to speak French and I don't want to be in Paris with 55,000 Americans. I want to be out in the provinces, where I can really come to know France and try to learn the language."

An opening came in Bordeaux and that's where I went. That really changed my whole career. They, frankly, were the two happiest years of my career, in a way. I can say happiest, because I didn't have any earthshaking responsibilities in those two delightful years to try and not only learn the French language and the countryside, but to appreciate the finest wine in the world.

I became very, very close friends with Jacques Chaban-Delmas, still mayor of Bordeaux today, and Prime Minister when I went back years later under Sarge Shriver, which I'll get to when we next meet. Chaban put up with my inability to speak French when I first got there. But after six months, I then gave my first speech in French. I'd had a tutor and worked every day and was determined to learn it and did, finally, which was a tremendous thing for me to focus on. I enjoyed it very much.

*Q: You had had, presumably, the standard no-speaking education [in a foreign language]?
[Laughter]*

ANDERSON: Yes, I took all the French they had to offer at Yale, and the result of that was you couldn't speak French when you finished it, because you don't learn a language through your eyes, you learn it through your ears; and that's the only way to do it.

Bordeaux was a tremendous experience for me because I learned about France. The people who go to Paris, and stay there for four to five years, don't know anything about France, really. Paris is so different. I had told them in Washington, Bill Blue and others, "If I do well in Bordeaux, and if I learn the language, I would then like to have a crack at Paris, if an opening comes."

Well, an opening came. I spent two years in Bordeaux and then went to Paris in April, 1961 for two exciting years.

Q: Just to clear that up, what did you actually do in Bordeaux?

ANDERSON: As the number-two man in the Consulate General, I was assigned as the political/economic officer. It was a small post of four officers. We had more than enough to do, I can assure you.

I was next assigned as a commercial officer in Paris, working for a very remarkable economic minister in the beginning. He was Jacques Reinstein, a hard taskmaster, but so bright and stimulating.

This was a very active period in the formation of the European community, of its common agricultural policy, of its common commercial policy. We also had our bilateral problems with the French in trade, quotas, you name it.

Right after I arrived, President Kennedy came over for his state visit to General de Gaulle. Jim Gavin was our ambassador. I was assigned to his visit as they needed somebody who spoke French. I was camped out at the Quai d'Orsay in the President's quarters, to take care of anything that came up. My wife, bilingual in French, was assigned to Jackie Kennedy, to do anything she could to be helpful.

Ambassador Gavin saw me during the President's visit and followed a couple of problems I had to deal with. He decided to change his special assistant and decided on me. Jack Reinstein successfully blocked the transfer. When the next special assistant didn't work out, General Gavin went to Cecil Lyon, his deputy, and said: "I'm going back to Jacques Reinstein. And I want Bob Anderson down in this office by December 1." He went to Jacques and said: "That's the end of it; there's no more discussion. Bob is going to move and work in my office."

And Cecil told me, he said: "You've got to save the name of the Service. Two of our members have fallen. You must go and do the job." And he couldn't have been nicer. Basically, what General Gavin wanted was a chief of staff. Well, that is the Minister's job.

It was a very delicate job in terms of my relations with Cecil, whom I liked and respected and with Randy Kidder, the political counselor, with whom I've been so close ever since. They were very senior; I was very junior. They all were 100% behind me and I was able to do the job to satisfy General Gavin.

Here again that shows that if you are given a challenge and can cut the mustard, as we say, you will be given new challenges and move up the ladder.

General Gavin was one of the most amazing men I have ever met. He had mixed reviews as Ambassador to France. A lot of the things that the press wrote were superficial, unfounded and unjust--they didn't really know what they were talking about. He had the respect of the intellectual community and the scientific community, for example, like no one I have ever met.

Q: What was his background in the military originally? Was he an engineering officer?

ANDERSON: He was a tremendous airborne combat officer, with his last job as head of research and development in the Pentagon. He broke with Eisenhower because he felt that the Administration was not giving enough attention to research and development. He retired and made President of Arthur D. Little and Company. Two months later, Kennedy asked him to go to Paris. The board let him go for 18 months or something like that, and said: "If you don't come back then, that's it," which is why he had to leave; because he had five daughters and needed the A.D. Little income.

One example of his imagination, he called me into his office one day and said: "Bob, I've just been reading some things about the laser beam. You know, we ought to think more about this, all of us. You know, I can envisage that one day the medical profession may be able to use this to save our eyes and the brain." This is unbelievable; we didn't know much about the laser then, mind you; this was 1962. And this man saw this back then.

As far as the Foreign Service was concerned, he considered one of our biggest weaknesses to be our lack of training. He said: "In the military," he said, "people are able to earn advanced degrees because, you know, we're a war-fighting machine, and so when we're not at war these people can spend maybe a third of their career or so in training. You poor people don't have this leeway, because the Foreign Service is always at war, basically, the war of diplomacy."

One other item concerning Paris and the CIA. This is something they do occasionally, and I was up in arms about it. Some of us may have an excellent source, and then without telling us, the Agency will try to recruit the source.

Q: On an exclusive basis?

ANDERSON: Yes, and pay him.

Q: And pay him, sure.

ANDERSON: I think that is the dumbest policy imaginable, and have made myself very clear on a number of occasions, to the Agency. What it did once in my career was to jeopardize an invaluable source, who had been close to us for years. We almost lost him because he felt insulted. The source happened to be a friend of mine of over 20 years. One did not need to pay this source.

Q: Bob McBride had the same observation from being there a little earlier.

ANDERSON: It was an insult to an outstanding gentleman.

Q: Yes.

ANDERSON: Well, Bob and I worked on some of the same things, as you can imagine. He was the DCM when I was director of Western Europe--your old job.

I received word to go back and work with George Ball, as one of his two Special Assistant, replacing Art Hartman. I came back in the summer of '63 and was with him for two years.

It was an unbelievable experience working with this man. I'm not sure that there has ever been such a harmonious and productive relationship between a Secretary of State and an Under Secretary than there was between Dean Rusk and George Ball. I was with them many evenings working till nine or ten at night, so I had a good chance to see them operating together.

Q: Well, Rusk never quit till ten; that was a standard day for him. [Laughter]

ANDERSON: The two of them were just wonderful together. There was no back-biting, they had confidence in each other, they complemented each other in so many different ways. Thanks to working with George, I came to know Dean Rusk well then, and later on, when I went down into the European Bureau. He was a remarkable human being, as far as I'm concerned.

Q: Yes. I saw a great deal of him, of course, during that same period or a little later.

ANDERSON: There are so many different things when I was working with George Ball that came up. I assume that virtually everything he did is already on record. But there are a couple of little things of possible interest that may not have been recorded.

One of them is the day that John Kennedy was shot in Texas. It happened around lunchtime, and I was there in the office, having a sandwich. George was Acting Secretary and involved in a luncheon outside the Department. His secretary, Helen Hanainy, returned after a quick lunch and ran into my office to say: "I just heard the President was shot."

I said: "What? What are you talking about?" We turned on the radio and, yes, he had. And so we reached George Ball as quickly as possible, and he began to take over as the overall coordinator insofar as the foreign nations were concerned.

Q: Such as delegations to the funeral?

ANDERSON: The first thing that had to be done--and here history was changed in a way--was to get hold of the Secretary of State. I was told to do this. I was the one who told the Secretary that John Kennedy was shot. And how did I get him? I reached him on a lane over the Pacific with four other members of the Cabinet who were on their way to Japan. I said: George says it might be a good idea to have that plane reverse course and return as fast as possible." The Secretary said: "Aye, aye." That was that. The only point I want to make is, that that was the last time in history that a large number of Cabinet members were allowed to travel together.

Moving on from this tragedy, I did see Harold Wilson with George, right after he was elected Prime Minister. We were in London at the time, and George was the first official American to talk with him. As I recall, it was a three-hour meeting, with four of us--Harold Wilson, his private secretary, George Ball and me. I took the notes on that one, dictated them to two or three secretaries and had it sent back to the President and the Secretary within a matter of hours. That's all on the record. We obtained a very good picture of what Wilson had in mind and because he was a very good friend of George he was unusually forthcoming to him.

Remember the MLF, the Multilateral Force issue?

Q: Yes.

ANDERSON: That was a tremendous struggle when I was with George, between Mac Bundy and George; Mac was totally against it. We were going over to Europe and Mac found out about our trip. So he sent Richard Neustadt over two days before we left to visit the same capitals and see the same people we would be seeing. The purpose was basically, to scuttle our trip.

We found out about Neustadt's tips, and sent out a telegram, drafted by George Ball himself, to our embassies, pointing out that: "Richard Neustadt is coming. He has no power to negotiate anything. He is there to listen and that is it." It was an example of quite a struggle that occasionally went on between those two strong personalities.

The MLF never was created. This was a mistake. I think it should have been born and could have been quite helpful.

When I left George in the summer of 1965, I went to the European Bureau, where John Leddy was Assistant Secretary. I was Acting Director for Western Europe for the first year. When they reorganized the Bureau, I became the Country Director for France and the Benelux for two years. In the summer of '68, I went back to Paris.

A rather momentous event happened at the time in which our Bureau was deeply involved. It was the withdrawal of France from the integrated military structure, the Atlantic Alliance. We faced many challenges working with the Hill to make sure the Hill wouldn't completely destroy our relations with France, which we all felt had to be maintained somehow in the face of de Gaulle's onslaught.

Dean Acheson came in as a Special Assistant to the Secretary, you may remember. And young Larry Eagleburger was assigned as Dean Acheson's Staff Assistant by Ball's office. An excellent choice. Acheson's mission was to focus on: "All right, de Gaulle has done this, now what do we do?" George Ball was the point man on this whole subject.

Q: Ball left in what, late '65, early '66?

ANDERSON: No, he stayed on most of the time when I was in the European Bureau.

Q: Well, Nick Katzenbach was there for about the last year or so of the administration.

ANDERSON: Yes.

Q: Or a year and a half.

ANDERSON: Yes, that's right. And Larry moved in as Nick's Special Assistant. He took my old job with Nick Katzenbach, as a matter of fact.

Q: Meanwhile, you had Chip Bohlen in Paris all this time?

ANDERSON: Yes. I should have mentioned, earlier that I worked for Chip Bohlen in Paris.

Q: Well, I thought you probably overlapped with him.

ANDERSON: Yes, and very much so. I was with him for--October '82 until the summer of '83, when I came back. And I should have mentioned that because our two families couldn't have been closer. When he first came, I was there as Special Assistant. Chip didn't know whether he wanted one, and he didn't know me from Adam. Cecil Lyon stayed on as DCM, and told him: "Look. Use Bob. He'll be fine. You'll like him.

One thing I had to do for General Gavin, was to draft his telegrams of meetings with de Gaulle, Couve de Murville, and others. He would come back, and then unload. In order to have his reports treated in the State Department and elsewhere in Washington, in a logical manner and effective manner, I arranged them subject by subject. It wouldn't, for example, be one telegram of a meeting with de Gaulle on umty-ump subjects.

Q: Separate telegrams?

ANDERSON: Separate telegrams, which Washington liked. So the question was how was this going to be done with Chip Bohlen. You know, he always dictated his own telegrams. He said at the beginning: "I'm not going to have anybody else do that for me." His drafting was not, frankly, the tightest and cleanest in the world. He was a marvelous conceptual thinker, but tended to wander off on occasion. [Laughter] Eventually, he had me mark over his telegrams. He'd dictate

a draft of a meeting, I would separate out the subjects, edit his handiwork. It worked out well. He loved it. The Department liked it.

One little sidelight, with Chip Bohlen, which--I don't know whether it's part of history. He loved to gamble. Maybe this was well known.

Q: I knew it. He and Tommy always had these high stakes poker games running, which I never played in and wouldn't have thought of playing in. [Laughter]

ANDERSON: In France, of course, Chip had to make his calls on various notables. He couldn't wait to go down to the Midi, to make his official visits. And he always took Avis, his wife, and Elena, my wife, and me with him. The next visit was to Nice and Cannes. While there we went to the casino in Cannes. Avis, his wife, was concerned about this, because she was always concerned about the household budget. She refused to go with him to the casino, but she said to me: "All right, Bob, stay with him and make sure he doesn't over spend."

Off we went to Chemin de Fer. He did pretty well and loved it. I did get him to agree to one thing. I said: "It'll make life a lot easier for both of us, Mr. Ambassador, to lessen the pressure from Mrs. Bohlen. Now, you won this amount of money. Will you please give it to me?"

"Why do you want it?"

"Because I'm going to put it in the safe at the embassy and this is going to be your gambling account. When we go out again to gamble, you can use this money without drawing on the household budget. If you keep winning, Mrs. Bohlen won't be so disturbed. So we established "the Bohlen gambling fund," very discreetly. [Laughter] I'm very sorry I forgot about Chip Bohlen. You must prompt me.

Q: You're doing great. You don't need much prompting. Well, we're still, I guess, back as country director.

ANDERSON: Yes. There are two stories I have thought about during that period. One has to do with de Gaulle's withdrawal from the military structure of NATO. You remember the Harmel Plan?

Q: Vaguely.

ANDERSON: Pierre Harmel was the Belgian Foreign Minister. And Stevie Davignon was his Cabinet Director. Harmel had been in the States, and was trying to develop a plan whereby the 14 allies (minus France) could have a doctrine to operate in light of the acts France had taken. We had some thoughts to contribute to the Foreign Minister. He was taking the boat back to Europe to draft the doctrine later known as the Harmel Plan.

Our Assistant Secretary, John Leddy asked me to pass on our thoughts to Harmel in New York before he left for Europe. He was staying at the Pierre Hotel. John didn't give me much notice to

get up there, as usual. When I arrived at the Pierre. Harmel and Davignon had just left to catch the ship.

So I flagged a cab, reached the ship just as fast as I could, got on board, found them, and said: "John Leddy has these thoughts."

The Foreign Minister said: "Well, come on. We'll go up in the bar where we can go over them." When the time came for all visitors ashore, we held the ship, in order to give the Belgian Foreign Minister the United States' views on his plan. I can't remember what the specific points were, but they were important and were included in the plan.

Q: The business of consultation is what you don't hear all that much about in the newspapers.

ANDERSON: That's right. And they were delighted to receive what we had to say.

Now with your forbearance, I'd like to stop after this because it'll take a little bit of time. This is a trip to Europe I made with Hubert Humphrey, when he was Vice President. It was March 27 to April 10, 1967.

He'd been asked by the President to go over and focus on two major subjects: one was on the Kennedy Round, which was really in trouble then, and on the Non-Proliferation Treaty, where we weren't at all sure how many backers we were going to get. The trip took us to Geneva, where Mike Blumenthal was our negotiator for the Kennedy Round, and then to Italy, Belgium, Holland, France, London, maybe one or two other places.

I was asked by John Leddy, four days before the trip, to go with the vice president and help prepare the trip. Unfortunately, Hubert's office was probably about the worst organized office in Washington. He's one of the brightest men I think I've ever met, really and truly; he's absolutely superb.

Q: And the nicest, isn't he?

ANDERSON: Yes. And his wife was so gracious and thoughtful. Ted Van Dyke, who is also bright, was his foreign affairs fellow. He and I got along like a house afire. They couldn't organize themselves. So I was sent over to see the Vice President, who'd never seen me before, and his staff. We managed to pull together all the briefing papers. John Leddy told his Bureau: "Turn yourselves inside out. We're going to get this thing done right." And we prepared a wonderful briefing book. Excellent oral briefings were given to the Vice President, two or three days before he left.

The trip was a very successful one from his point of view. And I think that Ted and I contributed to it, somewhat, by making sure that every single day a telegram was sent from Hubert Humphrey to the President of the United States on what went on. We held very systematic briefings for the press, which had never been done before. Some press people came on the plane

with us. Before we'd go into each capital, we would brief them on the plane. I had to do much of this. It's the first time I ever really started to deal with the press.

Q: Is this how you got your experience for your later experience?

ANDERSON: Yes, I guess so. But in Rome--and you can understand this--Hubert was tied up in a meeting with the President of Italy, and he was supposed to give a press conference. The press was there waiting; they waited 15 minutes, a half hour, one hour--no Humphrey. With their deadlines coming up, they were becoming very, very unhappy. I rushed from the meeting to brief the press. They seemed satisfied, and rushed off to file their stories.

Frank Meloy, God love him, who was our minister in Rome at that time, wrote an unbelievable letter back here to somebody about my impromptu briefing of the press. Frank, you may remember, was murdered in Beirut where he was serving as our Ambassador.

Q: Well, you had just finished your press conference in Rome, with the Humphrey trip. Do you want to pick up from there?

ANDERSON: Yes. The next morning before we took off for Florence and then on to see Foreign Minister Luns in The Hague, Ted Van Dyke came running into my bedroom and said: "The Vice President wants to see you immediately."

I said to myself: "Oh, God, what now?"

He said: "Down there."

I said: "Well, come on with me."

He said: "No, no, no. I'm not coming. There's a problem."

I said: "You're his man."

Ted replied: "No, he wants to see you."

I walked into the bedroom, and Mrs. Humphrey was there, and she said: "Good morning, Bob." I thought I'd done something; I didn't know what was going on. Well, "The Vice President's in there. He wants to see you." "There" was in the bathroom! [Laughter]

Q: Sounds like Lyndon Johnson. [Laughter]

ANDERSON: I walked in, and there was the Vice President of the United States, stark naked, standing in front of the mirror, shaving, and fuming! And I said: "Good morning, Mr. Vice President."

"Good morning, Bob." And he said: "I want you to get rid of that guy."

I asked: "Whom are you talking about?"

"That State Department guy. He was criticizing me and telling everybody last night, over drinks, that I'm a fool."

I said: "What?" And I found out that it was a State Department officer, and that in fact, he had been critical. He was just too young and immature.

Q: This was somebody in the embassy?

ANDERSON: No, he came with us from Washington to handle communications and telegrams. So I talked to this fellow, who was very remorseful. But I said: "There's no question. You're leaving." And I had to get somebody else flown out from Washington. I called Ben Read, who was the Executive Secretary of the Department, to find a replacement.

When I told the Vice President, he said: "I never want to see him again."

I said: "Yes, Mr. Vice President, I will get somebody else from Washington, but until he gets here, this gentleman's services are absolutely necessary, or else you're not going to get have telegrams in or out, or anything; his presence is very necessary."

"I never want to see him again."

"You won't see him, I promise you." So I kept him out of sight until we had the new person on board. [Laughter]

His meeting in The Hague, with Foreign Minister Luns, was a remarkable performance, I thought, if you want to talk about the power of persuasion of Hubert Humphrey. Luns had been Foreign Minister, for many years. I guess Genscher, the German Foreign Minister, has now broken his record, but up until that time, Luns was the longest serving Foreign Minister since World War II. Luns and his people were on one side of the table; the Vice President and his staff on the other side. The Vice President started talking about the highly sexy subjects of the Kennedy Round and the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It's pretty difficult to stir emotions on those subjects, I think. He had Luns with tears coming out of his eyes before the end of that meeting, as well as gaining the Dutch vote for the NPT. I have never seen such a performance. He was absolutely superb.

The end of the Humphrey story and this trip is rather interesting. We were supposed to get back on April 9, 1967, which was a Sunday. Suddenly the word came from the President: "Delay your return until Monday, because I want to have a formal welcoming ceremony on the south lawn of the White House for you. We're going to helicopter you in. After the ceremony, I'm going to have a Cabinet meeting to hear you report on your trip."

Hubert nearly died. That reminds me of a story I neglected to tell you earlier. At The Hague, at a lunch with our Ambassador, Bill Tyler, the top Dutch people were there, Hubert launched into one of his favorite subjects-- coat of arms of the Vice President. He described the President's coat of arms with it arrows and compared it go his which has only one. Hubert then stood up gesticulated and waving his imaginary arrow said: "But with this one arrow I can take care of him

or anybody else. You don't have to worry. I can protect myself." [Laughter] He had the entire Dutch Government in stitches.

To return to the trip home--we had an extra day; it was a Sunday. This was the end of the trip, and we were exhausted, I can tell you. But when we received this news, I suggested we have the Vice President's written report of his whole trip before landing in Washington, so that he could present it at the Cabinet meeting. Ted Van Dyke and I were in our respective bedrooms, lying down and totally exhausted. We had batteries of secretaries coming into our rooms and dictated the various pieces of it, and then shifting it to his room and my room and back and forth. We completed the final draft of the report of the Vice President's trip to Europe, with the background, summary of meetings, and specific recommendations for Presidential action. There were 23 of them.

At one point I said to Ted: "Somehow we must have the report in a presentable form to give to the President." So we scrounged on the airplane going back. We cut out gold lettering, and did all sorts of things to come up with a beautiful binder done for the report.

We landed, helicoptered to the south lawn and began the Cabinet meeting with the President on one side of the table, Humphrey on the other with Ted behind him. I passed the finished report to the Vice President, slipping it to him under the table.

The Vice President he started off, stood up, pulled out this report, and presented it to the President saying: "Mr. President, here is the final report of my trip to Europe, with specific recommendations for your action." The President was speechless and very pleased.

The President looked around at his Cabinet: "You see what a Vice President we've got here." Without looking he added: "I want all these recommendations implemented right away." [Laughter]

It made Hubert look like a winner. On previous trips abroad, written reports were never done. But this time he had his first written report, and was able to present it to the President an hour after we touched down. As a result of this experience, he and I became very close. He called for me from time to time to do little chores for him and I tried to help him out. He was an absolutely wonderful human being. I wish, frankly, he had been President of the United States. But that's another question.

Q: History would have been quite different.

ANDERSON: Yes. Now the only other thing I'd like to mention just now for a minute is the student riots in France in May, '68. It's the only time I ever had a difference of view with Chip Bohlen. I was the Country Director for France/Benelux, and the point man on that whole subject as far as the European Bureau was concerned.

When de Gaulle left the Elysée nobody knew where he was going. The President was in Texas. Dean Rusk was home under the weather--I think it was the only time he was not in the State

Department in eight years. Nick Katzenbach, the Under Secretary, was in Texas with the President. The president was going to have a press conference. Larry Eagleburger and I were in my old office, in Katzenbach's Suite, where I used to be with George Ball. Larry was Nick's Special Assistant. We did up the press guidance for the President to use in Texas, and phoned it down to Nick, and the President subsequently used it.

I can't remember where Chip was, and whether he was back as Under Secretary for political affairs or whether he was still in Paris.

Q: He was in Paris until sometime in '68, but I don't know--

ANDERSON: Yes. Then Shriver--

Q: I guess, yes, February, '68 he left Paris.

ANDERSON: Okay. Well, then he was back in Washington. I talked with him about de Gaulle's mysterious departure from Paris. Chip said he felt that de Gaulle had given up, and would resign. That's the only time I ever took issue with him. I said: "That does not sound like General de Gaulle; he just wouldn't do that. He's up to something. He'll be back. Something's going to happen."

Q: You know, I've forgotten this entirely.

ANDERSON: Well, he went to see General Massu, who was the Commander of the French forces in Germany. What he wanted to do was to make sure that Massu was going to stand behind him; because you remember, at the time of Algeria Massu was not exactly a de Gaulle supporter. So that's what he was up to. That was the one time Chip and I didn't agree on something, and I happened to be right on that particular one.

I don't know why Chip felt that, because that was so unlike de Gaulle, you know, to just quit and go off to Colombé les Deux Eglises.

[End of March 12, 1990 interview. Beginning of interview on March 26, 1990.]

Q: Ambassador Anderson, we're glad to continue your interview. When we left off, you had just, I think, finished your assignment in Washington as--or towards the end of your assignment in Washington--as Country Director for France/Benelux. Do you want to pick up there, or would you like to go back and fill in some things you may have thought about in the intervening two weeks?

ANDERSON: I would like, Tully, to go back and give you three or four items that are not in chronological order. They might be of interest. One is to go back to Nanking in April, 1949. Johnny Jones, who was our chargé d'affaires, let Tom Cory, who was our Soviet specialist, and me go down to Shanghai for a weekend, because we had been cooped up in Nanking for many,

many months and one just didn't know when the communists were going to reach the banks of the Yangtze and finally cross and take over.

While we were in Shanghai a message came that the communist troops were approaching the Yangtze. Shelling had started. Johnny suggested that it might be helpful if we returned forthwith, because of the reduced size of the embassy, and that it would be rather embarrassing to him and to everyone concerned if two of his officers--both political officers--were not there when the communists took over.

So a friend of mine took us out to the Lunghua Airport. Virtually all planes were going from north to south, retreating from the communists. Very few were going from south to north; and those that did go from south to north, were empty. We went out on the airstrip, stopped one of these planes, found out it was going to Nanking, and jumped aboard, much to the astonishment of the pilot, who figured that these two young gentlemen must be out of their minds.

On the way to the airport, we stopped at my wine merchants in Shanghai, Calbert MacGregor, picked up three cases of gin and one case of Roses lime juice, and put them aboard. One might say this was a frivolous act. In actuality, it was a valuable initiative, which we didn't realize at the time.

After the communists captured us on April 21, 1949, we were not allowed to leave our compound at all, but non-U.S. diplomats and press people--Seymour Topping, for example, from the *New York Times*, who was then a young stringer--were allowed to come and visit us. So for morale purposes, and to conserve the very limited amount of liquid refreshments that we purchased, the Nanking Volleyball and Gimlet Club was created. You had to play x-number of games of volleyball in order to have one gimlet. There were two or three exceptions. Tommy Davis, the venerable Canadian ambassador, was allowed to have his gimlet every day without playing. But everybody else had to abide by the rules. It was a very valuable morale booster.

One other point I'd like to mention are two people that worked with George Ball when I was George's special assistant. One is "Soapy" Williams, the ex-governor of Michigan, who was Assistant Secretary for Africa. He had a meeting in George's office one day, and the subject was the possible sale of two submarines to South Africa. Soapy was violently against this, as was his close friend Adlai Stevenson, our U.N. representative in New York. They felt that this would enable South Africa to reinforce its apartheid policy.

Needless to say, George Ball had a different view, as did I. We somehow or other failed to see how two submarines could be used in a military way to enforce apartheid, going down the main street of Johannesburg, or what; we just couldn't fathom this. But psychologically and politically, Soapy and Stevenson felt, that because of Third World reaction this would be an unfortunate move. George withdrew his objections and didn't block it.

The net result was the French made \$40,000,000 on the sale of two submarines immediately, and we lost \$40,000,000. It didn't strengthen or weaken apartheid one iota.

Another gentleman I'd like to make a brief comment about is Averell Harriman, who was, as I recall, negotiating on Indochina in Geneva. An issue came up, and he wanted to take a certain position. George Ball did not agree with it. A meeting was held at 9:00 in the morning, in George's office. Averell came, and was in a very sulky mood, as was usually the case when he didn't get his own way. He sat on the couch and Mr. Ball began making his points. There was no reaction whatsoever from Averell. Finally--I don't know whether George Springsteen, his senior special assistant, or I might have noticed it. One of us made a motion towards our ear. George Ball screamed out at Averell, "Get your hearing aid. I'm not talking to a wall here." And he was very, very disturbed about this. So Averell's special assistant had to leave the meeting and later come back with the hearing aid.

One other out-of-chronological-order subject has to do with Henry Ford. This was when I was still with George Ball, which means it had to be before the summer of '65. Bob Schaezel was a deputy-assistant secretary in EUR, and very much a European unity man, as we all know. He was hoping that the British could begin talks, at some point, to join the Common Market, following General de Gaulle's veto in January, 1963. There was very serious problems with the economy in England; it just wasn't working. All the indices were down. The prospect for successful talks with the Community were therefore not bright. So he invited Henry Ford, who had extensive interests in England, to come to Washington to chat with us about the economy. He asked Henry: "What can be done in England? You have extensive interests there. You must have some ideas."

Ford was very clear; he laughed, shrugged his shoulders, looked at us and he said: "There's just one thing the British have to do if they want to improve their economy. They have to go to work. They don't like to work. British executives are the greatest weekenders in history. Most of them may work a four-day week at the most, except for a few CEOs, who work quite hard. The power of the labor unions has caused a disastrous situation. I have my own troubles over there." We can see from this why Mrs. Thatcher went after the labor unions as her main target to cure Britain's economic ills.

Now we go to 1968, in the summer, when I finished up as the country director for France and the Benelux. Incidentally, I might make a comment about Dean Rusk, who invented the country director system. And I've always admired him tremendously. I guess Dean Acheson is my first hero, and Dean Rusk my second one. He was an unsung hero as a secretary of state in our country. I saw him in action frequently..Four or five days a week, I was with him in George Ball's office, or in his own office, as the two principals worked together. I think I mentioned in one of my earlier tapes their excellent relationship.

The country director system was one that I wish existed today because it helped streamline the decision-making operation of the State Department. It put it down at a level where it should be. It was sufficiently high if you had the right people at the country director level (that's the old office-director level, and I guess it's now, again, the office director level). You cut out a number of the channels between the country director and the secretary of state. Before, you'd have to have so many clearances on virtually every telegram. Many of these telegrams could be cleared and sent out at the country director level, therefore freeing the higher-ups to concentrate more on policy.

Q: As I recall, in an earlier conversation we had, you were talking also about a relationship with Rusk and his visit to de Gaulle, in which you and Ed Beigel did a special...

ANDERSON: Thank you for reminding me of that. This was in the spring of '66, right after General de Gaulle withdrew from the military-structure of NATO, which obviously concerned not only us, but the other allies. People really didn't understand a lot of the things going on in this man's mind. A fantastic book, called *La Tragedie du General*, by a Jean Raymond Tournoux, was published. It was a very thick tome, carefully researched, and its contents never denied by de Gaulle. It was essentially a book of quotations by de Gaulle, of his private and public pronouncements. Most of them were private.

Ed Beigel and I sat up for four nights, just before Secretary Rusk was taking off for the spring NATO ministerial in Paris. We thought that selecting different quotes of de Gaulle might give a better feel of who this man was; what was making him tick. It was about a 25-page paper that we came up with which we finished just before the Secretary boarded his plane.

He sent word back, actually, from the plane, saying, "This is great. I'm learning things." He made the staff travelling with him read it, then later gave a copy to each allied foreign minister, before the NATO ministerial started, suggesting they might want to read it. Anybody who's seriously interested in trying to understand General de Gaulle ought to get this book and study it. Our language people could probably have done a hell of a lot better job than Ed and I did, but time was of the essence. We both felt this was a modest contribution to trying to figure out what was going on in General de Gaulle's mind.

The summer of '68, I returned to Paris this time, as political counselor. Sarge Shriver asked me to join him as one of a number of changes he wished to make in the embassy in reorienting our activities in France.

Sarge Shriver, in my view, was the right man at the right time having come there during the events of the summer of '68 after which General de Gaulle would never be the same again. For example, he finally realized that he could not contain Germany by himself. This led to the very private luncheon with Sir Christopher Soames, the British ambassador in Paris, where de Gaulle threw out, for the first time, the desirability of maybe reinstating talks to have the United Kingdom enter the Common Market. (The British leaked this. I don't blame them for leaking it after de Gaulle's veto in January, 1963. They wanted to make sure he wasn't going once again to play games with them.)

De Gaulle was infuriated that this luncheon leaked in London. The actual negotiations for the entry of Great Britain into the Common Market did not start until Pompidou succeeded de Gaulle as president. Nevertheless, de Gaulle realized that Germany could not be contained, and that maybe the United Kingdom was just about as anti-supranational as France. In my own view, I think the British are more anti-supranational than France, if you think of what's going on today in the Common Market.

That being said: I wanted to make a couple of points about how Sarge Shriver reoriented the embassy. He was very imaginative, and totally dedicated. He had more ideas per minute than any man I've ever met. He might have ten ideas. Eight of them might be questionable, but one or two might be superb, and that's great. He was one of the more stimulating personalities I've ever worked with.

Q: Did you have a problem on the ideas that weren't good, quieting him down?

ANDERSON: Absolutely not.

Q: Good. Just did them anyway?

ANDERSON: No. He would knock some of his own ideas down himself. One of the things that we did at the very beginning of Sarge's stay had to do with your favorite sport, tennis. At that time, we were trying to build up a respectable Davis Cup team. We'd been in a disastrous situation for four or five years. Donald Dell, Arthur Ashe, Stan Smith, Charlie Pasarell and Bob Lutz were the top candidates for the Cup team. They came over to France, and we arranged a month-long tour throughout France.

Those of us in the embassy who spoke fluent French went with them to various cities where we'd speak at lunches and dinners and help them out. Needless to say, I volunteered not only because of my love of tennis, but because of the new French friends I found in the provinces.

They did a wonderful job, and were tremendous ambassadors of the United States in the provinces where there had been virtually no contact with Americans since 1958 when de Gaulle came to power. That's the way he wanted it in order to try and give the French people self-respect again. With the Americans all over France in different bases, what he wanted to do was to reduce the French thinking about the United States and Americans, and have them start to think about themselves.

I can't fault him on that, frankly. He did succeed in having the Frenchman regain confidence in himself. I think that was a vital necessity if France was going to continue as a world power, or even an important regional power.

Q: You were also having some military conversations, weren't you?

ANDERSON: Military conversations started before Sarge Shriver arrived in France, and continued between General Lemnitzer, who was the SACEUR, and General Ailleret, who was the equivalent of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for France. They worked out very confidential arrangements of cooperation between NATO and France in case of a conflict. If France decided to enter a conflict, certain things would happen. But the French insisted--and this is the main point always at issue--that they were going to decide unilaterally if they were going to enter the conflict.

If this had been made public, de Gaulle would have complained and nothing would have been done. I think we always have to remember that with our French friends military-to-military relationships have always been easier and more productive than political relationships which really is quite understandable because usually military-to-military relationships, many of which are contingencies, are not cast over the front pages of the newspapers as are political relationships.

Another wonderful program in the embassy was our youth program. I had a youth officer assigned to the political section and gave part of the section's representation allowance to the officer to use as he or she saw fit.

One program we started was an exchange of French Parliamentarians and U.S. Congressmen under 40 years of age. For the first exchange about ten American congressmen and their wives came to France and spent a week or ten days, if you can believe it. We had excellent meetings in Paris and out into the constituencies of their French counterparts. The next year, the same French Deputés came over with their wives to America. A similar program was arranged in Washington, and then they in the constituencies of their U.S. hosts. The speaker of the House of Representatives today, Tom Foley, was one of these people. Because of this experience, Tom thinks that the French are absolutely fantastic. And Don Beigle, then a Republican congressman and now a Democratic Senator from Michigan, was another participant. We had some very wonderful people in this program who came to appreciate France and made their judgments based on knowledge of the country and its people, not on the misinformed, emotional reactions we so often see.

Something happened in this program for which I was almost thrown out of France by some senior Gaullist Deputés who were friends of mine. The young French députés, who came over and went up to Capitol Hill. When they saw the facilities that our congressmen have, such as separate offices, separate telephones, and staffs, their eyes bulged. In Paris, when I was there, the French Deputés had to line up to use about three or four phones in one large *salon* in the Parliament building. It was very beautiful with gold and red damask curtains, but not very practical as they didn't have separate offices or separate staffs.

I would like you to know that today there is a separate building and each member of the French Parliament has his or her own office and staff, as a result of the first visit of the young Deputés to Washington in the late 1960s.

Some of the old codgers, some of my friends who were in the Parliament then, like General Pierre Billotte, for example said: "You are trying to ruin this country. We can't afford this. These young people don't need all of these facilities. I didn't ever have them when I was a *deputé* for 20 years."

I said: "General, I'm sorry. I don't agree with you; they can do a better job this way." Every time I go to Paris some of my friends take me over there, as they consider it a small memorial that I gave them. It's right behind Quai d'Orsay.

Q: It isn't called the Anderson Building yet?

ANDERSON: Hardly.

Another thing that we started--this started, actually, before I went there with Shriver, but we built on it a little bit. When I came back to join George Ball in 1963, I was concerned over the lack of people at senior levels who really knew anything about France. We had difficulties getting the ideal number twos, political counselors (Randy Kidder was an exception) and economic ministers.

I talked this over with Chip Bohlen and he said: "What we've got to do is build up a cadre of people who gain experience in France at an early age, and know something about France, so that later on the personnel system can dip into the files and find a DCM that at least speaks fluent French." It was unbelievable the lack of senior people who had any real background on France, and it's this way today, not quite as bad, but almost. So what did we try and do?

George Ball got behind this, along with Bill Crockett, who was the number-one administrator of the Department at the time Ball was Under Secretary. We arranged with the École National d'Administration (ENA), which is the elite graduate school formed after the war by Pierre Racine, from which any person aspiring to enter public service had to graduate, to allocate one slot for an American diplomat to go there. And Crockett funded it. It was a one-year program. The point was that we wanted a bright, young FSO already fluent in French to go there and absorb France and things French along side the future leaders of France. I think of the contacts he'd make.

The next step, following one year at ENA, was going to be to assign the class-four or five FSO as Principal Officer at one of our Consulates in France for two years. In this way, we could find out if he could run an office. Put him in Lyon as consul general; if he can't run anything, it doesn't matter anyway, because it's not going to break the bank. Peter Tarnoff was our first man. I just wish he was still in the Service, because he could have been the DCM, and eventually our ambassador to France. He was superb. He went through ENA, and was an excellent consul general in Lyon. The system has not continued the way we wanted it to. It did for four of five years. But this was the idea that we wanted to have work out, so a higher caliber of people who understand France could be available to fill the key jobs.

Q: Strangely enough, your friend Johnny Jones built up a very similar system in Italy, which was functioning when I was young. It's totally destroyed now because of this business of bidding for jobs.

ANDERSON: This is a pity.

Q: It is too bad.

ANDERSON: In recent years we failed to send students to ENA as the State Department says we don't have money. Well, this is inexcusable. For example, the Germans send 40 students every year. Now you think, this has been going on since World War II, practically; think of the number

of Germans that are close to the number of French. And at the level they are now, they're Ministers, bank presidents and corporation heads. They pick up the phone, the old-boys club starts to operate. De Gaulle wanted to have this done as another way to try and prevent France and Germany from being at loggerheads. I think it was a wonderful initiative.

Q: Frenchmen would go to Germany, too?

ANDERSON: I don't think the Germans have an ENA, but there are French students who attend other institutions. To continue on with ENA for a minute, which we built on when Sarge Shriver was in Paris. We instituted a graduation present for six students from ENA, to come to the United States after they graduated. They could come for six weeks and visit anyplace they wanted. It was separate from the Leader grant program, but the same idea. We did this for a few years, and then formed an alumni association, so we could stay in touch with these ENA graduates as they moved through their careers. This was an extremely valuable contact for the United States.

Henri Alphanand was French ambassador here, and went back as Secretary General of the foreign office. He never was pro-American, and managed to change with the political climate throughout his career. Charles Lucat, his successor here, was excellent.

When Alphanand heard about this program, he complained: "Oh, here's the United States trying to subvert these young Frenchmen by offering them a trip." This actually happened before Shriver arrived in Paris, because I was still back in Washington, and Charles Lucat was Ambassador. Lucat asked me to come over and see him. We had a drink together and he said: "Bob, I've received this telegram, and I don't think we can continue this program."

I said: "What? This is ridiculous."

He said: "I know." And he showed me the telegram.

I said: "Well, what's the problem? Is it because we pay for it?"

"Well, yes. They think you're bribing these people."

I said: "All right, Charles, do you agree this is a good program?"

"Yes."

I then commented: "I think, too, it's wonderful. It helps U.S.-French relations. So you pay for it. But still let them come. Don't deprive them of this experience, after they've gone through this terribly rigorous course." And that is what happened. So we were able to continue it and the French paid for it. We overcame Alphanand's objection, because we weren't paying for it.

To return to one thing I said on our efforts to try to understand France more, to have officers develop more contacts with the French people in this new atmosphere that I described earlier. We

instituted a program, whereby in the Paris consulate district, the members of the political and economic section had to visit specific parts of the district four times a year.

I never heard such bleats out of some members of the political section, all of whom are ambassadors now. That was one of the most star-studded sections in history; Mike Glitman, who just completed the TNF Treaty negotiations; John Gunther Dean; Andy Steigman; and Bob Oakley. We had a whole stable of them. They started to gripe about getting out into the countryside in a staff meeting, saying: "But look at the telegrams that are coming in my in-box."

I said: "Gentlemen, I couldn't care less about your in-box or your telegrams. You are to go out. You're going to learn something about this country. Paris is not France. You're going to meet mayors. You're going to meet members of Parliament out in the provinces. You're going to meet chambers of commerce leaders. I want you to learn about France and profit from this." They really were unhappy with me. And I said: "If you don't, it's going to be reflected in your fitness report. I'm sorry." I was very, very disturbed by their narrow view.

The long and the short of this story is that after they went twice, I couldn't keep them in the office. They loved it. They later came and thanked me, and said: "We now know something about France."

And that reminds me of one thing. When I arrived in Paris on August 15, 1968, Perry Culley, my dear, wonderful friend, was Consul General. He met me at the train station, because I brought my family over by boat and took the train from Le Havre. I had had no vacation, and those five days were going to be my leave. We drove to the front gate of the embassy, and Perry said: "Bob, I'm afraid you have to go into the embassy right now." I wasn't even allowed to go home and drop my family off at the residence, where Randy Kidder lived--you know, the house with the elevator at Leopold II.

Q: Yes.

ANDERSON: My three children and wife went on with Perry to the house. And I went up and Shriver looked up and said: "It's about time you got here."

I said: "What are you saying?"

"Look, I'm supposed to take off for Sardinia right now, and Eunice and the children are waiting. I've got to go. Good luck." He took off one hour later, and left me virtually in charge.

Q: Woody Wallner had just left ahead of you.

ANDERSON: Woody was there, but winding up as DCM. Ten days later, the Russians went into Czechoslovakia, and I was there in the embassy with Shriver in Sardinia, and Woody's replacement not yet in place.

One of the first things we did was to reduce the political reporting of the American Embassy by 60%. I had been on the receiving end in Washington earlier, and the quantity of telegrams was overwhelming. As often happens, and you know this as well as I do, our political sections like to compete with the newspapers. Newspapers are paid to get the scoops ASAP. We're paid to analyze. I did not want to try and beat the wire services with some minor scoop. Eliminating this type of marginal reporting enabled us to devote more time to go out into the country, to learn more about France and to develop new objectives to improve our relations with France.

There was a cost-cutting effort to close USIS offices in the provinces and operate only out of Paris. We fought that and won, because the USIS offices in France, for the first time now, were going to be able to have some effective contact with the French people. We therefore didn't want to lose this tool.

There are a couple of amusing stories about Sarge and Eunice Shriver. One had to do with a stag lunch at the residence--the old residence at Number Two Avenue Iena. There were about ten of us. One thing that you would never know as you went into the residence was where the dining table was going to be. It was like a floating crap table; it moved into different rooms, depending upon what the children were doing. There were usually no rugs on the floor because they would impede the mobility of the fire engines, the bicycles and the tricycles.

Two French Cabinet ministers came on this particular day. One was a very dignified, senior Gaullist minister, who always wore a bow tie, he was sitting at Sarge's right. One of the Shriver children came in. I was at an angle where I could see the child, I think it was Anthony. As he came in through the door, I watched his eyes. They were focused on the bow tie of the French minister. He came towards the French minister, and his right hand started to go up. I broke into the conversation, and I said: "Mr. Ambassador, Anthony's on your right. Get his arm, quickly." Sarge saved the day, and the bow tie of the Minister remained tied. [Laughter] That's just one little example.

Another story involves Eunice. She had very definite views on the people she'd like to sit with at dinners. A very large, important dinner was scheduled. Couve de Murville, the Foreign Minister, was going to be there. And Alphand had come back from Washington--no, at that time he was already the Secretary General of the foreign office. And then Arthur Ashe would be there along with other tennis people. It was a large dinner with a number of round tables in different rooms.

Eunice asked my dear wife, Elena, if she would come over and arrange the seating because she didn't have much confidence in the lady that was hired to do this sort of thing. So Elena did the job and came home to change for the big event. This was one of the few black-tie affairs the Shriviers had. As a matter of fact, Jackie Kennedy was there with her sister. It was quite an evening.

We returned to the Residence and walked in a little ahead of time. And there was Eunice moving the place cards Elena arranged.

Q: In France, of all places.

ANDERSON: I know. She wanted Arthur Ashe and other friends at her table, not Couve de Murville, the Foreign Minister. And she started to put Couve, the Foreign Minister, someplace. Alphant, who had been placed in the outer regions, nearly walked out.

Elena and I finally persuaded Eunice to place Couve at the number one table, but lost on most other counts. This is the way they were. Sometimes they'd get away with it, sometimes they wouldn't.

Incidentally, a little vignette on Couve de Murville, that comes to mind. It involves Sir Harold Nicholson, whom you know?

Q: Yes.

ANDERSON: Well, Couve de Murville has an Anglophobia the likes of which I've never seen. I'll never forget, for example, after de Gaulle pulled out of the military structure of NATO, there was a U.N. session in New York and Dean Rusk invited Couve and the French delegation, as we always did, to a small bilateral lunch up at the Waldorf Astoria apartment of our Ambassador. Couve refused to speak English; he wouldn't use one word of impeccable English. He just sat there, sulked and spoke French, and insisted that it be translated.

Q: Oh, I've heard Alphant will do this.

ANDERSON: I found out one reason that he's this way. It involves Sir Harold Nicholson, and it's a true story. When Couve was a young man, Sir Harold wanted to have a tennis professional, somebody to come and teach his children tennis. Couve saw the ad Sir Harold placed in the papers. He was accepted and went to Sir Harold Nicholson's to teach tennis and be a companion to the children. He was treated like a servant. He was not considered part of the family, and had a room out in back. Couve never forgot this. This may be an important little footnote to history that explains, in part why Couve feels the way he does about the English. I thought that this might be interesting for somebody to check into this further if one wanted to.

I believe I mentioned to you about Jacques Chaban-Delmas who was Prime Minister when Sarge Shriver was there. I told you before I had become very close to him starting in 1959 when he was Mayor of Bordeaux. I used to see him often as Prime Minister, always of course with Sarge's prior approval. He was delighted to have me see Chaban. I would usually be asked to come to the Matignon, where the prime minister had his office, and would go up the back stairs to see him, whenever he had something he wanted to discuss.

I'll never forget when France sold a number of Mirage aircraft to Libya back in '68 or '69. And you know, we were concerned about this. I went to see Chaban, at his request, and as far as I know, this has never been written. But he said: "Bob, look, please tell your people not to be so worried about this. They can't fly them. We are going to train their pilots. That's going to be in Dijon, France. It's going to take a long time, number one. And number two, they're not really

going to ever be able to really fly them. I don't think they will ever become a military factor. And through this, a sale of 100 Mirages, we may be able to exert some political leverage on Libya."

This is so typically French. That is what he told me, and I reported it to Washington. I must say, Washington's temperature lowered. I haven't followed the entire history of the 100 aircraft--but as far as I know, they have never become a potent military factor for Libya.

Q: They didn't seem to prevent our bombing [Qadhafi] some years later.

ANDERSON: I agree, but I don't know if any of those aircraft are still operational, because that's a long ago. They bought them in '68 or '69.

One other tidbit about Chaban-Delmas, when my wife and I were transferred--this jumps up to 1972 when I was going to Africa as Ambassador to Dahomey. I wanted to pay a farewell call on him. And so he and his wife invited Elena and me to his private apartments at the Matignon. The four of us were there alone together. He was thinking about running for the Presidency then, but his new wife didn't want to have anything to do with it; she was the sporting type and just wanted to return to her life in the southwest. And I was trying to find out his future plans, and asked: "Well, you've been prime minister now for quite a while. How much longer are you going to be here?"

He said: "Yes, I have been. Let's see." He looked up at the calendar on the wall, that had Xs marked for each day. He continued: "I've been here for X years, X months, and 16 hours." [Laughter] He looked at his watch, and said: "I can't wait to get out. Really."

His dear wife, whom I saw a couple of months ago here, had told him: "You'd better just move on." But she did let him make a run at the Presidency. Giscard d'Estaing did not play fair on this one. He falsely accused Chaban of not paying his income tax, which just wasn't correct. That eliminated him as a contender.

Q: Well, is he still mayor of Bordeaux?

ANDERSON: Yes, and still a member of parliament. Michel Jobert. I might say one brief word about him. He was subsequently Foreign Minister, but under Pompidou, he was the secretary general of the Presidency. I came to know him well.

He was born in Morocco. He has an American wife. The son went to the American school, very bright. Yet, he never really liked the United States that much. I think one of the things that became a little difficult was his relations with Henry Kissinger, who was then in the White House. They both had strong personalities, and just couldn't get along very well. I've seen Jobert many times since, and he still has a chip on his shoulder, as far as we're concerned; I don't think that will ever leave.

I remember once he called me over to the Elysée. He said: "The President is very upset by this *Newsweek* article. Why did you all do this? You didn't tell us this was your policy."

I found it amazing that a man of his intelligence, and Pompidou's intelligence, could focus on a *Newsweek* article, and consider it was American policy. But that happened so often. I just had to tell him: "You can tell your President that that is not our policy. We told you what it was last week. And just because *Newsweek* writes something different, it, doesn't mean our policy has changed."

And then an amazing thing was that he had all the secrets of the state on his desk, and said: "Fine. I'll go in and tell him." He left me sitting there alone with all the papers, commenting as he went in to calm Pompidou down: "He's really angry." He's angry at you, too."

I said: "Well, don't be angry at me; I didn't have anything to do with this. And ask him not to become so upset by *Newsweek*."

One item, to do with President Nixon's visit, when Sarge Shriver was Ambassador, and General Walters was our Defense Attaché. There was a beautiful dinner at the Elysée palace, that de Gaulle gave for President Nixon. General Walters was the translator for the toasts. When de Gaulle spoke, Walters stood behind President Nixon and did the translation. Then when Nixon spoke, Walters translated Nixon's toast into French. There was a slight difficulty here. General Walters became so enthralled with what de Gaulle and Nixon had to say that his rendition of what was said was horribly translated.

Henri Alphan and I were sitting near the end of the table and we looked at each other and there was the press and everything else. And we said: "Wait a minute. Dick's enthusiasm had run away with itself." We had to rush out and tell the press: "You can use what de Gaulle said in French, and you can use what Nixon said in English, but translations must be reviewed before release." Dick was such an admirer of General de Gaulle that on that particular evening things just got out of hand a little bit with the dear general. I still consider him one of the most brilliant linguists I have ever known.

Now, on Sarge Shriver and Nixon. Nixon asked Shriver to stay on as Ambassador, and Sarge accepted. Everybody was pleased with the job he was doing, and he stayed on through '69. Two or three young Democrats then came over and really worked on Shriver to run for the governorship of Maryland in 1970. Much to my disappointment, he succumbed, resigned and went back. The reason that I'm even more disappointed is, that these young Democrats hadn't done their homework properly. By the time he returned to Maryland, he was too late to register, and couldn't even run for the governorship.

So he resigned as Ambassador of France and couldn't run as governor for Maryland. I have been very disappointed in that because I think he would have been a tremendous asset to stay on there, rather than have poor Dick Watson represent us, because Dick was a--

Q: Man of complexes.

ANDERSON: He was a very sick man. He had a terrible alcohol problem, as we all know. And it finally did him in. I was very close to him. I can't say too much about distinguished things that happened while he was there. I think the main thing is we were able to persuade the French to cooperate with us on narcotics. Dick worked the Interior Minister, who at first didn't want to have anything to do with it, saying: "That's your problem, not ours."

But we persuaded our French friends, including President Pompidou, that this was, indeed, going to be a French problem, and it was going to affect their youth. You may remember the movies, *French Connection I* and *French Connection II*. *French Connection I* was a direct result of the cooperation we worked out with the French and illustrates the depth of our cooperation.

Q: Who, by this time, was your DCM there?

ANDERSON: Watson wanted a change immediately. Perry Culley came back this time as DCM. His background was more consular and administrative. Perry and I couldn't have been closer, and had worked well together previously. Perry was the one Dick Watson wanted when told by the Service that I couldn't move up from political counselor to DCM. John Burns, who was Director General of the Foreign Service, and a good friend, said: "That's something we don't like to do, if we can avoid it." I wasn't that senior then, and that was fine, because I loved my job as political counselor and knew I would enjoy working with Watson and Perry.

In any event, I went down to Cotonou, the capital of Dahomey, in March '72. It was just as well that I left Dick because three months later, he was out anyway, after press reports of his stuffing \$100 bills down Pan Am hostesses bosoms. It was an election year and an unhappy Nixon let him stay for a brief period and then replaced him.

Q: Then Irwin replaced him, as I remember.

ANDERSON: Yes, Jack Irwin, Dick's brother-in-law.

Q: That's right, Dick's brother-in-law, and also IBM. So IBM-

ANDERSON: Yes, they had a lock on it. My assignment to Dahomey, which was one of the 26 poorest countries in the world, was a fantastic experience for the two years I was there. I set three or four objectives; to see if somehow we could help the people of this country--about 2,500,000 at the time--survive and make a go of it. There were, believe it or not, things that *could* be done economically, and some projects which we developed. But that's all written down in history and it's not that earthshaking.

But there's one or two points that I do want to make here.

Q: When you went there, Kerekou had not yet made his move?

ANDERSON: When I went there, it was a country that had three sitting presidents, which is rather unusual. They were from three different tribes. The agreement was that they would change,

peacefully, every six months. The poor French had to pay for three palaces, three sets of cars, three sets of everything. One change did take place, peacefully, while I was there. But then just before the next one was supposed to take place, a military coup occurred and Kerekou took over. As was usually the case with Dahomian coups, no one was killed and virtually no shots were fired.

One might ask, why does this ridiculous situation of three sitting presidents exist? One of the reasons is certainly to maintain tribal peace. Another reason is that the Dahomians were far and away the most intelligent people in all of West Africa. The French used them to administer French West Africa. Dahomians ran Senegal, for instance. After all these countries, Ivory Coast and the rest of them, became independent, the Senegalese and the Ivorians and others, wanted to run their own countries. They didn't want these Dahomians there. So you had an influx back to little Dahomey of a large number of very intelligent people. What do you do with them? That was another reason that they were creating this three-headed monster. They had to do something with some of these people, and that gave them a few extra jobs, etc.

Another point I wanted to make here--I'll go into Kerekou in a minute--is the question of how the United States should operate in a Francophone country. When I arrived there--and this holds true for Morocco, too, which I'll discuss later--the French Embassy in Cotonou, was a large, imposing embassy with a well funded Cooperation Mission (the equivalent of our AID), and hundreds of personnel. We had a little, tiny mission with minimal resources. The two sides weren't even speaking to each other. There was constant French suspicion of the United States that we were trying to do something on their turf to undermine them.

I worked from the outset to changed this. Because of my long experience in France, I knew Jacques Foccart very well. He was "Mr. Africa," as you may recall, for General de Gaulle in the Elysée, he was all powerful on anything to do with African policy. Before I went down there, I went and saw him in the Elysée. Every time I was in Paris, I would call on him and his people; not just those in the Quai d'Orsay, but Foccart in particular. Through Foccart I was given an introduction to the French Ambassador in Cotonou. And eventually became very close to him.

I made it very, very clear that we were not in Dahomey to try to replace, supplant, or be in competition with the French, but that there might be some things we could help indirectly French policy in economic, social ways. I said it seemed to me the best thing to do was to work together: "I will tell you anything we're thinking about. And I would like your ideas on what we're thinking about before I send my comments back to Washington. Another thing we might think about, Mr. Ambassador is the other nations active here. The Germans and the Swiss have Peace Corps type programs. The Dutch are also here. And the UNDP (United Nations Development Program) are here. Why don't we try and have the U.N. office find out from all of us what aid is being sent to this country, so that we don't duplicate each other, waste funds, and avoid having the Dahomians play one country off against the others?" The French Ambassador liked the idea, and the UNDP instituted the system while I was there.

And after the coup took place, in late-'74, no late--I got there in '72, I left in April, '74.

Q: I think it was '73, the fall of--

ANDERSON: The fall of '73, yes. There was another French ambassador there by then and he and I couldn't have worked closer.

Q: Wait a minute. October of '72, pardon me, October, '72.

ANDERSON: You are absolutely correct.

Q: Six months after you got there.

ANDERSON: That's right. There was one peaceful presidential changeover, and then the military took over. The second French ambassador and I became extremely close. We would see each others, probably four or five days a week. Before I went to see Kerekou, I would check with him and he did the same with me. The confidence we had in each other was total, and certainly served the interests of both our countries.

I'll jump forward to Morocco now, on this very subject.

Q: Which is the same problem, but more complicated.

ANDERSON: Yes, it was more complicated because we had a huge embassy, and the French had a huge embassy. Morocco was French turf. Jean Bernard Raimond arrived as French Ambassador soon after I did. I had worked with him in Paris, when he was Pompidou's diplomatic advisor at the Elysée; so he was a friend. The two embassies weren't talking to each other when I arrived. There was suspicion with regard to military assistance programs, economic assistance programs, peace corps programs, even to the point of trying to assess the motive of why each of us was in Morocco.

That was changed dramatically under Jean Bernard, who, incidentally, became Foreign Minister of France under Jacques Chirac when Mitterrand and Chirac formed the two-headed monster of a government before the last election in 1987. I used to see Jean Bernard at the Quai d'Orsay when he was Foreign Minister, every trip I made to Paris. We're still extremely close.

That's enough on U.S.-French cooperation. But it's important historically. If somebody seriously wants to write something, there are details in the files on it.

Q: Yes, it's very important to have. Well, now I take it, although the record looks as though Kerekou was making a lot of posturings about socialism and communism and so on and so forth, that essentially the relationship with France never changed much under him, or did it?

ANDERSON: Yes, it did, very dramatically. Kerekou was a captain and not that well educated. He was eventually taken over by the leftists no question. While I was still there it was not much of a problem, to be honest with you. But I left with about three weeks' notice, and this really perplexed Kerekou. The French Ambassador later confirmed this to me. He was very upset by

this, and thought that my departure signaled a negative reaction of the United States to him. This was before the declaration of a Marxist and Leninist state occurred. That occurred after I left.

I would go to Kerekou's office three or four days a week. I must say, it was a little harrowing until I got used to it. He had a box of hand grenades by his desk, and assorted arms for his personal protection. I'd have to sit there next to all this armament wondering just how he planned to use it in a small office. He'd ask me to come around and sit next to him to review an economic project. Then he'd call up the appropriate minister and say: "Anderson's here. He suggests that we ought to do this and this. Do it."

The French ambassador knew every single thing that I did with Kerekou, in advance. After I would come back, we consulted. And this was a two-way street where there was no suspicion. We were trying to really help Kerekou get an economy moving. But unfortunately, leftist politicians soon took over. He didn't have the intellectual ability to combat them, so they did declare themselves a Marxist-Leninist state, and the country went absolutely down and down and down, economically as well as politically. Our relations were very poor. My successor had a difficult time, and, in fact, had to leave the country precipitously or they might have gotten to him. He did not relate to the Dahomians, and was never really happy there.

Q: He doesn't seem like the type to me; I know him pretty well.

ANDERSON: Jim Egle, yes. Jim never should have been sent there.

Q: A very bright guy, but in a totally different--

ANDERSON: It was a reward for his Vietnam service. He just shouldn't have been sent there. He had to leave. They considered having me return--except I was Spokesman for the State Department then and couldn't take off to go back--to try and extricate him.

But nevertheless, there's one little footnote to Kerekou that might be interesting. A year ago November, I received a call from our ambassador in Cotonou, where our relations incidentally are now much, much improved. Our ambassador did a wonderful job there; Walter Stadler, who is now number two at the Defense University. He called me and said: "I have to see you urgently. I'm coming back to Washington in another week or so." So I took him to lunch at the club and listened to what he had to say.

"Bob, you told me how you thought I should deal with Kerekou. I followed your advice, and am now in the position you were, where he talks to me candidly on virtually everything of concern to him."

I said: "That's great."

Stadler continued: "What Kerekou wants is help in the United States; he wants to try and improve relations here, obtain some economic help, have his country become better understood.

And he wants you to do it. I told Kerekou I would hope you would do it, and agreed to relay his request."

I said: "Well, I don't know. Maybe I ought to go out, see him, see how things are before deciding." So they invited me out there in June, '89. I hadn't seen Kerekou for 15 years. We went into the same enormous room, where I presented my credentials in 1972, for my audience with him. He came out through a small door leading from his office. In this room were only four people: the Foreign Minister was on one side, there were about 20 big, stuffed chairs and he was in one of them; on the other side there was the ambassador, myself, and a young lady--economic officer--who was going to take the notes.

Kerekou walked in, and he had his carved cane and nodded his head to the Foreign Minister. Then he started to walk towards me. I told the Ambassador: "You never know what's going to happen here." And in response to the vague way Kerekou looked at me, I said: "Oh, my heavens. He doesn't remember me."

His face ended up three feet from mine. He then screamed at the top of his voice: "Mais c'est vous!" He put his arms around me and we hugged each other, and started off once again as if we had seen each other yesterday.

I told Ambassador Stadtler earlier: "If there's a chemistry that's still there, I want you to suggest that I see Kerekou alone when we can take up items on the agenda that would be difficult for you to do." He agreed.

Q: Ambassador Anderson, you were just saying that you had met with Kerekou and had suggested to the American ambassador that you talk to him alone.

ANDERSON: Right.

Q: After his having recognized you.

ANDERSON: Right. Well, I subsequently had two meetings alone with him and went over the question of trying to have his country--which is, incidentally, now known as Benin, not Dahomey--to become better known in the United States, and to try and see what could be done here.

I told them that there were three or four things that I thought he would have to do because, frankly, any Administration in Washington probably concentrates on ten to twenty countries, maybe only fifteen. There are about 150 countries represented in Washington, and the Administration is not going to concentrate on Benin, unless we can find something that will attract its attention. Every once in a while there is something, even for a small country.

There is something that is going on right today that I cannot talk about. Maybe at some future time I can. It may help Benin attract the attention of top levels in the Administration. I've already

talked to Brent Scowcroft about it, and he's rather intrigued as are Hank Cohen, the Assistant Secretary for Africa, and the Assistant Secretary for NEA, John Kelly.

In any event, Kerekou has changed his stripes in Benin. I don't think that Kerekou himself ever knew what Marxism was, or Leninism was. In any event, he's taken formal steps, which I recommended last June, to declare publicly that Benin is no longer a Marxist-Leninist state. A revised constitution is in the works. He's going to introduce a multi-party system. He's doing all the things that he ought to do to try and improve his country's image. But there's one particular thing he has to do to get our attention, and I hope it's going to work.

Q: Well, does that pretty well wind up your actual tour as ambassador there?

ANDERSON: Yes. I think the main thing was our effort to stimulate the economy. Two or three projects started to succeed, but they all failed after the country was declared a Marxist-Leninist state and Leftists took over.

There's only one final historical point. That was my first service in a very, very poor country, which opened my eyes considerably. I was delighted to have had that experience. The thing that disturbed me the most about my service there was the fact that the Congress of the United States insisted that our economic and technical assistance be given on a loan basis, and not on a grant basis. And already, then, I could see that we were never going to get paid back. They couldn't pay back the interest or the capital; they didn't have the wherewithal. And this was a terrible political move, and it also, frankly--I considered it almost "inhumanitarian".

Q: Well, now when did this change occur? Because it certainly was not going on in the late '60s or mid-'60s, when I was in East Africa.

ANDERSON: You had all grant aid?

Q: It was substantially all grant aid; there were other forms of--

ANDERSON: Well, there were a couple of grant-aid programs, but the main--

Q: Essentially, there were no U.S. Government--there were certainly no U.S. Government loans to--

ANDERSON: Well, then there was change between your time in East Africa and it was a dumb move. The only saving grace to that is that when I worked for the Bush campaign last summer as a senior foreign-policy advisor, I attacked this debt problem for the sub-Saharan African countries. I felt that the U.S. Government should cancel those debts, because we are never going to get paid--they were mounting up and up every year. George Bush took this action last summer at the Summit of the Seven in Paris.

And, if by doing this we now are in a position to wipe this debt off, it gives the commercial banks a little more confidence in countries like Benin, and maybe we can attract some foreign

investment, American investment there. But with this official debt hanging over their heads, which could never be repaid anyway, we couldn't do it.

Regarding the *quid pro quo* for doing this. A young gentleman named Breeden, who was on the committee that heard me propose this during the campaign--he now happens to be the new Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission in New York--went after me: "This is ridiculous. They owe us the money and must pay it."

I said: "Sure they owe us this money. But we're never going to get it."

"Well, we can't just do this for nothing."

I said: "We're not. What we're going to insist on, before we do it, is that they move away from statism to privatization, and that they move away from import substitution to encouraging foreign investment and liberalization of trade. In this way, they may attract, at long last, some foreign investment. This is the name of the game. Because governments are not going to be able to continue giving massive aid. Furthermore, there's no reason to, except in very limited cases of major infrastructure projects." This was one recommendation Breeden and others accepted, I'm happy to say. That's the last point on Africa I wanted to make.

Q: Now, you came into, next, I guess, probably the most active assignment you ever had, in a way, I imagine. [Laughter] Do you want to tell us something about you got back to be the Department's spokesman? The job, I think, was set up a little differently than it had been before, wasn't it, when you took it over? It used to be a deputy assistant secretary, or sometimes an assistant secretary, or sometimes the assistant secretary for Public Affairs had the job and the spokesman was a layer below. And weren't you the direct spokesman of the secretary, in this case?

ANDERSON: Yes. Well, let's just focus on what I was.

Q: You go into it the way you want.

ANDERSON: I had the official title of deputy assistant secretary. I was also the special assistant to the Secretary of State for Press Relations. But I was the spokesman of the State Department. The assistant secretary of public affairs did not become the spokesman until Hodding Carter came in with Jimmy Carter. That was a mistake, in my view, you cannot combine those jobs. There's more than enough for the spokesman to do.

How did I get there? I had a telegram from Larry Eagleburger, who was working for Kissinger, and Bob McCloskey. They asked me if I'd come back. I made my only official telephone call to Washington, in two years, from Cotonou. I told Eagleburger: "That was the most uninformative telegram I have ever received. I'm not about to do this thing, take this on until I know what it's all about, what's going on. The least you can do is order me back, so I can see this man. Maybe he doesn't want me. I want to find out what's going on here."

So I was ordered back to Washington very quietly. I was kept up on the seventh floor, because they didn't want the press to know that Kissinger was about to start on his third or fourth spokesman in six months; that, basically, was the problem.

So I finally went to meet Dr. Kissinger on the day he got married, as a matter of fact, on a Saturday morning.

Q: [Laughter] He was still meeting personnel; not taking much time off.

ANDERSON: Larry Eagleburger took me in there, along with Bob McCloskey, who had come back from Cyprus, as Ambassador, because Kissinger asked him if he'd fill in as spokesman for a while. And that's why they needed me, because George Vest took's Bob's place, but couldn't handle the job, and asked for a transfer. That is why they turned to me.

So I went into Kissinger's office and he looked at me and, basically, we--

Q: Had you had some extensive contact with him before?

ANDERSON: No. I'd seen him in Paris off and on, when he would come over for his Vietnam talks. But I wasn't involved in the talks. So, basically, I hadn't had much contact with him. I was very close to Larry Eagleburger and McCloskey. Basically, Kissinger's opening comment to me was: "Well, you know, I suppose I don't have much choice. And even if you do a lousy job, I can't get rid of you."

I said: "Mr. Secretary, that's an unusual way to put this. I don't know whether I can do a good job. I've never been a spokesman. I did fill in for Hubert Humphrey years ago, and I deal with the press a lot. I like the press. But I don't know if I can be a spokesman. "I'm willing to try it if you want me to."

"All right. Well, we have to go to the Middle East right away, so you can start on Monday."

I said: "No, Mr. Secretary. My wife is in Cotonou. I have to go back there, make my manners with the government of Dahomey, pack up and then return."

So he gave me two weeks. One week after I returned to Washington I was off on the 31-day shuttle for the Golan Heights. As for Kissinger the man, so much of the period when I was with him is all written down in history. I don't really think I can contribute anything earthshaking.

Q: But there never can be too much said about such a complex figure, but I'm not trying to feed a scandal.

ANDERSON: I know that. He was a remarkable man, paranoia and all, I liked and respected him tremendously. To this day he has my total loyalty. All of us, who worked closely with him, feel that way. He could not work alone. I think that he, frankly, if I may say so, liked to use the people that he thought were the best and the brightest of the Foreign Service. He used the Foreign

Service to the hilt. He supported us. There were more assistant secretaries who were Foreign Service officers under him than under any other Secretary that I can remember.

After about six or eight months, when he finally felt that I was loyal to him and could serve as his spokesman satisfactorily, our relationship became extremely close, and is very close to this day. This doesn't mean that he isn't a difficult man. Very bright people are usually very difficult; they really are. He has a lack of patience that is just unbelievable, and I had many problems with him on that.

I remember once we were in Cairo, Egypt, on one of our stops there. We had the motorcade going out to his plane to rush back to Jerusalem and then on to Amman. Sometimes we did four and five countries in one day. He was, as you might expect, keyed up and anxious to see the Israelis and the Jordanians. Well, part of the press that was travelling with us didn't arrive with the rest of the motorcade. He wanted to take off without them. I said: "No, we can't do this Mr. Secretary. They will be along in a few minutes."

He became furious and said: "You are working for me, and we are leaving. I'm going to Jerusalem. I don't care if they're not here."

I said: "That is not the way to do it. And it isn't their fault, I'm sure." Then, finally, we saw this bus struggling onto the airfield, and I kept arguing with him to give the press time to climb aboard. I later found out it was the Egyptians' fault. Our motorcade went so fast because of Kissinger that the press bus couldn't keep up. It wasn't their fault. Little things like this would come up. But they were manageable; put it that way.

Jeremiah O'Leary. Do you know that name? *Washington Star*.

Q: I've heard his name.

ANDERSON: He's one of the most competent, sensitive journalists there is. His father was with the *Washington Star*. Jerry made a with me personally when I came aboard. He didn't know me from Adam and said: "You won't last six months. Kissinger just eats them alive; eats press spokesmen alive." Well, I was there two years later. On my departure Jerry wrote a very touching piece about this.

Q: By then it was time to move on.

ANDERSON: Yes, I was exhausted. I had found somebody to take my place. That was the secret. If I hadn't have found Bob Funseth, I never would have left. It took a number of months before Henry agreed to it. At the time Jerry O'Leary wrote a very nice piece in the paper, and said: "I lost my bet." It went into the fact that I was able to handle the job.

There are some things about Henry. He was one of the nosiest people I've ever met. He always wanted to get into other people's business, and read everything that you were reading. The configuration of the aircraft that we spent 60% of our life on--really we travelled 60% of our

time-- had his compartment up front with Nancy, and then four big stuffed chairs with a large table on each side of the aisle, where we would be sitting. Henry would keep coming back, looking over our shoulders to see what we were reading or writing.

I, usually, would have the seat with my back to his compartment. He would come and he would lean on the seat, over my left shoulder. And he was forever taking the telegrams that I was reviewing to get ready for my briefings.

So we did a couple of things to him once, to try and cure him. We did up a fake telegram, as we were on the way to Portugal from London, for a visit there. It was from our ambassador in Portugal and dealt with the secretary's arrival in Portugal. Things that Kissinger detested were to have hordes of advance people, a lot of folderol, speeches and protocol events. We had this telegram begin with: "A hundred and thirty-six advance people have come from Washington." We had bands playing. The ambassador said in the telegram: "We tried to turn this off, but the president . . ."

Q: Who was this? Was it Frank Shakespeare, maybe?

ANDERSON: No, I don't recall who it was. The point is, he picked it up and after reading the first sentence started to get redder and redder as he read through it. In the beginning we had fooled him. Then he looked at all of us, slammed the telegram back down on top of my desk, and said laughingly: "Why you do this to me?" He came back a minute later and grabbed the telegram. "I must show it to Nancy." [Laughter]

Another thing we used to do concerned Hal Sonnenfeldt, who is not the world's most loveable man. He was always trying to go on trips with Kissinger, but most of the time remained in Washington. During our trips we'd do up fake telegrams giving reports of Sonnenfeldt press conferences in Washington, of Sonnenfeldt meetings at the White House and of other Sonnenfeldt exploits. When Kissinger would see this, that somebody else was giving a press conference and learn what Hal had been up to... [Laughter]

Q: What job did Sonnenfeldt have?

ANDERSON: Counselor of the State Department.

Now there was one thing I wrote down about Dr. Kissinger, which is rather a personal thing, that occurred on March 25, 1975. We had gone over, again, to the Middle East, on a trip, March 5 to March 23, to try conclude the Sinai II agreement. Rabin was Prime Minister then, and we thought that it was all set. We'd been led to believe that if we went over and negotiated this thing out, that there was no internal division within the Israeli Government on this, and that we would be able to do it. Well, it turned out that there was a serious problem within the Israeli Government. We negotiated and negotiated and negotiated, and were going to have to go home without an agreement.

So the day before we went back--it was on a Saturday, and the Israelis wanted to have a Cabinet meeting, to see if they could iron out a position. We went to Masada, the famous place where the

Jews way back in history committed suicide by jumping off this huge rock, to spend the day while the Israeli Cabinet was meeting in Jerusalem. We went over by helicopter. The press went with us. I was sitting in the helicopter across from Henry. Nancy was along, but he was sitting alone.

And I wrote the following, which I think is of interest here because this was a very difficult period for our foreign relations. You have to bear in mind that Nixon went out the year before, Ford was in, we were losing Cambodia, Vietnam, etc. Let me just read what I wrote on the helicopter as I looked at this unusual figure:

"Went to Masada this morning, by helicopter. HAK sat alone, sad, very reflective; a small, round man, obviously thinking his efforts, which had been superhuman, for peace, were hanging in the balance. With his mood on this trip, cheerful, considerate, I do not think he is worrying about his own future. He will already go down in history as one of our greatest secretaries of state. Rather, he is concerned, profoundly sad, and frustrated, almost to the point of helplessness, over the unravelling of American Foreign Policy; Cambodia, Vietnam, Portugal, Turkey, the Middle East, Western Europe, a world-wide recession, energy, food, you name it. The West is in disarray. And the domestic weakness--economic, political, and psychological--of the United States cannot provide the necessary leadership. This is what troubles HAK, Henry Kissinger."

It sums up Henry, you know, pretty well, especially, Tully, if we remember that even today--and he's been out of office now for a long time--if any real crisis comes in the world, he still is the one that the media go to, unfailingly, to seek an informal opinion. They seldom turn to other ex-Secretaries or ex-Presidents for that matter. He commands an almost unique position of influence in the field of foreign affairs here in the United States and abroad.

Q: Well, it is interesting.

ANDERSON: But that's enough for now on Kissinger. Do you want to move on to Morocco?

Q: Yes, well, I think that's good, because obviously you had something to say about the world crisis every day, and you were quoted in the paper, and so that's all on record.

ANDERSON: Yes, and every press briefing I ever gave, I have the texts of them. They're there.

Now on Morocco, where I went in March, '76, there are three or four points that I might mention. One, the King himself, King Hassan, is a truly remarkable person, whom Henry Kissinger qualifies as a statesman; Henry doesn't say that about many people. Why does he feel that way about Hassan?

When Kissinger came in as Secretary of State, you may remember, that was the first time that he then decided, after the '73 war, to become involved in the Middle East. The first stop he made, before he went out there was to see the King in Rabat. The King briefed him on every person he was going to see on his trip. He talked to him about Sadat. He talked to him about Faisal in Saudi Arabia. He talked to him about Hussein in Jordan; Assad in Syria, and even Boumedienne in Algeria. Henry had never met any of these people.

What's more, the King sent his Foreign Minister, Taibi Benhima, in advance of Kissinger to each stop; Taibi could brief all of these leaders on the King's impression of Kissinger. Henry never forgot that.

Now Hassan is no fool. He felt, "I'm of use to the United States of America and because of this the Americans will support me." He did this on the question of Sadat going to Jerusalem. There are certain initiatives that King Hassan took to bring the Egyptians and the Israelis together; it never would have occurred without Hassan.

Here again, he knows that we never would have had Camp David later on. None of these events would have occurred if it hadn't been for Hassan's actions when I was in Morocco. Phil Habib, who visited me at the time, and I were privileged to learn of what transpired on condition that we remain silent about it.

Q: What was our posture in Morocco at the time you went there? Did we still have communications bases, but no military bases, so to speak?

ANDERSON: That's correct. We had two communications facilities, but no military bases as such. While I was there, the U.S. Navy made the decision to close the communications facilities. I found out about this just by luck; hearsay at one of the facilities. I was not told officially. I was concerned in view of Hassan's reaction in light of what he had been doing to help us in many areas.

I went back to Washington and saw the vice CNO, and the Secretary of Defense, commenting: "Look, you don't do this just like that. King Hassan is a friend of the United States and doing some very valuable things for us. Any action we take must avoid showing a lack of confidence in him. Let us study this plan. If the Navy says it doesn't need the communications facilities, that's fine. But let's see if there's anything else we would like to have from Morocco in a security sense."

So the Army, Navy, and Air Force were asked to look into this. In the meantime no final action was to be taken as to closing the facilities. All sorts of wish lists came in. Some were ridiculous; some practically wanted to go back to Morocco and make it a colony of the U.S. But finally, there were two or three items that would be politically palatable. I went to the King--and this is all in the history books--and told him that we were going to close, outlined the very orderly way we planned to do this and sought his approval of our plan and our desire to consider two new security operations in Morocco.

The King made a very sensible comment when I told him about closing these facilities because we were going to rely on satellites. He said: "Well, I'm not a communications expert, Mr. Ambassador, but you might tell Washington that I am perfectly willing to have them leave any of the equipment here in mothballs in case there's a war and the Russians shoot down your satellites and you will be in need of these older communications systems. You might want to use these again."

I relayed this to Washington. "No, no, no, no was the answer." Later on, that's just what the Navy wanted to do and it was too late, because they moved all the equipment into Spain, where its future use is far from assured. And to think we could have had this. The King was a very far-sighted individual.

There is another subject that I think we ought to concentrate on. This concerns the Sahara. I recommend that anyone who has the time and wants to be serious about the historical evolution of the Sahara, should focus on one or two things here. There was an international-court-of-justice opinion, which if read objectively, indicates that there certainly is a Moroccan claim to the area.

But the key here, I have always felt, is the gentleman who is now the President of Austria, Kurt Waldheim. I consider that he is the man primarily responsible for the war in the Sahara continuing. He was up for reelection as UN Secretary General. Butaflika was the Foreign Minister of Algeria at the time, and President of the UN General Assembly. Waldheim took some actions that were not neutral, and had sided with the Algerian position. And this caused--

Q: To ensure his own reelection?

ANDERSON: Yes, I'm sure, especially when one recalls the dominating influence of Algeria in the Third World. For example, Waldheim sent a Swede, Rydbeck, who was in the political office at the U.N., as a neutral observer to go and talk to the different sides. Rydbeck was totally on the Algerian side. There was a census of the 75,000 people that were there at the time Spain left the Sahara. Waldheim refused to give it to the Moroccans to conduct any kind of a referendum. The rest of it is all written down. But I just wanted to flag this. Kurt Waldheim did not distinguish himself here.

Again on our relations with France, there is one specific point here to show that if you gain the confidence of the French you can work with them. Bids were out for a radar air traffic control system, to encompass the entire country, including the Sahara. Westinghouse had put in a bid. The French had put in a bid. Giscard d'Estaing, who was President of France, kept calling the King to try to win this bid for France. This was a \$120,000,000 or more contract, a significant contract.

I was having a meeting with the King, and he brought this subject up. He said: "This Westinghouse bid is much lower than the French, and the quality is better."

Once I heard that, I said to him, "Well, you know that one of the objectives that I have here is to try and bring American investment in, because you want to diversify, don't you?"

"Yes."

I said: "If I have to, to make sure that this bid is treated fairly, may I use this information that you just gave me, on price and quality?"

He said: "Absolutely."

So I went to the French Ambassador and told him about it, I said: "I know that your President is calling the King. But here are the facts. We've been dealing with each other very honestly. I'm going to go after this. And, you know, if, in light of what I have been told, the French win this contract, I am never again going to recommend that any American company invest one penny here. And I think you'd agree."

He said: "No, I don't blame you."

I continued: "I would like you, to the extent you can, politically--not to push it. If your President wants to call the King, that's fine. But you don't have to push it at this end."

He said: "I will play fairly."

David Rockefeller happened to be visiting Morocco at the time the Finance Minister, who was a good friend and involved in the selection of the contract, gave him a dinner. So at the Minister's house, I asked David if he would come with me for a moment, and we stood at the stairwell, together with the Minister.

I said to the Minister in French: "I want you to know, Mr. Minister, and I want David Rockefeller to hear this. I have the Westinghouse people here now negotiating for the radar contract. I want you to know that I've been told about the price and the quality of their proposal. If anything happens on this contract, and anybody else that has lower quality or higher price receives this contract, I will never recommend that any American company come to your country to invest one penny. I wanted the chairman of Chase Manhattan to hear this conversation."

Three days later, Westinghouse was awarded the biggest contract in history for an American firm in Morocco. I think this is historically important because it shows what one can do if one cooperates with the French, and they don't become suspicious of you.

An amusing story on Melilla and Gibraltar. One fine morning, an urgent call from the King to go and see him. And it so happened, the British ambassador received a similar call. We both ended up there together. The King was talking away, and all of a sudden, the King looked at me and smiled very slightly. He turned to the British ambassador, and said: "There's been talk about my trying to go after Ceuta and Melilla. But I want you to know that I am not going to give my kingly brother, Juan Carlos, any problem. He has enough problems moving his country forward. What I would like you to know, Mr. Ambassador, is that when Spain gets Gibraltar back, I am then going to turn Ceuta and Melilla to Morocco. Because by that time, that won't be a problem for Juan Carlos. You may tell London this." [Laughter]

The Ambassador was a Scotsman named Jock Duncan. On leaving the meeting he said: "Bob, I am not sure I really understand all of this. Do you think we could have a small drink before lunch to review what His Majesty had to say before I communicate with London?"

I said: "Come on over, Jock." We went over the meeting so he understood exactly what the King meant.

When Jimmy Carter became president, our policy towards Morocco changed dramatically. It was a policy that I could not agree with, because I felt it was founded on false premises. The basic premise was that we wanted to have improved relations with Algeria, and that to improve those relations with Algeria, you couldn't remain friends with Morocco. That was absolutely wrong.

Dick Parker, a career officer, who you probably know, was our Ambassador to Algeria then. He had been number two in our Embassy in Rabat under Ambassador Stuart Rockwell. This was early on in the Carter Administration. I suggested to Dick: "Look, why don't you and I go someplace, sit down and iron this thing out, and really try and think it through?" Dick and I eventually me for four days alone in Madrid. We came up with a joint telegram, which Roy Atherton subsequently said was unheard of in the Foreign Service where two ambassadors representing countries that were not exactly friendly, could come to a joint assessment. Basically Dick and I believed that there was absolutely no reason why you could not be friends with both countries.

There are a number of things that entered this picture, I believe. There were certain people in the United States that wanted to get LNG (liquid natural gas), for New England. Clark Clifford represented some interests in Algeria, and was close to Carter. Jim Schlesinger, who was Energy Secretary, told me at one point: "The worst thing we could ever do is make a long-term contract with Algeria for liquid natural gas for the northeast of the United States. The Algerians would hold that over our head and use it as a tool against us."

One of the main problems that we had was the question of OV-10 reconnaissance aircraft, and again, I'm not going to go into this in detail, because it is part of history. But the King asked me to see if he could get half a dozen of them. They were really small observation-type planes to use in the Sahara, to see what was going on. Our position on the Sahara was so pro-Algerian then. We wouldn't let them do anything to displease Algeria, which was absolutely wrong. The Libyans were helping out, the Algerians were recruiting Tuareg tribesmen by the tens of thousands for the Sahara. We were practically signing the death warrant of Morocco for a while.

I did see a lot of Al Haig, at that time. He was the SACEUR in Brussels. I saw him when I was still Ambassador, and then after I left, in October, '78, and went to work for the Commander-in-Chief Atlantic, in Norfolk, who was also the Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic. I used to see Al Haig in Brussels, four or five a year when I was over there on NATO matters.

Al Haig understood the picture; that the Moroccans had to be given some help, or else we might lose this very valuable ally. All I want to say on the record there is that the day that Al Haig became Secretary of State, he was sworn in in the late morning, walked over to the State Department, and made his first remarks on the stairs, where he said something that I think he should not have said. To announce: "I'm the vicar of foreign policy for this Administration," was not his brightest remark and did not go down well. He then went to his office, and that afternoon

ordered and implemented all of the things he and I had talking about for four years, on military assistance to Morocco. He did it that afternoon. It was the first act he did as Secretary of State. That action helped enormously.

Q: As a result of these troubles going on then, did you resign, or was this just coming to the end of a term, more or less?

ANDERSON: No. I didn't resign. I loyally carried out every policy that I was told to. On the other hand, I continued to send in my views. I think that probably the White House and State were getting a little weary of reading them. One reason for my departure concerns Dick Parker. He was our ambassador in Lebanon, after Algeria. And Dick had some health problems in Lebanon. He's an old Near East hand, as you know, and they wanted to find a place for him right away. So they chose Morocco. He'd been there before as DCM. I guess the timing of my transfer was a combination of that and having to look at my telegrams all the time.

But I have to tell you, that Dick only remained for a short time. The King never focused on the *agrément*. One or two of the coup d'état attempts took place when Dick was the DCM. He was not pro-monarchy, and his views were known in Morocco on that score. He and the King just didn't hit it off, and the King then made a decision that he didn't want any more career people. He was very unhappy that I left, and he tried everything he could to keep me there. He said: "I don't agree with President Carter's policy." But he said: "At least you understand us and I know you're honest, you're objective, and you report what our policy is. And I can't ask anything more from you. And I have confidence in you." Therefore, after Dick Parker's departure, Angie Duke went out and they've had politics ever since.

There's one other point I want to say about the King. In the beginning when I arrived there, he had been using the CIA as his main channel to Washington. He had a tendency to do this all the time, and not using the State Department, nor the embassy, nor the ambassador.

Q: Duly encouraged by the CIA, usually, of course.

ANDERSON: Yes. Well, we wanted to get rid of this practice. I took with me a private letter from Kissinger to the King. In it Kissinger suggested that the King could entrust to me anything he had on his mind, and that I had the access to him and to the President, and that he would prefer that business be done that way, to avoid confusion. That had a tremendous effect, and was one of the reasons I was very close to the King.

I think we'd better stop here, if you don't mind.

[April 9, 1990 interview begins]

Q: Ambassador Anderson, it's good to have you back. You had just, I think, finished your assignment in Morocco, but hadn't told us where you went from there. Do you want to pick up as you leave Morocco, and tell us what you did and how you came to do it?

ANDERSON: I'd be delighted to, Tully. I left Morocco in October of '78, and started off on a new job right away. It was a combination of a job in Washington and Norfolk, Virginia. I was assigned as Special Assistant for International Relations to the Commander-in-Chief Atlantic, who also had the NATO hat of the Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic. This was Admiral Harry D. Train III.

This was one of the more fascinating assignments of my Foreign Service career, quite different from any of my others, but extremely valuable as an educational assignment. In addition, because of the admiral I worked with, I think that I was able to make a contribution to, shall we say, military-civilian relationships in our own government. Admiral Train, in my view, is one of the most brilliant minds that I have ever come across. Admiral Train, as far as I'm concerned--and I came to know all of the top Navy officers, during this assignment of almost four years--and Bill Crowe, who has just finished up as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, probably are the two most formidable Navy brains in this century. They were absolutely unbelievable. This made the assignment so satisfying and precious to me, to be very honest with you.

I'll go right to the end of my assignment for a moment, regarding Admiral Train. When I was about to leave, to go as ambassador to the Dominican Republic, I went over to see Frank Carlucci, who was the Deputy Secretary of Defense. I was very concerned that the administration might choose not to continue to use Admiral Train, who had already been SACLANT and CINCLANT for over three years with four years the limit for that assignment. He should have been made CNO. But as in many institutions of our government, politics enters into it.

Q: Very heavily at that level, I would think.

ANDERSON: Very. I'm afraid that because of that--the then Secretary of the Navy had his definite feelings about certain other naval officers--Harry Train did not receive this appointment.

But one thing, that did disappoint me. Frank Carlucci took me in the back door to see Secretary [Caspar] Weinberger to talk about Admiral Train. And I told the secretary of my three and a half-odd years with him, and what a superior person he was, and especially how allied governments thought so highly of him, because as SACLANT, he had relations with all of the top civilian and military officials of our NATO allies.

I said to Weinberger: "All right, if he can't be CNO, don't lose this man's service to our country. Reappoint him, again, as CINCLANT. And I'm sure the allies would love to keep him on as SACLANT. Or maybe send him over to Italy, as the top NATO commander in Naples, because earlier in his career, he was the commander of the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean. He knows Italy and NATO like the back of his hand. Above all, keep him in the service."

Weinberger looked at Carlucci, and he said: "That's a very good idea. We'll take care of this." They never gave him anything. And I was very disappointed, but there was nothing more that I could do. I see Harry today on projects we get together on, and still have a tremendous admiration for him.

But back to my assignment of almost three and a half years with him. I spent maybe 60% of my time travelling abroad with Admiral Train. He took me on every trip he made. And that's what made the job. Some top NATO, or top American, military officers don't use their State Department people the way that he did. He included me in all his meetings with military and civilian leaders.

I emphasized to him that it was necessary for him to concentrate, in the NATO framework, on civilian leadership, not just military leaders. I urged him to see all of the NATO ambassadors. He saw the NATO foreign ministers and the NATO prime ministers in their different capitals. And he was able to gain valuable insights. And they were able to learn from him. As the Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic, he had the responsibility for the allied defense of the entire Atlantic, including the North Atlantic, right up to the Arctic Circle, and down to the Tropic of Cancer which is the so-called limit of the NATO boundary.

Q: In theory, I suppose he would not be concerned with Italy or Greece or Turkey, because they're not--

ANDERSON: No, the ships would leave his command when they approached Gibraltar to go into the Mediterranean, and they would then go under the--the acronym is CINCUSNAVEUR, with headquarters in London. They would cross over to his command once they got into the Mediterranean.

I said earlier that this assignment was a fascinating one, and that I thought because of the way Admiral Train wanted to use me, that maybe I was able to make a contribution here and there. Here are a few examples.

One of the first things that happened after I went to work for him was to go down to Key West, which at that time had a very large naval base. The Carter Administration was trying to save money here and there, as we know, and they were particularly going after the military. There was a move afoot to close down naval bases at Key West and elsewhere.

But there was a paradox that arose here because they also were trying to close certain naval air stations elsewhere in the United States. And so they thought that maybe, as far as the naval air station in Key West was concerned, they would be able to transfer some of the squadrons down there for their flight training. The planners forgot it was only 90 miles from Cuba, among other things.

And I went down there, and, looked into this situation. Could the Key West naval station absorb a great number of other naval aircraft? It was quite clear that from a political point of view to have airplanes flying around so close to Cuba would not be good. It also was quite apparent that the authorities in Florida would not permit it. Air congestion would have become horrendous, because Key West happened to be in a prime area where commercial airliners were flying over and going to and from the U.S. from South America. The whole thing was a disaster.

I reported this to Admiral Train, who sent me to Washington. And I, as a civilian, had easy access to the military. I explained the situation and said the plans should not be carried out. Because of this, a number of air stations remained open elsewhere in the United States, and they did not move their aircraft to Key West. The Navy was grateful to me for that.

Q: You accomplished two things for them, really. You kept things from closing and kept them from making a mistake.

ANDERSON: That's right. Another question came up, that had to do with the U.S. military organization setup in the whole Caribbean area. After going with Admiral Train to visit some of the small, independent nations there, we saw that it made no sense, whatsoever, to have the United States Army command in Panama, called SOUTHCOM, have the defense responsibilities on land for all of these little island nations, while the U.S. Navy had the defense responsibilities for the water around all of these islands. This included military assistance, as well as disaster assistance, if the military was called upon. Here you had a headquarters about as far away from the Caribbean as you can get, way in the western extremity, having to deal with these nations.

We went to the Bahamas, and were meeting with the prime minister there. And he was baffled by this because he didn't know very much about CINCLANT, the Commander-in-Chief Atlantic, until Harry Train went there. He suddenly realized that here was the man who probably, if anything happened, would be the fellow to help out, because he was the commander-in-chief, which meant that all the military services would come under his command in time of conflict.

So a turf battle started. I started it, and I finished it. Harry Train wisely stayed out of this one, although he wanted it this way. Finally the Army lost the land responsibilities for the small island nations of the Caribbean, and that went over to CINCLANT, where they should have been in the first place. If a disaster occurred, you would have CINCLANT handle a hurricane in Dominica not the Army people, sitting way down in Panama trying to cope with it with assets from the U.S.

But I can tell you a lot of blood flowed over that issue, and I think the Army would have welcomed seeing some of my blood flow but they didn't catch me. But it now is a much more sensible setup, and even the Army recognizes that it was a very useful reorganization.

When I was with Harry, I suggested that he institute an annual West African cruise, because the CINCLANT area went right over to West Africa. So Harry made the first such cruise. We flew out in his P-3, and met two of our ships on arrival in Ghana. We started seeing all the chiefs of state and the prime ministers and others in each country visited. This helped the United States presence very much; I might say, during the Carter period when the relations with some foreign nations were not all that good, as far as the civilian leaders were concerned. These cruises continue to this day.

Admiral Train did the same thing once a year, as far as the Caribbean and South America were concerned. In the Caribbean itself, it would actually be on one of his ships and we'd go and visit four or five countries a year. When we'd visited South America we'd use his P-3 because of the great distances. These visits were particularly valuable in Latin America, again because our

political relationships with many of the nations were not very warm under the Carter Administration. This made it all the more necessary to try and keep the military-to-military relationship as solid as we could, during this period.

Admiral Train was a master at this. In doing all of this, I was in extremely close touch with the State Department, as well as the Defense Department, and the NSC in the White House. In preparing Admiral Train for these different visits, whether it be to Africa or someplace in Latin America, I'd tell them ahead of time that the Admiral was going to go here, here, and here. First, I'd get their concurrence for the visits, and then ask if there was anything he could do to be helpful? It was a very cooperative program that was welcomed by the White House and the State Department, and often used to their advantage.

Q: Did you have any dealings with Mr. Noriega at the time?

ANDERSON: We called on him very briefly. He was number two. The top fellow wasn't available. Relations were not that good, at all. Let me put it this way. The stop we made in Panama does not stand out as one of the highlights of my tour of duty.

There's one thing, from an historical point of view, that I think might be useful for someone to look into. This has to do with NATO. As we know, a number of our allies, in order to avoid assuming responsibilities in certain parts of the world, even when their interests are at stake, say: "No, this cannot be discussed in NATO, because this problem is outside the NATO area." This is, if I may put it very bluntly, hogwash. I think that a serious scholar could look into this and maybe write a little something about it. Admiral Train and I went over this many times together, and we talked with a number of our friends. In fact, other military leaders agreed completely with us. You have to go back to Article V, and Article VI, of the NATO Treaty. And as you know, Tully, Article V is the article that says, more or less, an attack on one is an attack on all, and each nation will then decide on how it's going to come to the assistance of the nation. It isn't automatic; we couldn't have that completely because of the Vandenberg Resolution.

Article VI of the NATO Treaty defines the NATO area in relationship to Article V. That was very explicit. It said the territories of the NATO countries--the Algerian departments of North Africa, and then the outer limit is the Tropic of Cancer. But they did this with regard to the attack-on-one, attack-on-all clause in Article V.

Now, there is nothing whatsoever in the NATO Treaty which says that if a problem arises, say in the Persian Gulf or South of the Tropic of Cancer, that this cannot be discussed in NATO; there's nothing in the treaty that says that the NATO allies can't get together and do something about that problem.

You have to look very carefully at Article V. A very specific example of the attitude of the military commanders is this--and I checked with Admiral Train last weekend on this one point, as a matter of fact. The Tri-MNC study, that was done when I was with Admiral Train--MNC is Major NATO Command. The Tri-MNC means SACEUR (South of Brussels); SACLANT, who

is Admiral Train; and the third major NATO commander is CINCHAN, Commander in Chief of the Channel, and he's a Brit. And they sat down and drew up their plans.

And one of the plans that they have is that if the sea lanes around South Africa are put into jeopardy, the MNCs will consult and take the action necessary to protect the continuation of the supplies that are necessary for the security and economic well-being of our NATO nations. This is certainly South of the Tropic of Cancer. I think that this, historically, is something that ought to be looked into.

I don't think I need to go into too much more of my assignment with Admiral Train, unless you can think of any particular hole that I've left out. I wanted to just give you a feel for it. It was a fantastic assignment that I enjoyed. And I went on from there to Santo Domingo.

Q: And you felt, generally, by this time, after many years, that we do have a feeling for each other; that is, the Foreign Service, the State Department, Defense, and the military establishment. You're happy about the coordination as of the time you were there?

ANDERSON: Well, I found tremendous cooperation.

Q: Well, I'm thinking a little bit of worldwide attitudes, because I think they have improved immensely, though, over the last 30 years. I was a POLAD [political advisor] in 1955, so I go a long way back on this. [Laughter]

ANDERSON: No, I think it has improved. I think another reason it's improved is there are more and more exchanges of assignments between the State Department and the Defense Department.

There's one point that I do want to go back emphasize the value of the military-to-military relationship, and how deep this is. This has to do with France. Because of my own background in France, and interest in it, I was able to persuade Admiral Train that this is a country that he should become very, very close to. And he did to the point where a most unusual thing happened, because of Admiral Train and his personality.

We went up to Brest, in France, on a number of occasions to visit the huge naval headquarters there. And again I emphasize, because of Admiral Train and the way that he had been able to establish a relationship of confidence with the top military leaders in France, they took us into their nuclear submarine base. They went over every single point of interest to us, not only showing us the submarines, but their plans and everything else. With the French, I have to say that on the military-to-military relationship, an awful lot of things can be done.

If it shifts over into the political leadership, things will not get done. I firmly believe that that is the case today, also. Today, for example, we are having problems with them, with regard to the reunification of Germany; we don't seem to be able, on the political level, to understand each other. On the future of NATO, in light of what's happening, it seems to be a dialogue of the deaf.

But on the military-to-military side, this does not happen. I just wish that we could get a better political dialogue going, and it's something that on the outside, I'm trying to help bring along. Admiral Train was a master with the French. They loved him. He had them coming over, visiting him, all the time in Norfolk. That was just a little addendum there.

I will move now, if you would like, to my last assignment in the Foreign Service, which was as ambassador to the Dominican Republic.

Q: Fine.

ANDERSON: Bill Clark, who was the number-two in the State Department and Al Haig asked me if I would take on this assignment. Al Haig, in particular, wanted to get, shall we say, some outside blood into the Latin American Bureau. He got Dean Hinton down there, and he got Tom Pickering, and two or three others, and I was one of those. This was one of the more challenging assignments I've had. It was a very delicate one, because of the historical relations between the Dominican Republic and the United States, the nearness to the United States, the dependence of the Dominican Republic on the United States, in so many ways.

And anyone that goes down there has to conduct himself or herself, as an ambassador, in a very circumspect way it's so easy to be taken as a governor general or some kind of lord and master even today. I found that the delicateness of this assignment was a great challenge, because you were on the stage 24 hours a day, literally. In anything you did, the Dominicans were watching, and they would report it in the news, on the television, and in the newspapers, etc. So one had to be aware of this.

Q: Just to get us oriented timewise, this was about June 1982, was it?

ANDERSON: Yes. I think I received my call from President Reagan around Thanksgiving, 1981. I actually went out in '82, because, as you know, confirmation takes longer and longer because of all these ethics requirements and every other blessed thing that go on now. I stayed with Admiral Train up until about end of January.

And then I went to the Foreign Service Institute, because I had to learn Spanish; I didn't know any Spanish. This was my first and only assignment in Latin America. And I must say, I managed to get a half decent mark, and within six months, I gave my first press conference down there, and was able to, above all, talk alone with the president. That was the key thing down there.

Well, when I started to prepare myself to go down to the Dominican Republic, they had elections in May of that year, and a gentleman named Salvador Jorge Blanco was elected president. When the U.S. troops went in, in '65, Ellsworth Bunker went down and stayed for a year or more, and brought the opposing civilian factions together to form a government. One of the gentlemen sitting across from him at the table was Salvador Jorge Blanco, who was not considered a conservative by our people, and possibly bad news for us. So here he was elected president, and some of our folks felt that this could be a disaster for the United States. I remember, Dick

Walters--General Vernon Walters--in particular; he knew Joaquin Balaguer, who was president for about 12 years before.

Q: He went in about '63.

ANDERSON: Twelve years, and then he had three terms. He was voted out and a democratic change took place, and a gentleman named Guzmán was made president. I'll mention him in a minute. Then Jorge Blanco, the same party as Guzmán, won the election.

Walters said: "The only person that can really govern this country is Balaguer. All these others are too far to the left." I couldn't understand this very clearly; I didn't know much about Jorge Blanco at all then, except that he was a very successful lawyer from Santiago, who represented a number of American companies. I couldn't see where he was a socialist or anti-private enterprise, or anything else.

And so I asked Ellsworth Bunker, one of the dearest friends I've ever had and one whom I respect very deeply, if he would have lunch with me at the Metropolitan Club to talk to me about the Dominican Republic. And I asked Ellsworth: "You know, I get these readings about Jorge Blanco, who's going to be president, that are not very flattering."

He said: "That's ridiculous. He is a pragmatist. He will be fine as president. He's very bright, brilliant, and he will cooperate. But he's his own man."

I said: "Ellsworth, that is marvelous. Thank you, sir." I did not worry about it from that day on, once I had Ellsworth's very objective and wise counsel.

So I went down there in June and I met President Antonio Guzmán, presented my credentials on a Saturday, two weeks before July Fourth. We agreed we'd meet one week later; I told him I really would like to sit down and have a substantive chat with him. The following Friday night, he had a very serious gunshot wound and died the next day, the day I was supposed to see him.

The only reason I want to go into this a little bit is an example of why I am convinced that the wonderful job that Ellsworth Bunker did, to establish a democratic base back in the mid-'60s was extremely valuable, and it took hold.

The basic answer to establishing a successful democracy in the Dominican Republic was to get the military out of politics. Balaguer, in the beginning, was just the man to take over the leadership of the country after Trujillo, because he worked for Trujillo. He's a *caudillo*. He's a dictator himself. The only difference is Balaguer didn't throw people to the sharks, didn't beat people, kill people. But he was very authoritarian, and if one didn't do things his way, certain economic difficulties might arise: Let's put it that way. He started the process of removing the military from power.

Guzmán, who took over peacefully from Balaguer, was a master at taking further steps to get the military out of power. He would retire some of them; he'd rotate them. That was his greatest contribution to his nation. Because by the time that Jorge Blanco was due to come in, the military

accepted the fact that it no longer was a political force, and that its role was to accept the civilian leadership of the country.

Now, here you had a president who some say shot himself, but I have always said to our own government: "If the Dominicans wish to say that, that's fine. But we should not say that." Because with a suicidal death, as you know, you lose certain rights of the church and all sorts of other things.

Q: The only record I found on this, in my hasty review, refers to it as suicide.

ANDERSON: That's right. They did. But I told our embassy: "We're never going to say this," and we didn't.

Now here, mind you, I had been in the country about ten days. I received a call at 11:00 at night, from the palace, from a General Imbert Berrera, who was the man that drove the car, that had the people in it who shot Trujillo. He was an advisor to Guzmán in the palace. I had not yet met him. He called me to tell me what had happened, and asked if I could get some medical help to save his life. I got hold of the watch officer at the White House, and in point of fact, we were able to get a medical plane out of Holmstead Air Force Base down right away. But it came too late. I think that probably he was virtually dead when Berrera called me.

I called my staff together and asked: "Okay, this is what's happened. According to the Constitution, what's the next step? Because here you have the president, who remains president until August 15, when Jorge Blanco is supposed to be inaugurated. So we have a 45-day period here, where somebody else will get to be president. I assume it's the vice president. Is that right?" And so we got out the Constitution and there was a specific article calling for him to take over immediately.

I called back General Imbert Berrera immediately. I didn't want to see anything happen here, where the military might suddenly do something in this very unusual situation. I told him: "I know Washington will be extremely interested in what's going to happen now." This was after he confirmed to me that he had died. I said: "According to your Constitution," and I was able to read him the articles and everything else, over the phone, "I understand this, this, and this are supposed to happen." I said: "I assume that actions are being taken right now to install the vice president as the civilian president for the balance of this administration."

And he said: "Oh, yes, yes, yes, yes."

I said: "Well, I'm delighted. And I wish you would tell the people at the palace, and the new president, that I am so informing Washington right away. And I wish you'd also, if any of the military leadership is there, tell them that, too, would you please."

And they got the message, I can tell you, because 72 hours later I received a call from this General Berrera. I had since been to Santiago and attended the funeral as one of the pallbearers. General Berrera: "The military leadership would like to pay a formal call on you at the embassy."

I said: "Fine. Is there any particular reason?"

"They want to assure you of their loyalty to the constitutional system."

I said: "That's wonderful." They came over to my house. Two or three of my staff were also there. The Chiefs of all the Services came in full dress uniform. They had a formal document they all signed (the president, who had just taken over, also signed it) stating their total loyalty to the Constitution. I made a few remarks, thanked them for their courtesy and said I would report this meeting to Washington immediately.

I think that gives about as good an example as any to say that the roots of democracy were firmly implanted in the Dominican Republic. I would never be so foolish as to say that a hurricane couldn't uproot them, but it's going to take a pretty, pretty strong wind to have the country revert to any kind of a military dictatorship.

Now, as for Jorge Blanco himself, the president. I guess this was the second week I was there, a few days after the funeral took place for President Guzmán. Tom Enders, who was assistant secretary of state for Latin America, telephoned me and said: "Look, we'd like to have Jorge Blanco, the fellow who's going to be president, come up to Washington and see the president. The president would like to discuss Central America. And maybe the president-elect, might like to go up to Congress and see some people." Remember he wasn't even president.

Q: This was before he was inaugurated?

ANDERSON: Yes, he was still president-elect. The fellow that took his place was of the same party, but a political opponent of his within the party.

Q: That is the vice president.

ANDERSON: Who was now president, for this 45 days. And so here we were asking Jorge Blanco to leave, go to Washington as president-elect with a 45-day president in office. I thought this was quite something. I didn't know him at all then, and had to persuade him to do this. He did it on one condition. He said: "If you will go with me. I have to do it that way. Otherwise, the people won't understand."

Q: Will think that you're getting him out of the way, in order to--

ANDERSON: Or that it really is urgent, for the President of the United States wants to see me, etc.

And so I was out at the airfield. I walked across the tarmac and flew to Washington with him, and was with him on all his calls. He then established a very good relationship, before he ever became president, with our president and with our leadership because he supported us in Central America.

At one point I said: "I think, Mr. President, that this could stand you in good stead in the future." And it certainly did. U.S. assistance when I arrived there or the year before, was \$30 million a year, and increased to \$160 million just before I left in August, 1985. He deserved every bit of it for the help he gave us on the Caribbean Basin initiative legislation and on Nicaragua.

On Nicaragua there's an interesting story he told me, and I think this can now be told. He did some very helpful things.

Q: Ambassador Anderson, I'm afraid we were cut off in the middle of a sentence there, but can you recapture where you were and continue?

ANDERSON: I'll try, Tully. I believe I was just starting to talk about some very valuable things that President Jorge Blanco did, with regard to helping us in Nicaragua. He used to see the Nicaraguan Foreign Minister, earlier a Catholic priest, if I'm not mistaken. President Jorge Blanco told me of one particular meeting with him, to try and convince him of the intentions of the United States with regard to Nicaragua.

He told the foreign minister he was absolutely convinced that the United States had no intention whatsoever of invading and occupying Nicaragua. Jorge said to the foreign minister: "And I'll tell you why I'm telling you this. You may remember that the United States came into my country militarily in 1965. They're not there now, and they left after a year. If they had not come in, I would not be here today, facing you as a freely elected president of a democratic nation. Believe me. If you could transform your policy so you could become a democratic nation, you wouldn't have anything to worry about as far as the Americans are concerned." I thought this was quite a statement to make.

One other point on the military intervention of President Johnson in 1965. We should remember, I think, very clearly, that when the Marines went in then, it was not like previous interventions in the Dominican Republic to take over the country so we could collect taxes, and create a Trujillo. We unwittingly created Trujillo. You know that. Our military trained him and thought he was just a great fellow.

I'm going to make a statement now which I'm prepared to argue with anybody. Our military intervention in 1965 was strictly limited to separate two warring factions, and to prevent deaths. There was a line we wanted to protect in Santo Domingo. We didn't go all over the country. That intervention was probably one of the most successful foreign-policy actions we have taken since World War II, with regard to the use of military force.

Why do I say that? Because today you have probably the most solid democracy in the entire area. That would not have taken place but for this very limited, precise action, and an incredibly skillful, patient effort by Ellsworth Bunker. The 20th anniversary of the our intervention took place when I was in the Dominican Republic. There were a few reports that communists, leftists and assorted radicals were going to stage huge demonstrations. My security officer was battenning down all the hatches. He was having a fit. I wasn't that concerned, personally, nor was my DCM,

although we noted that the biggest university was just down the road and was very leftist and radical and had students who would demonstrate about anything at the drop of a hat.

So we went to work that morning and were waiting for all hell to break loose. Finally, around 9:00 or 9:30 in the morning, about 20 or 25 bedraggled students came walking down the road with a few placards protesting our military invasion 20 years ago. The security officer came and told me about this. I said: "Well, that's great. Let's go down and see them."

And the security officer was having a fit. "You can't do that."

I asked: "There are about 20 of them out there, or something, right?"

He said: "Yes." I went out on the street, talked to them, and invited them in for coffee. That was the demonstration marking the 20th anniversary of our military intervention. The Dominicans themselves know the value of that intervention. I thought that this little historical footnote would be of interest. I haven't had anybody really dispute me when I cite this is an example of, perhaps, the most successful political use of military force, since World War II.

One point about Jorge Blanco and Ellsworth Bunker. It has to do with the inauguration of Jorge Blanco in August 1982. There was a gentleman who was going to be the head of the delegation for the United States, named James Watt, who was the Secretary of Interior. I had earlier made a number of recommendations on who should be on the delegation and who should head it. I had suggested Ellsworth Bunker as an ideal head. the selection became very political. The ball was being thrown around in Washington on who should head the delegation.

When James Watt was picked to head the delegation, I telephoned Washington--I will not say to whom--and said: "I will not be present." I was a brand-new ambassador who had just arrived. I said: "Forget it. This is most inappropriate. He has nothing whatsoever to do with this country. It isn't going to mean anything. And he is very controversial in the United States already. I don't want to be around."

Fortunately for the Dominicans as well as me, he became ill and couldn't come. Ellsworth Bunker, my original suggestion was made the head of the delegation and he came. Jorge Blanco hadn't seen him since they were sitting across the table that I mentioned to you before, negotiating back in '65 and '66.

The night before the inauguration, Jorge invited the American delegation to come over to the palace. The whole delegation marched over, and I led them into Jorge's office. I stood aside, because I knew I didn't have to do much by way of introduction. There were Jorge Blanco, the former negotiator for his country's independence, who was going to head his country, and Ellsworth Bunker, the man who made this possible.

Jorge Blanco saw Ellsworth, rushed up to him, threw his arms around him and started to cry. It was a very moving and touching scene. I can't think of a better person that the United States could have had to be the head of our delegation. I mean, Tom Enders was on the delegation. Russ

Doherty was there, the labor leader, who knows Latin America well. They had some good people on it. Bill Middendorf was another one; he and his wife came down. But this relationship between Bunker and Jorge Blanco was such a precious thing to watch.

Now, a first that took place between the United States and the Dominican Republic. This is hard to believe, and I couldn't believe it for a long time. It was a visit that Jorge Blanco made later on. When I was fighting to get some kind of an official visit, I found out that despite the fact that we had had diplomatic relations since about 1890 there had never been an official visit, or a state visit, by a Dominican chief of state to the United States.

Some people said: "Yeah, but Trujillo used to come up here." Well, he might have come up--

Q: But it wasn't--

ANDERSON: No official or State visit. So I used this with the White House, and I kept pointing out the help we were getting from Jorge on the CBI and Central America. And so, lo and behold, it was made not an official, but a state visit. I wasn't even pushing for a state visit, which, as you know so well, Tully, is much harder to pull off. We had a most successful visit with President Reagan. He came to know Bush very well. This first state visit, or official visit of any kind, was another accomplishment of Jorge Blanco, which was so helpful in our relationships with his country.

Do you remember when I was down there, we went into Grenada?

Q: Yes.

ANDERSON: Eugenia Charles, who was the Prime Minister of Dominica, came up here on behalf of the Eastern Caribbean states, to request the United States' help, because they didn't have enough forces to correct this very anarchic situation that was going on in Grenada.

I was awakened early on the morning of the invasion by Washington, and was asked to go over and tell the president just before it was going to happen, and seek his understanding. So I got word to his staff and I was over seeing him at 7:00 in the morning. I told him about it, our action in Grenada that would soon take place, and why we were doing it. He looked at me and said: "Look, you obviously know that I can't come out publicly and praise this. I'm not going to say anything. I'm just going to remain silent. But I think you know the way I feel." There was no criticism of our activity from him.

That same day, a prominent political leader named Pena Gomez of the same party as Jorge Blanco--he's black, very active, very dynamic, charismatic, but who has some very strong views on certain subjects--was coming over for a one-on-one lunch. By that time, the news was out that we were all in Grenada and things were coming under control. Pena stormed through the door, and I said: "Oh, I can see we're going to have a nice lunch, aren't we, Pena." He proceeded to upbraid me for the invasion. I went through the scenario with him in detail. He said: "You cannot go around invading these countries. Who do you think you are?"

I said: "We went in at the request of others to help return the country to peace."

When Pena countered with: "That isn't good enough," I became exasperated with him, and said: "All right, Pena, I'll tell you what. Except for Cuba, the Dominican Republic is the largest nation in the Caribbean in area and in population, including Jamaica and all the other English-speaking nations."

Pena: "So?"

I: "You don't disagree there was an anarchic situation in Grenada that had to be taken care of. And you didn't like the Cubans there, right?"

Pena: "Right."

I: "Well if you people could assume your responsibilities in the Caribbean, seeing that you have a few airplanes and some other assets, maybe Prime Minister Eugenia Charles could have come to you and asked the Dominican Republic to go in and help them. But I guess they felt that you probably would say no. If you had taken a more positive attitude, and assumed a leadership role, maybe we would not have had to play a role in Grenada."

That shook him. He said: "I have to admit that you have something here." We remained very close friends. But I thought that the Jorge Blanco reaction to Grenada was something that ought to be noted.

Now, I don't propose to go on any more with the Dominican Republic. If you have anything in mind, on the Dominican Republic or anything else where I might be helpful, you have only to ask.

Q: Just to bring this record up to date a little bit, what is the present status in the leadership of the Dominican Republic? Is it still as hopeful as it was?

ANDERSON: That's an important question. The president is elected every four years. There was an election in May, '86. Believe it or not, Joaquin Balaguer was reelected, again, for the fourth time. He's totally blind.

Q: A bit over the hill, I gather?

ANDERSON: He is quite old. He's in his eighties. He hasn't changed his thinking. The thing that became apparent when he took over in his fourth term, having been out of office for eight years, was that he didn't realize that the country has progressed economically, and that there is now a very important, burgeoning middle class which is the real key of the nation, the real kernel of the nation's future. He just ignores this.

He still likes to go out on the weekends, go into an area and give small bits of land to peasants. That's the *caudillo* approach that he has. That's economically a disaster. You take large land holdings and divide them up into little, tiny plots owned by different people and you're not going to get little economic production out of them.

Another thing that he's done, which disappoints me about as much as anything. He wants to build buildings just so people remember him; he's printing money to do it. Jorge Blanco didn't print a note. One governor in the Center Bank tried to print some notes and he was fired. That's why Jorge Blanco was able to conclude agreements with the IMF and the World Bank. That's why he was able to get a lot more aid, because he showed himself a serious leader. That was great.

Balaguer is just the opposite. Inflation is now running rampant. The current tragedy is there is an election, Tully, next month, in May. There are two candidates. Balaguer is running again! The other principal candidate is Juan Bosch, a Marxist-Leninist, very leftist, just about as old as Balaguer. He can see, at least.

This is a most unfortunate development for the Dominican Republic, and this is the one thing that I'm unhappy about. I talked to you earlier about the democratic evolution and the fact that the roots of democracy are getting imbedded in the Dominican Republic. I feel that Balaguer has had a stranglehold on the country. As he won't nominate a successor to his party, others don't wish to fight it. There are some very competent younger people who are coming up, who cannot really take part in the political life of the country the way they should. If this goes on this way, this structure may start to weaken. That's what disappoints me. But I still don't feel that there's a military coup in the offing, or anything like that.

Q: It's not hopeless, yet?

ANDERSON: No, but it's not a healthy situation. Does that answer the question?

Q: I think it does, very much, indeed, although it doesn't leave one exactly thrilled.

Well, now do you have any comments on the generality of the United States policy and handling of Latin America? Has it become more sophisticated and matured? Do you think we are generally on the right track these days, or is there a peculiarity about our relationship with Latin America which needs to be corrected? What are your general observations on what American policy should be, and American conduct should be, diplomatically, towards Latin America?

ANDERSON: Let me go about it this way. After I finish this comment, I want you to remind me to talk about the Foreign Service in Latin America.

Q: Right. In a way, it was an implicit part of my question.

ANDERSON: I am very pleased with the way that the Bush Administration is handling our Latin American policy. I think that President Bush--and I know that he recognizes this, because he and

I have talked about it in the past--recognizes the necessity to consult with Latin American leaders before the United States goes in and tries to take a political or other action.

Let me give you a very explicit example. As you know, the Organization of American States, the OAS, has long been considered a virtually useless organization, because of United States dominance of the organization in the eyes of our Latin American friends. They, therefore, will not allow controversial political subjects to be discussed or acted on, in the OAS forum. They're all there, huddled together, virtually against the United States. That's one of the reasons the OAS has not been very successful.

Now President Bush comes into office. They had these elections in Panama that, as we all know, were a total fraud. What did President Bush do about that? He did something that is almost without precedent, and I give him full marks here, and this is indicative of the way I believe he wants to try and handle our relations with Latin America.

We had our own views about what we might like to do, regarding these elections I don't think it was military action at all but rather certain political actions. So how do you go about trying to accomplish what you would like to see done? You talk privately with the key leaders of Latin America first, before you say anything publicly. The result was amazing. Carlos Andrés Pérez, the president of Venezuela, was in the lead here. But this highly controversial political subject was discussed in the OAS. The United States was not in the lead in the discussions. It was three or four Latin American leaders that took the lead. The U.S. would then support their positions.

The result was unusual. A commission was formed, headed by the secretary general of the OAS, and three or four members, and was charged to go to Panama and investigate what happened. Now it's very true that they went down, investigated, came back condemned what had taken place. The OAS then voted to condemn it. But, as expected didn't vote for action against a fellow Latin American country.

That's all right, as far as I'm concerned, as a starter. Through this action, the president was able to move the OAS back into the political ball game. So now if a subject dealing with the American continent comes up, it doesn't have to go into the U.N., where you face all sorts of other problems. The OAS can now be a channel for action. This is why that was an excellent move.

Now, you could very well say, "Well, what about the invasion of Panama?" Well, I personally feel that it was a correct move. There was no choice but to do that. I am not privy to the inner counsels of our government now, but I would be willing to wager a bet that there was prior consultation, quietly, with certain leaders. I just feel it in my bones.

Q: There must have been, yes, obviously; or you'd have had much more criticism.

ANDERSON: I can tell you that, privately, Carlos Andrés Pérez had no problem with it. I also noticed one other thing. The president of Peru, you may remember, came out after the invasion and excoriated our president saying: "This is the most imperialistic move I've ever seen." Of course, he has an election right now, (and I don't think he's going to win, either). But you know,

with an election going on; he had to say something like this. He also said: "If you think I'm going to go to this drug summit in Cartagena, with that president who's invaded one of our fellow Latin American countries, you're crazy." He was the first one to meet him at Cartagena; threw his arms around him, cooperated fully. [Laughter]

So you see why I think that the way the president's handling our relations with Latin America is quite different than before. The way, for example, he comported himself at the drug summit. He didn't go down there the way, probably, some of his predecessors might have, and start telling them how they should do things.

First, he went down and said: "This is a two-pronged problem. There's a supply side and demand side. The demand side is my fault, my responsibility. We have to do better. I'd like to hear any thoughts you have."

Then he said: "The supply side is your problem." Then he didn't start saying all the things that they weren't doing right. He said: "Now, we're trying to help you now. Is this help useful? Is there any other way that you feel we, together, can try and work on the supply-side problem?" Approached it in a collegial, not dictatorial way. I think that that is a very good approach.

He saw the president-elect of Brazil two or three times up here, before he took over. I don't know whether this poor guy's going to be able to make it or not. He has a handful of problems that he will have to work on. Our President's concern about them, and the attention he gave to the President-elect should be helpful.

There's a change here and I look forward to the president continuing to try and work things out with Latin America. The initiative of trying to conclude a free trade pact with Mexico, the way we did with Canada is another indication.

Q: Well, you said you might also have some thoughts, though, on our diplomatic representation in South America.

ANDERSON: Yes. You and I have been in this business a long time. Having served on five different continents, and therefore having served in a number of bureaus, and especially having been the spokesman of the State Department, where I had to deal with each bureau every day for my daily press conferences, I have felt that the staffing in Latin America was the weakest that we have. It was ingrown. Most of our career people in this area have big blinders on. They're very happy, they're contented, because in the old days they'd enter the Service, get a Latin American assignment, and just stay in the area for their whole career. One reason they liked it is that there were more countries, so they could end up as an ambassador, hopefully. Other's in the bureau weren't really interested in Latin America.

One has to realize that unless you have an area where there are real problems, the national leadership isn't going to think about it. The Congress isn't going to think about it. Therefore, your top officers are not going to want to spend their career dealing with issues that are of no concern to anybody but themselves.

I'm not trying to be--what should I say--critical of these officers. If I had started out in the Latin American Bureau, as a young fellow, and all my colleagues that started out in the Latin American office were staying in Latin America--and you get to know your friends as you go from assignment to assignment--I might have ended up like that. I kind of doubt this though, because my intellectual pursuits were broader than just Latin America. In fact, I never was excited about Latin America that much, because the area did not deal with the major problems in the world affecting the United States, especially before Castro came into power.

When I was spokesman of the State Department, I'd have to go to each bureau to obtain suggested answers to the questions each day. From the Latin American Bureau I couldn't get straight answers; they were afraid of the press. They didn't want to answer. I would say: "You have to answer, or I've got to answer. If you can't give me one, I'll get it and I'll tell you what I'm going to say after I've said it. You can listen to what I'm going to tell the press." It used to make me absolutely livid.

When Bill Rogers took over under Kissinger as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, before he went up as Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, it was a different story. It was wonderful. He came from the outside. I would have to go to him every morning to get answers to questions, and some were pretty piddling. But I couldn't get it out of his public affairs people or the desk officers, or the office directors lots of times. They just didn't do it.

Q: Of course, the history of the bureau, I think, is that the top ranks of government, the White House and so on, have not always been that interested in that bureau.

ANDERSON: Well, that's what I was saying.

Q: But a lot of businessmen have been very interested. And the pressure has sometimes come in, I think, through the business community, who had specific interests there. I wonder if that has an effect on things in some way; that they get a slightly warped view. Anyway, it's a very interesting problem.

ANDERSON: I am sure that the American business community--particularly in the past, when you had W.R. Grace and Company and some of these giants--I'm sure they had an influence. And they're the only ones, probably, in America that cared at all, about Latin America.

Q: Well, United Fruit, the copper companies, all of those.

ANDERSON: Yes! ITT was down in Chile. Yes. But this did not attract the top people in our service. You know that yourself. You were in European affairs.

Q: Well, it's accidental in my case. [Laughter]

ANDERSON: I'm not saying that none of them were any good, at all. It's just that their optic was limited, because their entire careers were focused on this hemisphere. And, you know, there are

things going on in Europe and Africa and other places that have an effect on Latin America. And they wouldn't be interested.

They had this one program that I did approve of very much, called the GLOP. I don't know whether you ever heard of that or not. The GLOP program meant that if you were a specialist in an area every so many years you had to serve out of the area for at least one tour of duty.

Q: Yes.

ANDERSON: You know, the European boys loved Europe. This is one of the reasons that this came. Get these guys over to Africa. Let them get their feet dirty. But also for Latin America. Get them out and let the blinders be removed. And then they'd be tremendous officers.

Q: One of the things that I like to get people to talk just a minute or two about is what they did after they retired; because you, of all people, and many other people, have done some very important and interesting things in retirement. And I think it's interesting, historically, to report that. And I wonder if you'd like to just take two or three minutes to say what you have been doing and what your future objectives are, if you have any?

ANDERSON: Well, I have been very active since I retired. Unfortunately, I lost my wife very unexpectedly, six months after I retired in December, '85. Particularly after that, I just had to get going and do things. I think I'm getting out of the trauma now because of being active. I'm busy in consulting work. A couple of law officers here call me up, and they have a problem, and they ask me if I can help out. The consulting firm here is a friend of mine I mentioned earlier, I think, Donald Agger. I help him on occasion. I have a retainership with a couple of corporations, that keep me busy. I was just made a director of the Atlantic Council of the U.S.A., which thrills me very much.

And I'm working now with Paul Nitze and Tim Stanley--Dr. Timothy Stanley--to try and, maybe, come up urgently with a paper on our objectives in Europe and elsewhere in the world, in light of this rapidly changing world? I don't think we really have thought it through. And then once we've figured that out, then how are we going to fulfill these objectives?

I chaired a meeting the other day at the Atlantic Council, and the subject came up of what organizations can the U.S. use in order to make sure our influence is brought to bear in the evolving East-West picture. I was disappointed in the discussion as it called for yet another grouping, and so stated at the meeting. Joe Fowler, the ex-secretary of the Treasury, was there, and said: "Bob, I couldn't agree more." Because people were searching for a new organization; create a new bureaucracy, a new secretariat. The trouble is, we have too damned many organizations now. There are plenty of organizations. Let's use them more efficiently to suit this changing world of ours.

Q: Well, that ought to be very fascinating.

ANDERSON: I was asked to be a trustee of the Burns International Center, that's attached to the University of South Carolina; Bill Brock is the chairman of it.

Q: One of the best men who ever served in government, Bill Brock.

ANDERSON: I think he's wonderful. And it's a very international board. It has many Europeans that I've known for years. Peter Carrington is on it; and Stevie Davignon, who's president of the Société General, Villier Pagniez, who used to be chairman of Renault and Mitterrand's ambassador here when he first was elected president. And I enjoy working with them. And I'm trying to help out on the Caribbean and European matters.

I don't know, Tully. I have more than enough to do, I can assure you. And little things keep coming up daily. The main thing I'd like to make sure I am able to do this year is to go to the French Open Tennis Tournament. And I've been invited to Wimbledon again. And I want to do those two things, come hell or high water. I hope my business doesn't prevent me from doing it.

I'm very active and I think that Foreign Service people have so much to offer, really. If they just can have confidence in themselves and make themselves known, particularly if they've dealt with American business. I always did that as an ambassador. My top priority was to help American business abroad. That is why I was offered many of the things I am doing today. I was helpful to American business abroad in the Service, and this became known to corporations back here. You would be surprised how well the bamboo telegraph works in our industrial world. And that is a thing that all Foreign Service people should try and do.

Q: Well, it's certainly one of our major objectives. Well, thank you very much, indeed.

End of interview