

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

**AMBASSADOR BETTY CRITES DILLON**

*Interviewed by: Ann Miller Morin*  
*Initial interview date: December 9, 1987*  
*Copyright Ann Miller Morin (used with permission)*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Childhood and Education

- Frequent family moves
- High School in San Francisco
- Miss California 1939 - Outstanding Outdoor Girl
- Initiation into Blackfeet Indian tribe
- University of San Francisco
- University of Indiana
- Impressions of Japanese internment

Professional Beginnings

- Secretary - San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
- Staff assistant - Kaiser Shipyard
- Burns-Philp Co. - Assistant
- RCA - Communications Work for UN Charter Conference
- U.S. Chamber of Commerce - Washington, D.C., Executive Secretary
- Life in Washington, Segregation

Presidential Campaign

- 1948

- Candidate Harold Stassen's Washington Office - Manager
- Republican Convention in Philadelphia
- Comments on Republican Party, on Stassen

San Francisco

- International Trading company - Assistant to President
- Philippines Airline account
- 1952 National Campaign - Republican Congressional District, Chairman
- Northern California Campaign Chairman for Stassen
- Comments on Eisenhower, Campaign Dynamics, Republican Party
- Harold Stassen
- Overseas National Airways Inspector - Route, Service, Facilities

## Washington

Foreign Operations Administration - Special Assistant for  
Management  
Technical Assistance Programs for Women

## Aviation

Pilot's License, Personal Aircraft  
Commanding Officer, Civil Air Patrol Squadron  
Parachute Accident  
Overseas National Airways - Assistant Vice President  
Civil Aeronautics Board - Air Transport Examiner for Africa and Middle East  
Department of State - on loan for air transport policy development  
Princeton - Mid-career Fellowship Program

## Peace Corps

Tunisia, Acting Director  
Sri Lanka, Director (First Female PC Director)  
Life in Peace Corps, Schools, Food, Relations with Embassy, Illness

## Montreal - International Civil Aviation Organization

Chief of mission to ICAO, rank of minister  
First US woman permanent representative to a UN agency  
Senate confirmation, swearing-in, presentation of credentials

## Montreal - Operations

Committees on Finance, Air Navigation, Air Transport, Hijacking  
Head of Delegation to UN-New York for ICAO Assessments  
Relations with Soviets  
Chinese Membership Issue  
Relations with Washington Agencies

## Montreal - Mission Activities

Staffing  
VIP's  
Staff Meetings  
Importance of Inter-cultural Sensitivities  
Heavy Representational Schedule

## Montreal - International Aviation Problems

Israeli Downing of Libyan Plane  
Foreign Competition in Technical Equipment  
Saturation of Facilities Following Deregulation  
Malaise of Aviation Personnel  
Comments on Air Controllers' Strike

Montreal - Candidate for Secretary General of ICAO  
Successful French Campaign for Own Candidate  
Poor Diplomatic Support by US  
Fatal Illness of Sister

Montreal - Activities  
Trip to Soviet Union  
US Observer to Latin American Civil Aviation Conference at Montevideo  
Post Inspection  
Relations with Consulate General  
Threatened Strike of Pilots over Hijacking  
Serious Poisoning from Pesticide at Residence  
Role of Mission Wives  
Typical Day

Termination of Appointment  
Unexpected Dismissal

Washington  
Consultant at Department of State  
Head of Delegation to World Aeronautical Radio Conference at Geneva  
No Further Assignments - Retirement

Nairobi Conference on Women  
Coordinator and Member of Delegation  
Difficulties with Maureen Reagan  
Limited Responsibilities  
Resignation

Other Activities  
Lecture Tour of Africa for USIA  
Tunisia - Peace Corps director for One Year

Advice for Women Careerists

Reflections

Sexual Discrimination  
Dismissed for Rejecting Proposition  
Company Conference at Wings Club  
Meeting at Army-Navy Club  
Comments of a Superior  
Reported Embassy Position on Women as Secretary  
General of ICAO

## Comments about Women

- Opportunities for Women
- Advantages of Beginning as a Secretary
- Career vs. Marriage
- Trailblazer - First Woman in All Positions
- Fitting Into a Male Society
- Advantages to Being a Woman
- Setbacks to Women's Movement

## Appendix

- Family Sheet
- Curriculum vitae
- List of Women Chiefs of Mission
- Release form
- Bibliography
- About the Interviewer

## INTERVIEW

*Q: We spoke together last spring about your life, and I wonder if we could go right back to the very beginning and talk about where you were born, what your parents' background was, and what it was like growing up in your town.*

DILLON: I'm afraid we've launched upon a complex discussion right from the start, because I really didn't have--and I don't have--a hometown. I was born in Tucson, Arizona. Do you want the date?

*Q: Shall we put it in right here--July 18, 1923.*

DILLON: My parents were both from the east. My father was with Western Union. He was born in West Virginia, and the rest of his family is there. My mother was from southern Indiana, and she had come out to Tucson because, as a university student in Indiana, she had acquired what they thought was tuberculosis. In any case, there was a medical problem and she was sent out to Arizona to recuperate. She was working at the Western Union and they met there and were married. My sister and I were both born in Tucson, but we left there at a very young age, after three or four years. I think, even so, those very, very early years were important, as they are to every human being.

Arizona had been a state not for many years, you see, and we were there on the Mexican border. Tucson was a very small town. The Mexican influence was very, very strong. The Indian influence was strong--the Papagos and the Yaquis. So much of that, even though I don't remember a great deal of the detail, has stayed with me over the years. It was a very early orientation into an international, multi-cultural kind of atmosphere.

*Q: Yes, indeed. You have just the one sister?*

DILLON: I had just the one sister. I lost her very tragically a few years ago, and perhaps we can get into that when we come to that item on the chronology.

*Q: Were you the first child?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: What was the background of your parents? That is to say, their parents and their parents' parents. You say your father was from West Virginia. Was he of Scottish origin?*

DILLON: Primarily German. My name was Crites, which I think over the centuries came from perhaps Kreitz or something like that. A very strong German background. His father was a Methodist minister, so I acquired a great religious sensitivity early on. As a matter of fact, my mother and father founded University Methodist Church in Tucson, Arizona, during those few years we were there.

*Q: Was your father a lay minister?*

DILLON: No. My father was a technician with the Western Union, a very competent one. But he simply had inherited that. Having grown up in a parsonage, he inherited that marvelous religious background. Mother, on the other hand, had come from a Quaker background just one or two generations before. So together they brought a very real sense of the importance of religion.

*Q: Indeed they would. Could I have your parents' full names right here before I forget to ask you?*

DILLON: My mother was Ruby Claire Kern Crites. My father was Marvin Crites, no middle name. He was named after Bishop Marvin of West Virginia, who was the Methodist bishop there when he was born.

*Q: Then religion played, as you say, a large part in your early life. You went to Sunday school?*

DILLON: Oh, yes! Sundays were very important days. We lived at the church. Mother was the Epworth League sponsor, the old Epworth League, and my father was on the board of the church and so forth. And I might say that kind of church involvement was there all through my formative years wherever we were. As you'll see, my father was transferred by the Western Union very frequently from one place to another and where he was needed. But always very soon after arriving in a new town, we became involved with church activities.

*Q: So it gave you a feeling of comfort, I should suppose, because it was something that was very familiar, even though you had the upheaval of moving.*

DILLON: Sure.

*Q: Continuity.*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: What kind of a home was it? Your parents were both of Germanic background. Were they very authoritarian?*

DILLON: Mother was of Scottish background as well. No, I wouldn't say that at all. We simply had really unspoken kinds of disciplines with respect to our family and social life. They were never questioned. We behaved in keeping with the ten commandments and "church discipline", and that was understood. There was never, that I can recall, any disciplinary action on the part of my mother or father.

*Q: Is that so?*

DILLON: In the sense of restrictions. We were never hit. Never, never, never.

*Q: You just behaved because it was expected of you.*

DILLON: It was the thing to do. That was the family--

*Q: Was it a very loving family? Was there a great deal of cuddling and hugging?*

DILLON: No. It was a very, very close family, but not an expressive one, a demonstrative one, not at all.

*Q: Did you feel closer to one parent than to another?*

DILLON: That's hard to say. In the one sense, I perhaps was closer to my father, but my mother, if there was a dominant one between the two, it was my mother. She was a very strong person. But because my father was quiet and in many ways self-sacrificing, as people had to be over the years--well, Mother was, too, for that matter, but he was simply the quiet person that I revered very, very much.

*Q: It wasn't a case of being Daddy's little girl and you could get him to do anything you wanted?*

DILLON: Oh, no! Of course, this was a very modest background, as I'm sure you see. We're also talking about not only the '20s, but the early '30s and the Depression period, and there wasn't even a question of getting everything you wanted, not in that atmosphere.

*Q: Certainly not. Mother, however, didn't work outside the home?*

DILLON: No. She started working during the Second World War as an accountant and worked for several years before they retired. While we were in school, she didn't work. I don't think it was a very deliberate decision on her part. I think she simply was the mother and the wife and the homemaker, and that was our whole family orientation. Of course, in those years women didn't have all the choices they have now, in any case. She started working primarily during the war effort, as part of the war effort, and then continued on for a few years afterward.

*Q: Yes, World War II gave a great many women opportunities that they had not had before. It liberated them in many ways. She was an accountant, you say. Your father's family were back in West Virginia, and your mother's family were originally from Indiana. Did you have any relations with your grandparents? Did you have uncles and aunts and cousins?*

DILLON: Yes, but we didn't see them often. My Grandfather Crites passed away in the early or mid-'30s. We were there at the time he passed away. They sent for us and we were there for a week or so. My Grandmother Kern passed away in 1929. We were in Seattle. We had come the summer before to Indiana because it was cancer and she was very ill at that time. So we had a good visit with her during the summer. But then when she passed away the following year, I guess my mother only came, but that was early on, 1929. So we didn't see as much of the West Virginia family as perhaps we should have. We were always somehow tied to Mother's family in Indiana, the old farm there, I think primarily because of the property. It has become the home place. That's where I go and come now.

*Q: So it's still in the family.*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: That's wonderful. Did you have a sense of belonging when you went back there as a little child?*

DILLON: Not at that time, but I certainly do now. It's developed over the years, especially since we not only moved and traveled so much in the early years, but because of my career I have continued that lifestyle. The old farm is there, and that's about the only thing that stays there permanently, unchanging.

*Q: Were your parents part of large families?*

DILLON: No. My mother had one brother who was in the west for a while, but then he returned to Indiana. His family was there. My father had a larger family. There were three boys and a girl who were the children of his mother, who passed away when the girl was born, the youngest sister. This was in the late 1800s. Then my grandfather remarried a

very, very fine woman whom we knew as Grandmother Crites, because she was the only one we ever knew. By her there were three or four girls.

*Q: So that was a large family, but you didn't really see them very often?*

DILLON: No.

*Q: So they didn't impinge much on your consciousness as a child?*

DILLON: No.

*Q: What about cousins?*

DILLON: There were a number of cousins there.

*Q: Any visiting back and forth?*

DILLON: No.

*Q: It was because of the times. I understand that.*

DILLON: We did see our two cousins by my mother's brother occasionally, but I think that was simply because they were in the west a short while. They were in Tucson while we were there. They were married while we were there as little ones. Then they stayed there and lived there for a number of years after my family had to transfer and move on. So simply because we had that western connection, I think we were a little closer to them, perhaps.

*Q: I think it's usually the case that one is closer to the mother's family.*

DILLON: Perhaps.

*Q: Because women are better at keeping up relationships, so I think that tends to be true. Did you write to your grandmothers, either one of them? Did you have any feeling of closeness to a grandmother? I'm just getting at the women figures in your life.*

DILLON: Sure. My Grandmother Kern, I felt very close to, although she passed away when I was five, six years old, you see. But I remember her. I remember being with her at the old farm. She was a very quiet woman. I don't remember her voice. I don't remember her speaking. I don't remember her smiling. In recent years I've thought back. I don't remember what kind of teeth she had, for example.

It was her family that were the Quakers. I'm not suggesting that there was any direct connection, but I think probably she inherited a certain reserve as a Quaker girl, and then being a farm wife and mother in the midwest during those years, it was not an easy life.

She had graduated from Normal School, a two-years' teachers college in the area, and was teaching when she and my grandfather were married. I still have her little--she had a little calling card printed up with a little red rosebud on it, Emma Belle Boyd, when she was teaching. They weren't married until she was, I think, perhaps in her late twenties and my grandfather was in his early thirties. No, I beg your pardon. She was a year older than he, so I think they were both in their late twenties, but not youngsters, certainly.

*Q: Times were very difficult for almost all Americans, certainly. Were you people hit by any childhood illnesses?*

DILLON: Yes. We had the childhood illnesses. We had chicken pox. I had the mumps. My sister never had the mumps, which is very unusual. We had measles.

*Q: Scarlet fever?*

DILLON: Yes, we had what was called scarlet fever, and at the same time what was called diphtheria. As I recall, we had it on Christmas! (Laughter) So it was a very big event in life.

*Q: Were you old enough to remember the diphtheria?*

DILLON: Yes. Well, I can tell you exactly.

*Q: That was a killer.*

DILLON: Yes, it was. It must have been in about '31 or '32.

*Q: Was it a question of possibly losing you?*

DILLON: It was very serious. I recall we were quarantined, which was a big thing in those days. It was very serious for a while, but we were kept bundled up and the doctor came and went. Lord knows what they gave us, because there were no antibiotics, of course.

My sister seemed to have more serious things than I did. She had, at a young age of five or six, what we think now was typhoid fever. At the time they called it intestinal flu. I think that, too, was in the early '30s. We very nearly lost her. As a matter of fact, my parents were told that she just wouldn't make it. But she was seriously ill for six weeks and made it.

*Q: Did that have any effect on the way you children were treated afterwards? Was there an overprotectiveness, perhaps?*

DILLON: There might have been in her case. She had other things. She had tonsillitis. She wasn't a sickly child; she was strong and active and so on. But somehow those things

caught up with her from time to time. Later on, as a teenager, she had active tuberculosis for a short while and we had to make some adjustments for a year because of that. She was the first one to have her gall bladder out, then the appendix out. You know, it was always something.

*Q: How many years' difference is there between you?*

DILLON: There are only two years. She was younger.

*Q: You had a sister, so I presume you played with your sister.*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: Can you remember any of the games you played?*

DILLON: We went roller skating together very often. We got new bicycles at ages eight and ten, which she always fell off of. (Laughter) It was a terribly traumatic time, but we rode our bikes together. Earlier than that, we had dolls. Mother dressed us alike almost as twins. Mother made a lot of our clothing, and they were always exactly alike. And when she bought toys--

*Q: Did you like that?*

DILLON: Yes. When she bought toys, she'd buy the same thing for each one. I still have dolls from the late '20s that are very sweet. So I remember our playing with our dolls with doll houses. I recall we each had kaleidoscopes. Just little simple ones, you know, that you turned.

*Q: What were your Christmases like?*

DILLON: Oh, outstanding! I remember our family Christmases very, very well. We always had a fresh tree, usually a large one, always a large one. We had some decorations, lights always. I remember the lights well, multi-colored lights. There was always a stocking. I think my father took great pleasure in Christmas. There would be little gifts for us, maybe two or three things each, and as I recall, Mary and I were given a little bit of money to get gifts for Mom and Dad, or we would think of something. The wrappings were always very nice. Nice Christmas dinner. Nothing extravagant, but always turkey and dressing and the usual.

*Q: There were surprises? I suppose the excitement built up, did it?*

DILLON: Oh, yes, always surprises. Always Santa Claus. I think we must have been--I don't remember what age, but I think we must have been pretty good-sized girls before we found out. (Laughter)

*Q: Did you find out at the same time, or were you clued in first?*

DILLON: I don't remember. I think somewhere along the line we began to get onto it, and then we really didn't want to bring it out into the open. We eased into it.

*Q: Did you feel you had been tricked when you found out there wasn't one?*

DILLON: No. No. No. I think especially since it went on for a couple of years after it was generally understood you were onto the game. (Laughter)

*Q: They just sort of let that drop into the conversation. Did you put out a little bit of something for Santa Claus to eat?*

DILLON: No.

*Q: Can you remember any of your early books, Betty? The first things you read?*

DILLON: I do know that I read long before I started school, but I can't tell you what I read. My grandmother having been a teacher and Mother and the whole family having a great respect for education, saw to it that I was reading well, I think at three years old. And my sister similarly.

One of the earliest things I remember was a little magazine called *Playmate*. I don't know if this goes back into the '20s or the early '30s, but we subscribed to it for many years. We would have it changed when we moved. It would come to the new address. It must have been an excellent little magazine for youngsters. There were things in it to do, to cut out, to color. There were little stories to read. There were puzzles. It was very educative.

*Q: Certainly. But that's quite unusual that your parents made that sacrifice that you would have that, because those were hard to come by in those days.*

DILLON: Yes. Oh, yes.

*Q: Yes, indeed. That's very interesting. Do you remember the Weekly Readers in school? Did your schools have the Weekly Readers?*

DILLON: Later on.

*Q: Four-page newspaper things.*

DILLON: Yes, later on. I don't remember them from early years.

*Q: Well, I suppose not all schools had them.*

DILLON: But from the '30s and maybe not out west, you see, so much. I do remember them later on. I hadn't thought about them until you mentioned them, but my recollection

of them was that they were too elementary for me, so I must have started reading them at a later date, a later age.

*Q: Did you get your hands on the Bobbsey Twins?*

DILLON: Yes. I recall, again, a little later, I guess sub-teen, reading some of the *Bobbsey Twins*.

*Q: Uncle Wiggly?*

DILLON: No.

*Q: Raggedy Ann?*

DILLON: No.

*Q: Alice in Wonderland?*

DILLON: No. *Peter Rabbit*, early on. *Three Little Cottontails*.

*Q: By Beatrix Potter.*

DILLON: Yes. I still have all of those. (Laughter)

*Q: Do you, really? Isn't that interesting. Did the pictures make a big impression on you--illustrations?*

DILLON: Yes. Yes. As a sub-teen I remember *Last of the Mohicans* which I enjoy to this day; *Quo Vadis*, and the Beth Streeter Aldrich books.

*Q: Did you read any of the books like Kidnapped and Robin Hood, with the Howard Pyle or the N.C. Wyeth illustrations?*

DILLON: I don't recall the illustrations. I recall reading *Robin Hood* somewhere along the line, and *Robinson Crusoe*.

*Q: Oh, yes.*

DILLON: Then *Little Women*, I think I read early on. *Anne of Green Gables*. Poetry. My mother was always quoting poetry to us.

*Q: Which poets?*

DILLON: Wadsworth, Tennyson, and some of the midwest poets, and Robert Frost she liked very much. James Whitcomb Riley. And, oh yes, Oliver Wendell Holmes' "Chambered Nautilus"--"Build Thee More Stately Mansions, Oh My Soul--."

*Q: "The goblins will get you if you don't watch out!" (Laughter) Did you used to memorize poetry when you were small?*

DILLON: Yes, I did. I remember when we were in Las Vegas, Nevada, memorizing a poem about the desert that was given to us in English class or something: "Morning on the Desert," which I remember in large measure to this day. I don't particularly know why; it wasn't any great poetic work, but it seemed to epitomize the desert that I loved so much.

*Q: Yes, it must have been very interesting having the desert be among your earliest memories, because the desert is so enchanting, even to those of us who came upon it at a later age. It must be really part of your fabric.*

DILLON: The greatness of it, the great expanses of it, I think, gives you--I've always thought it provides an openness of thinking and it does the same thing to your mind as the spaciousness does to geography. You get an overview, a sense of great expanse, of openness.

*Q: Almost, too, of hope, if you know what I mean. It seems to lure you on.*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: At least it always did me, as though there was something there right over the horizon.*

DILLON: Beyond the next mountain. Although I've always gotten that feeling when I'm in the midwest and the east looking west. That's where I get the feeling of "just over the next hill."

*Q: Yes. Of course, you do know what's out there! (Laughter)*

DILLON: Yes, I certainly do. (Laughter)

*Q: So that helps. You played with your sister a lot. Did you play with other children much?*

DILLON: We did, but you see, neighbor children, not so much school children. But since we moved so often, it was difficult to set up lasting friendships. I think at the sub-teen stage, I did make a friend in Las Vegas, Nevada, whom I corresponded with for some years and visited once or twice when I dropped back through there in later years. But I've been out of touch for many, many years.

Again, at about that stage, I remember for a year or two we developed the idea of forming clubs, secret clubs, among the youngsters. I was always the president, for some reason.

(Laughter) We would jump off of garage roofs and dig caves in the back yard, two marvelous things.

*Q: Were these all little girls you played with?*

DILLON: No, no. Mixed.

*Q: Were you very active physically as a child?*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: Did you play rough games?*

DILLON: Well, I don't know about rough, but I was, I think, more physically-oriented than my sister. I've always been very athletic and very physically-oriented.

*Q: Would you say you were a tomboy?*

DILLON: Yes. But still I would say very much a little girl and very feminine in many ways.

*Q: With the dolls. When you were by yourself, what did you like to do, other than read? We take it as a given that you liked to read when you were alone.*

DILLON: Yes, I did read.

*Q: Sew, perhaps? Knit?*

DILLON: I never cared for sewing. I took a sewing class, I recall, in early high school or late junior high, and I did what I had to do and did it well, but it's never been something I was keenly interested in. I did knitting for a year or so, I think when I was in my twenties. But again, I don't have the patience and can't find the time.

When I was alone as a youngster, I remember dreaming a lot, and I used to be inclined to excuse that as maybe a waste of time. But not so many years ago, I did some research in preparation for giving an address in Ceylon to the youth of Ceylon and about the youth of Ceylon. Some of the research I did from the United States indicated that one of the problems with our social lives and our society and our education system in more recent years is that there is no time for the youngsters to dream. They put it in exactly those terms. A child doesn't have the time to dream, to imagine, to hope, to organize his own thinking and explore intellectually. That opportunity doesn't exist anymore. I recall doing a lot of that. If you ask me what I dreamed about, I'm not sure I can tell you.

*Q: No, of course not, because it was a little girl's dreams. That's a very interesting point. I must pursue that with some of the other women, if they did. It is, of course, very*

*important to synthesize what you learned and to put it all into perspective. Growing up is a big business!*

DILLON: It certainly is.

*Q: It's a lot of work. We say, "play is a child's work," which is why, of course, we have to ask these questions that seem so silly. But did you play jacks and jump rope?*

DILLON: Yes, I played jacks and jump rope. Yes.

*Q: Marbles?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: When you were playing with your caves and your clubs and everything, did you imagine yourselves to be princesses and knights? "You be the king and I'll be the princess" and so forth?*

DILLON: Not in connection with the clubs. They were pretty realistic kinds of things. I recall one of them. I talked the group into putting on a puppet show for Christmas, and we all had to make the stage and the puppets. Then on another occasion we dared one another to jump off the garage roof, and that was a whole afternoon of endeavors.

*Q: Jumping off a roof! (Laughter)*

DILLON: A greater one was digging the cave in the neighbor's back yard, and it was a week or two before they discovered what we'd done. By then we could stand up in it. (Laughter) No, I would say that was a very realistic kind of thing. But I do recall dreaming. I recall dreaming, Lord knows why, at a very young age, of being a Russian princess. (Laughter) I think I had seen a movie, or goodness knows what prompted that thinking. But I imagined myself sitting low in the back of the limousine with a great fur coat on, a Russian princess.

*Q: Isn't that funny! Why Russian, one wonders. The movies--that reminds me. Did you go to movies every Saturday matinee?*

DILLON: As a sub-teen. Not so much as teenage. We kind of dropped it by then. But during the early thirties, yes, movies, occasionally. I recall seeing, very early on, in the late twenties, *Flying Down to Rio*.

*Q: Oh, really? So you were Ginger Rogers, I suppose.*

DILLON: Well, probably. (Laughter) *East Lynn*.

*Q: Did you see East Lynn?*

DILLON: Which goes way back.

*Q: That was never a movie, was it?*

DILLON: Yes, it was, and it may have been a silent movie, way back. And *Daddy Longlegs*. Those were the three I remember from the twenties, way back as a youngster.

*Q: Oh, I remember Daddy Longlegs. What a wonderful film that was. Something to dream by for little girls. Why did we all want ourselves to be orphans? (Laughter)*

DILLON: I don't know. (Laughter)

*Q: Can you imagine? Did you have any early ambitions, Betty? I know you can't remember what you dreamed, but can you recall wanting to be, when you grew up, something?*

DILLON: That's a very important aspect of my background. I don't remember dreaming specifically continuously about a dream goal, you know, of being this, that, or the other thing. But I do know that starting very, very early, there was no question in my mind that I would be involved in an international life.

When I was in the first grade, mind you, I was selected as school chairman for the Swiss International Red Cross Fund Drive for the Indian floods. The Ganges flooded. Now, this must have been in '29, '28. I recall standing at the podium in front of the student body--I was six years old--asking everyone to bring pennies from home for these poor Indians who had been flooded out. Over a week, we all brought two or three pennies tied in our handkerchiefs, as you did in those days, and we probably collected, you know, two dollars and forty-nine cents for the Swiss International Red Cross.

Well, you see, at that early age, I was asking, "Where is Switzerland? What is Switzerland? What is this international charitable effort? Where is India? What is the Ganges?" You see. So that stuck in my mind over the years. I don't for one minute suggest that that experience got me off on an international track; I think even prior to that, there was a certain international sensitivity in my makeup that has always been there.

I think the fact that my Quaker family heritage was there helped me with the interracial aspects. They ran the underground railroad through southern Indiana, my Boyd family did. And I grew up absolutely color-blind. If I have a prejudice today with respect to the blacks, it's pro-black, it's a prejudice in the opposite direction.

*Q: You grew up not even knowing there were prejudices.*

DILLON: I have on occasion in later years sat around negotiating tables where there were African representatives and a multilateral kind of environment, and not realizing the color

of my colleagues, being absolutely oblivious to their color, which I think must be the height of openness.

*Q: Absolutely. You forget because you don't look at the skin. You talk to the mind underneath it.*

DILLON: The next reference to international work or a career that I remember must have happened when I was ten or eleven years old. We were in Las Vegas, Nevada. My father was what they called the traffic manager, which in those days was simply the manager of the Western Union there, and was at the Western Union late nights.

Las Vegas then was a gambling town, as it is now. Hoover Dam was under construction. There was a lot of money, a lot of looseness. In those days, people who won money brought it to the Western Union and wired it, telegraphed it somewhere. So there were often very large amounts of money in the Western Union. One night after midnight, a man came in with a gun and held up the Western Union. My father was there alone. He took the gun away from the man. The gun was fired and the bullet burned his shirt, his arm, and his body, so you know how close it was. It was a very exciting thing. The man had never robbed before. It was Depression years and he felt he needed the money, but he did receive a prison sentence, I think two or three years.

We went to the trial, and in connection with the family being interviewed by the paper, someone said to me, "Little girl, what do you want to be when you grow up?" And my mother spoke up and said, "Well, maybe she'd like to be a lawyer. We've been sitting in the court here for a few days and we're all very impressed with the court procedures." And I remember very deliberately saying, "Perhaps, but an *international lawyer*." Now, I was ten or eleven years old. So even then I was holding onto that international orientation.

*Q: Broad horizons, yes. Amazing how early these ideas are planted.*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Very amazing. By the way, did you start school in kindergarten or first grade?*

DILLON: I went to a kindergarten. I believe it was in Grant's Pass, Oregon for, I guess, the better part of a year before starting school. I started school in Seattle. We were there a couple of years.

*Q: Was your father transferred on a regular basis?*

DILLON: Yes. I'm not sure why, except he was a very competent person, very hard working, and a very, very good technician. He had no formal training, but he did some of the early designing of the facsimile and some of the very complex technical systems that are in use today, just as a volunteer effort on his part, working in his spare time. I suspect that it had to do with something else. The Western Union was one of the largest corporations in the country. It ran on a seniority basis. My father had been with them for

many years. He started working at 16 or something as a Morse operator with the railroads in West Virginia. He came with Western Union out west in the--it must have been at the time of the First World War or shortly after. Among other things, he set up Western Union wires to the Pancho Villa raids in Columbus, New Mexico. He supervised the connection of all of the wiring at Boulder Dam when Roosevelt came out and dedicated the dam. That kind of thing. A very competent man.

But in spite of the many years with Western Union, it was always a family concern that he had broken his seniority when my grandmother died in Indiana in the late '20s, or at the time she became ill. They wouldn't give him the leave to go, and so he resigned and lost at least ten or twelve years of seniority. Consequently, when an opening came up for bid, the man who had kept the seniority and had more seniority than he did would get the best post or the best assignments, and he, after that period, was starting over as a new man from scratch, you see.

It was always a very sad kind of thing in our family. It wasn't often mentioned. And I must say, when he retired, we were able to get one of the vice presidents of Western Union to restore his seniority so he could retire with full compensation. But of course, that hardly made up for the 45 years he served Western Union very, very loyally. He worked through strikes for them, for example, in San Francisco, and there were only two or three men that kept the whole office operating while all of the rest of the employees went out. He felt that he should be loyal to his company. But I think that was perhaps the reason he was transferred as often as he was, and the fact that he was good.

*Q: Did this embitter your mother at all, this treatment of her husband?*

DILLON: Mother was a very strong, active, outspoken person, and I wouldn't say that she was embittered, but she was very angry about it and occasionally over the years would mention it. She blamed the person who made the decision at the time, the supervisor, and his name was a very bad word in our house for many, many years, I recall as a youngster.

*Q: When you had to leave your friends, do you recall being terribly upset, or did you take the opposite tack and not get too close to people?*

DILLON: We moved so often and traveled so much that this knitted the family together. The four of us were extremely close as a little unit in our own little capsule. In school, for example, I recall it provided for a growing experience because I was always the new child coming from some far-away place that brought new ideas. I would write papers on the last place I lived. I remember doing a paper on the sheep herds in Oregon when I was back in Indiana at one time. I recall doing papers on Hoover Dam when I was, you know, someplace else. So in a way, this spoiled me, because I didn't go about my school work in a routine fashion. I recall, for example, the joke in my family was that I had written book reports on the same book at four different schools: *Bob Son o'Battle (a Scotch Border Collie)*!

*Q: Even though you had to move so often when you were young, at the same time your father always did have a job.*

DILLON: Yes, except for the Depression.

*Q: So you must have had a little bit of security there, didn't you?*

DILLON: Oh, yes. I don't recall feeling insecure socially or economically or personally at any time during the early years.

*Q: And your family always had a steady income, so there never was that trauma that so many--*

DILLON: It was very, very modest, but I don't recall ever wanting something that I couldn't have or doing without something that left me angry or hurt. Not at all. I think my sister and I both had a very realistic outlook with respect to our economic situation. I recall times when it was difficult to find a nickel for an ice cream cone, but somehow Mom and Dad would find it.

*Q: So you were never deprived, so to speak?*

DILLON: No. But we never expected much.

*Q: As far as schools go, you went to the public schools every place you went?*

DILLON: Public schools, yes.

*Q: Can you remember, when you were growing up, was it expected that you would go on to college?*

DILLON: No, because there were no university degrees in our family. My grandmother's Normal School certificate was the closest. But at the same time, especially from my mother's family, came this very great respect for education, its importance in life, throughout life, the respect for teachers and educators, the respect for advanced education. Now, where that came from, I don't know. I understand that our Boyd ancestry is--well, I know from our genealogy, which was prepared when we became DAR [Daughters of the American Revolution], that it was the nobility in Scotland, and there's some myth in the family that we're directly descended from Mary Queen of Scots and so forth. So I think from an early age, the idea was instilled in it that we had that kind of heritage and that education was a part of it.

My grandmother's father, John T. Boyd, whom, of course, I never knew, was apparently a very well-read man. I have some of his books which were beautiful leather-bound books. His penmanship was exquisite. Now, he was a farmer in southern Indiana, so he got that somewhere, you see. But neither my mother nor my father had university degrees. Mother went for three years to Indiana University. How they did it, I will never know, because

her parents were on the old farm 25 miles from the University. She went up and back on the train every day, helped with the farm at the same time, and I mean plowing with a one-horse plow and that kind of thing. It may have been that grueling schedule that led to her becoming ill and having to go out west. But other than that, there was no university background in our families.

We went to public schools, of course. It was never really anticipated that we would go to college or university. I don't recall its ever being discussed or anticipated. We just assumed that the means weren't there and that we would go to work as soon as we got out of high school.

I got a Social Security card when I was 16, and I worked for the ten cent store during holidays part time. That was my first job. When I graduated from high school, I graduated with straight A grades, second in my class of 200 or 250 in San Francisco, and I think, without doubt, if we had had the university background, the academic orientation, if either of my parents had known how to do it, I could have gone on scholarship. No question about it. But I didn't have a mentor, as we say now, although many of my teachers were, in effect, that. They always encouraged me and provided extra opportunities for me and that sort of thing. But there was never any one person that said, "This is how you apply to a university. Do you know that scholarships are available?" and so forth.

*Q: Especially with the state system in California.*

DILLON: Exactly. I'm a life member of the California Scholarship Federation. However, this was 1941, and we remember well what happened in December of '41. It wasn't a time to start planning a very difficult university program. So, in fact, I did go to work immediately as a secretary at forty dollars a month at the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

*Q: Before we get to that, could we back up a bit?*

DILLON: Yes, I want to, because we're moving far ahead now.

*Q: Let's go into your schooling, because that's very important.*

DILLON: That's where we are now. I worked one year before starting night school, we called it then. It's evening school or adult education or something now. But from that point on, I always did my university work in evening school or occasionally part time, and this went on for years, and I got my degree that way.

*Q: So you missed that whole experience?*

DILLON: The whole experience of academia and association with professors and instructors, of association with peers, the whole environment. I only got my degree in 1983 in economics from George Washington University.

*Q: Is that so? That's very remarkable.*

DILLON: I think it was '83.

*Q: You are to be commended.*

DILLON: But nonetheless, this did not stand in the way of my being selected as the first woman in Princeton's graduate school in the mid-career program, and I was in residence there for a year in the Woodrow Wilson School on an individually-tailored program, together with twelve other mid-careerists. I insisted on meeting the course requirements, which was not required of mid-careerists, but I said, "In my case, since I don't have a university degree like any of the others yet, I want to feel that I'm doing *everything* that I need to do to get the most out of this marvelous experience at Princeton." And I did.

*Q: When was that, Betty, that you first went?*

DILLON: 1964-65.

*Q: Going back to your early years, can you remember any special teacher who really stood out?*

DILLON: We were always in touch with the teachers. My mother and father both felt that was important to have teacher talks and consultations.

*Q: Did your father go for consultations?*

DILLON: Once or twice. It was difficult because of work, but, yes, I recall his being involved, too. I recall in Las Vegas, for example, there was an art teacher, Miss Price. I recall her as being a more mature woman. She was not a young teacher. She was short and heavyset and very gregarious and friendly. "Miss Price" got to be a family word around the house just because--I still to this day have a pencil sketch drawing she did of me. I was teacher's pet, so I remember Miss Price.

*Q: Do you have artistic abilities?*

DILLON: No. Not that I know of. I've never pursued it. I've never really been interested in it.

*Q: But she found something there?*

DILLON: She found something there, and I can't even remember what we were doing in the art class. It must have been sketching or drawing or colors or something. I would have been ten years old then.

I remember another teacher negatively--two other teachers negatively, but not from the very early years. This was high school. One was in Indiana. I won't mention her name. She's passed on now. She was a biology teacher. I was doing extremely well in biology. I'm an outdoor person, I like nature, I like animals and plants and so forth, and I did even then. I did a bird book, which I have to this day, which is this thick, a scrapbook that was just very well done. She had given me one A and an A+ on the scrapbook. At the end of the second semester she gave me a B. Well, my mother hit the ceiling. My family was upset. I'd never had a B in my life. When we talked with her about it, she said, "It's because she has all As. It will be good for her to have a B." And it undoubtedly is the reason that I wasn't number one in my class instead of number two when I graduated with 250 students in San Francisco.

*Q: Isn't that hateful!*

DILLON: It was. She was a very young teacher, a very attractive woman, and my mother later said it might have been a bit of jealousy, some kind of a personal thing on her part. That teacher I remember well. (Laughter)

*Q: Well, I should think you might.*

DILLON: The other teacher I remember was a U.S. history teacher in San Francisco, who was quite a good teacher. She was authoritative when it came to U.S. history. But first of all, I was teacher's pet and she always had me sit right in front of her in the front row, and she would address me during her teaching. "Now, Betty, don't you agree with that?" or "As Betty knows, such and such." Well, as a teenager, this was terribly embarrassing and, I think, served to alienate me from some of my peers, of course. I also remember she was a very homely woman, very heavyset, very bosomy, and she would come in with her breakfast right here. [Demonstrating] (Laughter) I really shouldn't put things like this in.

*Q: Why not? It's all part of your background.*

DILLON: But those teachers I remember. On the positive side, in San Francisco--these are high school years--my mathematics teacher was a fine supporter and advisor for me, a counselor.

*Q: Woman or man?*

DILLON: A man. He, as I recall, was helpful in having me take the chairmanship of the International Club at his high school. James Kinney.

*Q: What other things did you take part in besides this International Club, Betty?*

DILLON: Well, if we're up to the high school period now, there was a very important thing. In 1939, we had been in San Francisco for a year and a half. I was taking riding lessons, horseback riding lessons, as part of my high school program. I was doing extremely well with it. Our teacher came to me and said, "You know, there is a contest each year in California," (co-sponsored by the State Board of Education, which is important, the Chambers of Commerce at all of the cities throughout California, and the Salinas Rodeo, which at that time, and may still be, the largest rodeo in the world) and we think you're doing very well with your riding. You're a natural athlete and natural on horseback. We would like to groom you to be our high school candidate next year." They talked with my parents about it, because it entailed some classes and riding and training outside of my high school program.

Well, my parents were delighted and I was very pleased, and we undertook it. There was a little bit of money involved in the sense that I had to go from an English saddle, from English riding to a western style riding, which was something of a transition. That entailed riding every day after school at a ranch nearby for training and so forth.

Well, we did it, and the following spring, I was selected as the county winner from my high school. Then they began to caution me that I was the youngest girl ever to enter. I was only 16, and the entries were usually 17- and 18-year-olds. The year before, our San Francisco girl had won the statewide contest, so they said, "There's no way they're going to select a San Francisco girl again, so don't get your hopes up. But you're an excellent candidate, and let's go on with it."

I won the county, and as "Miss San Francisco", went to the finals in Salinas, and I was selected "Miss California". The title was--and I like to use it, because when you say "Miss California," people envision bathing suits and the beauty contests. The title was "California's Outstanding Outdoor Girl."

*Q: That's quite wonderful.*

DILLON: We were judged in four categories: horsemanship, of course; scholarship; outdoor appearance, which included posture, which was a big thing in those days, and then there was a fourth category, general knowledge or something. I recall the judges and there were half a dozen of them), interviewed us and asked questions about current events and that sort of thing.

*Q: Character wasn't one of the categories?*

DILLON: It was an overriding consideration. Sure.

*Q: What did this prize bring you?*

DILLON: I had a choice between two years of junior college at the Salinas Junior College (now, mind you, I was a sophomore in high school) or a one-month trip throughout the

west, including a week or two at Glacier National Park. The Great Northern Railway was involved in some of this sponsorship. A lot of PR, and in that connection, membership in the Blackfeet Indian tribe, which we will come back to later. I think I made the right decision. I decided on the trip rather than the two years of junior college. Now, we can look back and say, "There was an opportunity to continue with your education." But it was junior college. It wasn't a state university. It was in Salinas. It was a small junior college. Mother and Father and my sister and I talked it over, and we felt that not only for my growth and my personal, even career opportunities later on, as well as PR and so forth, that the trip would offer a great deal more for me than would just two years of junior college. In fact, I think that was the case.

There was tremendous press coverage. I was on the front page of every paper in California. The trip itself was covered at every stop. We were at Timberline Lodge out of Portland. We were received by the Chambers of Commerce. It was a train trip. Since we had lived in Grant's Pass earlier on, you see, I was received as a former Oregon resident. We went on to Seattle, where we had lived for two or three years, and "local girl makes good." The Chamber of Commerce played it up. And all sorts of nice things, you know, little gifts and gestures along the way.

At Glacier Park, I was, in fact, made a member, initiated into the Blackfeet tribe, which is with me to this day. I am very close to the Blackfeet. I'm sponsoring some big programs out there.

*Q: Tell me about this initiation.*

DILLON: The initiation was conducted by the elders of the tribe. The chief, Chief Bull at that time, whose English name was Richard Sanderville, was very, very receptive. The other chiefs were all there, some of them quite elderly. We smoked the peace pipe, of course. That's part of it. They had sent me in the meantime a kidskin, a little kidskin, with Indian writing on it, inviting me to come, you see, which, of course, I have beautifully framed to this day. I beg your pardon. It was the other way around. The invitation is a huge deerskin, a grown deer, with the invitation on it all in Indian writing and all of their signatures, which I have framed, a monstrous thing.

Then after I was initiated, they presented me with the kidskin, which is a certificate of membership, if you will, that I was there, that I was inducted into the tribe. Part of the ritual for me was riding one of their Indian ponies, which was a tremendous thrill. There was a tremendous rapport developed between me and those old Indian chieftains immediately, just immediately. It's the same kind of thing that I've seen happen when I meet international colleagues. I love them all. I immediately set about trying to understand them, where they're coming from. So I was with them for at least an hour, with interpreters, although certainly Richard Sanderville spoke beautiful English. He had been a government interpreter for the tribe for many, many years.

I rode their Indian pony and rode it extremely well. This was all covered, of course, in photographs, and I have a marvelous scrapbook.

*Q: When you ride an Indian pony, do you have a saddle?*

DILLON: I did in that case. Then we took the saddle off and I rode him without the saddle.

*Q: I always thought that the Indian society was strictly a male-oriented society.*

DILLON: It was, more so then than now, of course. It still is, but you know, there are some of these myths around that we should analyze very carefully. Here were half a dozen old chieftains, traditional men in the true sense of the word, most of them not speaking English at all. They received me by the look in their eye, by the expressions on their faces, by the things they said, by the things that came to me through interpreters, as a wonder woman, a wonderful person, a wonderful human being.

*Q: I suppose the chiefs looked at you as a little white princess.*

DILLON: Yes, and they gave me the name of "Princess Guiding Star." Which in Blackfeet is *E- TOO-MEE-KAH-KAH-TOS-AH-KEE-W(A)ki*.

*Q: Oh, my! I wouldn't attempt to spell it "Princess Guiding Star." Isn't that sweet. You entered this contest and became "California's Outstanding Outdoor Girl," and you entered as Miss what?*

DILLON: Polytechnic High School.

*Q: "Miss Polytechnic High School." There were no boys in this contest? It was strictly just for girls?*

DILLON: For girls.

*Q: I thought maybe they did two, a boy and a girl.*

DILLON: No. This young woman served as queen of the rodeo, if you will. I'm sorry. We skipped over that lightly. The Outdoor Girl was the Sweetheart of the Salinas rodeo and presided over the entire three- or four-day rodeo, led the parade, rode, and so forth.

*Q: I suppose now they can't do it anymore because it would be considered sexist, wouldn't it? (Laughter)*

DILLON: I suppose so! (Laughter)

*Q: Princess Guiding Star. I think that's just delightful. Can you recall what you talked about with the elders of the group?*

DILLON: They asked me a bit about California, what it was like. They referred to it as the Land of the Big Berry Tree, and it was so depicted on these skins that I received.

*Q: What's the berry tree?*

DILLON: Orange trees.

*Q: Oranges! Oh, isn't that charming. Very poetic, isn't it?*

DILLON: Yes. There was talk about my riding, how long I had ridden, why I rode, and so forth. I asked them questions, of course, about the tribe, I think, how many Blackfeet there were, their names, each of their names. I would say generally it was chit-chat kind of light talk, getting-acquainted sort of talk.

*Q: How did that particular tribe get involved with this?*

DILLON: I think through the Great Northern Railway, you see, which served the reservation and beyond.

*Q: Are they part of a larger tribe, or is that the tribe?*

DILLON: That is the tribe. The tribal council and the headquarters are in Browning, Montana, for the Blackfeet. The Nez Percé and the Piegan are also from that general area, but they're administered and administer themselves separately.

*Q: Were you given a set of clothing, Indian clothing?*

DILLON: No. During the initiation, one of the chiefs took off his headdress and put it on me, which, again, was a very nice gesture.

*Q: "Photo opportunity." (Laughter)*

DILLON: Yes! (Laughter) But also he didn't have to do it, you know. Chieftains' headdresses are very special things. They have special features and special ornaments on them. There's a small museum in Browning, and we have tried to locate the very beautiful costumes that these chieftains were wearing. I have many, many photographs, of course. I said to my Blackfeet friends, "Where are these things? What's happened to them?" Well, what's happened to them over the years was that they were sold off by the Indians to get money, sometimes to museums, which is not all that bad, sometimes to private collectors. But as a result, they are scattered, very much scattered.

The small museum in Browning, a very nice one, [is] trying to get started, but there just isn't much that can go in it. The University of Montana has a nice one, and the Railroad Association has an Indian museum in St. Paul, if I'm not mistaken, that has a number of things.

*Q: What a fascinating experience for a young girl! You were just 16 years old?*

DILLON: Yes. It was a maturing experience, as well as an educational and very broadening experience.

*Q: Did you feel the weight of the state of California on your shoulders? You were representing them?*

DILLON: Yes, of course. I've always felt very responsible when it comes to any kind of a challenging situation like that. Responsibility weighs very heavy on my shoulders. But you know, as I look back, I think I had much of the premature maturity that comes with being a teenager. A teenager who is intellectually competent, who has some accomplishments and qualifications, is at the age where you can take on the world and feel rather mature about it, you know. There's an unnatural early maturity that comes during those years. As I look back, I did and said things with great self-assurance that I don't think I'd do today. (Laughter)

*Q: Very sure of your judgment? You probably were quite right. You enjoyed scholastic superiority all through school, Betty?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Can you remember, going back to your earliest days, what subjects you enjoyed the most?*

DILLON: I liked early mathematics. Later on, I got up into calculus and trigonometry and I did not enjoy that. I liked the real and logical aspects of mathematics, of arithmetic and algebra. I liked biology very much. History.

*Q: Any particular type of history? European? American? World?*

DILLON: No. I wouldn't say that I was all that--it wasn't my favorite subject, but it was something that interested me.

*Q: What about languages?*

DILLON: Yes. We, of course, didn't have language in elementary school. Incidentally, I think that's a grave shortcoming in our educational system. But in high school, I started Spanish and took three years, or four, of Spanish. I took three years of Latin. My mother had been a Latin scholar, and I'm so grateful for that now, because here again, I think

Latin should be included in our school curriculum all the way. It's just such an important basis for vocabulary, for spelling, for reading and writing, for history, to a certain extent.

I did not take French, and I'm not sure why, because I've always had a keen interest in French. I started private tutoring in French not long after I started working in the '40s, so much so that when I came to Indiana University in '45, where I was able to sandwich in one semester, I could be exempted from the first three years of French and go into advanced French work. (By the way, at the same time I was exempted from all further English requirements, after an examination.) And then later in my career, I was given special French lessons, orientation in connection with my aviation work. So my French is quite good.

*Q: Did you enjoy English classes?*

DILLON: Yes, but I think I enjoyed them just as I enjoyed Latin and other languages, because of the structure and the grammar and the modes of expression.

*Q: You enjoyed that part of it more than the literature part?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: You seem to have a scientific bent in this objective way of looking at things. It runs all the way through--the arithmetic and the biology and even the way you studied English. It's fascinating.*

*Can you remember any other episodes of your schooling that are worth recalling?*

DILLON: I started school in Seattle, Washington; kindergarten and first grade. We were in Grant's Pass, Oregon, and that's where I was chairman of the Red Cross drive. We were in Las Vegas, Nevada, two different times. Then I was in the eighth grade in southern Indiana.

*Q: You moved about every year and a half or two years, Betty?*

DILLON: Yes, approximately, on average.

*Q: Ever in the middle of a school year?*

DILLON: Usually not. I can't recall breaking a school year--well, breaking at a semester, perhaps, but not breaking a school year. For example, I started high school in southern Indiana, and my father was finishing a special project in Las Vegas and then was transferred to San Francisco. So I went the first semester of high school in Indiana, then went on to San Francisco starting with the second semester of high school. Other than that, it was generally breaking at the end of the year. They were rather careful about that.

On occasion, I know Mother, Mary, and I would stay behind or go on ahead or something in order to accommodate the school year.

*Q: Did Mary have as easy a time picking up and moving around as you did? Was she a good scholar, too?*

DILLON: She was not as good as I was, but she was a good scholar. She was "skipped" over a grade in elementary. I often look back and think that my sister came out second-best very often. She was not physically as well coordinated as I was. She wasn't as athletic. She wasn't quite the scholar I was. Not because of any neglect, certainly. As a matter of fact, I think we all gave her as much or more attention than we would have otherwise because of her illness.

*Q: Was more expected of you, Betty? Children tend to live up to what their parents want of them.*

DILLON: Yes, I think so. But I don't want to underestimate my sister. She was president of the student body in her junior high in San Francisco, the first girl president of her student body, and it was a huge junior high in San Francisco. I don't know, 1,000 students or something. She was very good in music. I played the piano. She played the violin, and I accompanied her. In junior high, she took up the saxophone and did extremely well with it, organized a little band and played. But here again, she acquired the touch of tuberculosis at that time. She had to give up the wind instrument, she had to give up all physical activity, and we had to move to a suburb of San Francisco where she could get more sunshine for a year. So it just seemed that this physical thing kind of injected itself at very unfortunate times with her. No, I think much was expected of her, too, and she was given a lot of support.

*Q: I'm interested in this Quaker line in your family. Your mother was raised a Quaker?*

DILLON: She wasn't raised a Quaker; her mother was.

*Q: I see. But that thread was there, and certainly that early indoctrination, if you will--I mean that in a positive way--that her mother must have given her.*

DILLON: Because we were away from our families back in the east so much, my mother and father both went out of their way to create a most favorable impression of our families, both sides, and our genealogy, our background, always emphasizing the positive and forming in our minds a great deal of respect for our families and our backgrounds.

*Q: What other extracurricular activities did you engage in in high school? You said you went to work when you were 16?*

DILLON: That was just holiday work. I started working in a permanent job when I was 18, immediately after leaving high school.

Extracurricular. Well, sports certainly were.

*Q: These are team sports?*

DILLON: Some. I played baseball on occasion. I played basketball. My horseback riding, once I got into it, for some years took all of my extra time.

*Q: What did you do as the head of the International Club?*

DILLON: I'm sure it's what most clubs do in high schools. We would meet once a month, talk about current issues. I think we had some guest speakers in.

*Q: It gave you practice in running committees, I suppose.*

DILLON: Oh, sure. Oh, well, earlier than that, one of the teachers at Polytechnic High School had come to me. Why me? (Laughter) And he was interested in forming--this was mid-'30s--something very new and innovative called a community center. He wanted to organize youth in the neighborhood and the parents in an adult group and a junior group for the purpose of building neighborhood sensitivities and setting up a social program, binding us together more as neighbors around the high school. He asked me to take on the organizing of the youth group. I became its first president. The adult group was formed, and I think I was vice president of the adult group. We sponsored dances, lectures. We had meetings and discussed things going on in the neighborhood and so forth. Interestingly, it was called Haight Ashbury Neighbors.

*Q: That's a familiar name, isn't it?*

DILLON: You bet.

*Q: Did that take up much of your time?*

DILLON: Not a great deal. It was kind of a monthly thing, as I recall.

*Q: Did you date when you were in high school?*

DILLON: Yes, but I always felt that--well, I know I was referred to on occasion as a DAR, which was a "Damned Average Raiser" back in those days, (Laughter) because I was such a good scholar.

*Q: You found that interfered with your popularity?*

DILLON: Yes. Yes. Because I was often teacher's pet in the sense that I would be the one asked to do the special paper, I would be the one asked to give a special talk to the class, or I would be the one to chair this or that. Those were marvelous opportunities for me, but they don't make for your being the most popular girl in class, you see.

*Q: Were you ever class officer, or were they all boys?*

DILLON: They were boys, but I was--what was I? I recall running for treasurer of the student body, and this was a 2,000 student body. That was successful. But my run for student body president was not. But before that, I think I was vice president of my class or something.

*Q: Did this bother you that you weren't Miss Popularity?*

DILLON: Not that I wasn't Miss Popularity, but I liked people. I love people, am fascinated by people. I enjoy being with them. I felt a certain loneliness.

*Q: Also, Betty, you have said how well you interacted with the elders of the tribe. Did you at that time find that you had more in common with older people?*

DILLON: Always. From the time I was a little girl, it was the older people visiting that I sat and listened to, rather than go out and play with the kids. Always.

*Q: Of course, that would be why the elders would respond to you.*

DILLON: Sure.

*Q: Makes sense. But it's very difficult, I think, on a young girl in high school, where these are such important things.*

DILLON: Yes. There was a second factor. You must remember I had come from a very modest background, a somewhat limited background socially, in the sense that we did spend time at the farm in southern Indiana. We had lived in these small desert towns. Tucson and even Las Vegas at that time was just a small desert village.

We had lived in small desert towns and in the midwest. Grant's Pass, Oregon, was a very small town at that time. Even Seattle was far removed from the sophistication of the east. So that when we arrived in San Francisco in high school, I really was socially behind my fellow students.

I recall one incident. I was playing the piano. I was studying the piano, had piano classes, and music students were asked if they would like to volunteer to be ushers at the San Francisco Opera House. I volunteered. I was fascinated. What an opportunity! And then I became frightened. I had never been in such a place in my life, I had never seen an opera in my life. I wasn't sure what an usher was supposed to do. I was terrified. It almost made me ill for a day or two before, but I made myself do it, with the support of my family, and, of course, grew because of it and matured because of it. But even as "Miss California" in 1939, we had only been in San Francisco two years, and I'm sure that everyone expected me to be the sophisticated young "Miss California," you see. But I knew what was behind me, and that often put a great strain on me.

*Q: Yes, it would, wouldn't it? Did you feel perhaps that somebody might get behind that facade and realize that you weren't all that sophisticated? Was that your fear?*

DILLON: Yes, partly. Also I was always very afraid that I would make a *faux pas* or do the wrong thing or say the wrong thing. It does build a certain conservative attitude. You bet.

*Q: Certainly. Yes. Growing up is terribly hard, isn't it? (Laughter)*

DILLON: Isn't it? (Laughter) I recall one incident when I was singing in the choral group there, and there was a young man, a boy, in the group that I was quite interested in. He was very popular. When we had been back east, the social thing to do was to invite some of your friends, including your boyfriend, out to pop popcorn or to make fudge, you see. So I finally got up my nerve and went to a small group, including this young man, and said, "I'd like very much for you to come over Sunday afternoon or evening and we'll make fudge and sing some songs." Well, we had a big thing at home, we got all excited, we got in the supplies, and I got all ready. No one came. No one came. And that week I mentioned it. I said to some of them, "I thought you were coming Sunday evening. I was expecting you."

And he said, "To make fudge? Ha!" You see? That's the kind of thing that really strikes hard at the heart and soul of a teenager. It really does.

*Q: Oh, that's terrible.*

DILLON: That was the kind of thing that concerned me more than not being Miss Popular.

*Q: Well, I can understand that. What a terrible thing!*

*In 1939, when you were Miss Outdoor Girl, the war was warming up in Europe. As president of the International Club, you must have been aware of this. Did you follow these things, Betty, or did they seem terribly distant to you? Were you much aware of Hitler and what was going on over there?*

DILLON: Well, let's face it. Our country was not as aware as it should have been. I admired--and do admire--Charles Lindbergh so much for coming back and telling straight out the facts, for which he was chastised, and maligned gravely. But our country wasn't that aware. Sure, I followed it to the extent anyone else was and the club was.

*Q: Perhaps you were taking a history course at the time?*

DILLON: I don't recall its being brought up in history at all.

*Q: That's terrible, isn't it?*

DILLON: Yes. Europe was boiling, was boiling over. Nowadays, I assume in history classes, to the extent we teach world history anymore--I'm not sure it's emphasized--but I would hope that the teachers would keep everyone apprised of current events.

*Q: Do I understand it correctly that you had most of your high school in one place?*

DILLON: San Francisco.

*Q: Three and a half years, perhaps?*

DILLON: Yes, the whole three and a half years. I graduated there. We were in San Francisco the longest of anywhere. We went there in the winter of '37. Although I was here in Washington in the late '40s, I didn't actually leave San Francisco until I came back here in '53. My parents had retired from San Francisco to Indiana in the meantime. So there was a period of ten or fifteen years that that was really my home away from home.

*Q: You were living in the Haight Ashbury district?*

DILLON: We were when we first went there. We moved out of town because of my sister's health for a year. When we moved back in town, we were in the Richmond district, as I recall, out toward the beach.

*Q: Very, very nice. Can you recall the impact of World War II on you?*

DILLON: Yes. I had graduated in June, and we came back to the farm for the summer and the fall. I'm not quite sure why, except my sister always wanted to go to school in Indiana. She ultimately moved back to Indiana to spend her life there. As I recall, she was in school there then, because she still had two more years to do.

But December 7 [1941] came, and I remember that day very well, as we all do. We had been out sledding with some friends, and came back in the evening to hear the announcement. We left almost immediately for San Francisco to be with my father there. Those were very exciting years in San Francisco, because we were involved in the war effort. I worked for a while as secretary at the San Francisco Chamber, but then I, too, went to work as a secretary in the shipyard, and carried a carpool 50 miles every day and back for a year or two during the height of the war.

*Q: Did you give blood, Betty?*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: Worked for the Red Cross?*

DILLON: Yes, yes. My sister and my mother were volunteers for the Air Force. They worked the late-night shift. What did they call it? They plotted everything coming into the coast from the west. That's the only way they had to do it in those days, on great tables at an Air Force center, in an effort to identify unidentified flying objects, presumably the Japanese. As historians have since said, if the Japanese had chosen to come onto the West Coast after Pearl Harbor, there would have been very little to stop them.

We lived just half a dozen blocks from the beach, and by the time we got out there in January or so, the military had cut down huge trees, dragged the logs to the beach, pointed them out, and camouflaged them with limbs and shrubbery so that they would look like cannons and guns. That's what was defending the shoreline, you see. Of course, being the marvelous military machine we are, we cranked up very quickly in the Presidio there at San Francisco. But there were Japanese submarines off the coast. There were many, many air raid warnings. We kept candles and frequently had to light them and pull the shades.

*Q: So, of course, the Pacific war was seen as much more menacing to you than the Atlantic war?*

DILLON: Yes. It was real.

*Q: You had a blackout, of course.*

DILLON: Oh, yes, often.

*Q: Of course, you had troops by the thousands coming through San Francisco--by the millions.*

DILLON: By the millions. We had lived so many places that those young men we were in touch with would stay with us or come through for a day or a week or overnight. We would either go visit them, or if they could get leave, they'd come to the house and stay for a while. We'd feed them. I corresponded with some 80 servicemen throughout the war, just as a matter of personal obligation.

*Q: Eighty servicemen. My goodness, that must have kept you busy. Well, they were frightened young men, young boys.*

DILLON: Boys, they were.

*Q: You see them on television now, how young they look.*

DILLON: Incredible.

*Q: Didn't seem so at the time, did it?*

DILLON: And many of them were boys we had known in the midwest and [who] were very unsophisticated. They were not cosmopolites, as it were. They were drafted quickly, trained quickly, and sent. Many of them came to my mother's funeral in the midwest, boys that we had not been in touch with over the years. They said that she had been so good to them and cooked so many meals for them when we had entertained them out there, and they'd never forget.

*Q: Were you aware of the internment of the Japanese?*

DILLON: Very much so. I have strong feelings about that to this day. I realize that it was a horrifying situation. We were suddenly at war, it was unexpected, we weren't prepared for it, and those responsible, of course, had to do what they had to do. But we saw beautiful, loyal, patriotic Japanese families uprooted. We saw Japanese men who had been leaders in the community, we saw Japanese entrepreneurs who had been fine businessmen not only put in concentration camps, but their property confiscated. That was, I think, one of the very unfortunate occurrences of that period. It's so long now and it's almost impossible to undo it. I think there was some litigation and some of the Japanese were, I believe, compensated for their property and that kind of thing. We have friends in Phoenix now, Japanese friends, who remember those experiences very, very well and remember them as being awesome.

I think the interesting thing is that all of those Japanese, I think almost without exception, have not become embittered and left the country or made big issues of it. That, to me, is the surprising thing.

*Q: There was a very fine documentary on that. They had some remarkable footage of rounding them up and putting them in, as you say, concentration camps. It's shocking! We weren't aware of this on the East Coast.*

DILLON: One of which was in the Salinas rodeo grounds, which, for me, was pure irony.

*Q: Did you have many Japanese friends yourself? Did you happen to know many?*

DILLON: Not many. A few.

*Q: Were they scattered throughout neighborhoods, or did they live sort of clustered?*

DILLON: Well, both, but there was a concentration of them, interestingly enough, in the edge of the Haight Ashbury district, between that and the Civic Center. My family and I remarked, when the problems arose with the Haight Ashbury district some years later, the drug users and so forth, wasn't it irony, because much of that area had been left vacant by the confiscation of the Japanese property and the removal of the Japanese, which may have left something of a vacuum there into which drug users, prostitutes, what have you, moved later years.

*Q: Why weren't they given back their property afterwards?*

DILLON: I really don't know. It would be interesting to see who acquired that property.

It's extremely interesting for me to reminisce and go back over these formulative years. It's an opportunity for introspection and looking at myself and how my personality and my character and my career goals evolved over the years.

*[February 4, 1987]*

*Q: Let's begin today's session with your early career.*

DILLON: I think a good way to begin would be to take an overall view of my life and my career in the light of some of the major tides of history in our country. I was born in the west in a period when the western expansionist movement was still going on, and I was very much, as a child, a part of that whole feeling. I started school in 1929, the year of the Crash, and my early school years and childhood and sub-teens were lived through the great Depression. I graduated from high school in June of '41, and, of course, Pearl Harbor brought us into the Second World War in December of 1941, so that the early years of my career were worked during the Second World War and the immediate post-war era. As we'll see later, the Korean airlift and the Korean conflict and the Vietnam War had an influence on my career.

So on the one hand, these awful happenings were dreadful for many people, and in many ways, the Depression and the wars were dreadful for me and my family. On the other hand, there were some advantages. They were exiting, challenging periods and I wanted to be a part of them in one way or another.

So having painted that overall picture, we can go back to '41 and the start of my career. Here I want to say two things about my entire career. First of all, I had to work, as I mentioned earlier. There wasn't money for me to go to university full time, but I took the position that since I had to work, I was going to make the most of it. I was going as far as I could go, I was going to be the best I could be, and enjoy life on that basis. The second very basic, very deep assumption in my mind--and it was always there and it never left my thinking, and in many ways directed most of my career decisions--was that I would work in international relations. I wasn't sure when or where or how, but that was my goal, and I always knew I would reach it and I always moved in that ultimate direction.

My first position was offered to me by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. They had an opening for a secretary, and they knew me because they had co-sponsored me a couple of years before, for the Miss California contest. I started working for \$40 a month, mind you.

*Q: Imagine.*

DILLON: And that was a six-and-a-half-day week, still. The second month I worked, I received a ten-dollar raise, which was a great credit and a marvelous beginning for my career. The third month I worked, I received another ten-dollar increase, which everyone received, because it was a cost-of-living bonus as a result of wartime inflation. So in a short period, at least financially, I was progressing very well.

In addition to secretarial duties, I was asked to revise the manufacturers' directory of the San Francisco Bay area for the Chamber. This meant updating it. It meant contacting industry, companies, corporations in the area, and was in and of itself a very broadening and educative experience.

By the beginning of 1942, we were deep into the war and I felt I should be a part of it. San Francisco was an awesome place to be in 1942. We had very frequent blackouts at night as a result of incoming unidentified aircraft. Japanese submarines were patrolling the coast and on one occasion, at least, shelled the state of Oregon.

The war was everywhere around us. We were the major port of embarkation for our military men to the Pacific theater. My mother and my sister were working as aircraft spotters at night for the Air Force, as volunteers.

So I applied for and got a position as secretary to the general supply superintendent for one of the Kaiser shipyards. We were building Liberty ships, famous transport ships that played such an important role in our winning the Second World War. I was very fortunate in that my supervisor, my boss, was a very hard-bitten construction engineer who was a stereotype from the '20s and '30s. He had built pipelines and dams and roads and highways across the country, and was a very practical, down-to-earth, no-nonsense person. He liked me. He treated me as an assistant. For the first time, I supervised other staff. I issued purchase orders, I maintained all of the shipyard files, expedited orders, and on many occasions not only supervised personnel, but spent a lot of time listening to them and counseling them.

*Q: You were barely out of your teens?*

DILLON: Yes. There was a lot of competition between the four shipyards, the shipways at Kaiser, and that made it interesting and exciting, because supplies and equipment were in short supply and very often one shipway would steal from another in order to meet their ship schedule. Huge equipment. We came in one morning to find that a huge crane had been stolen during the night by the engineers at the other shipway in order to get their ship off the ways. Whenever a ship was launched and went out on several hours' trial run and came back with the broom flying, we were very, very pleased about our effort.

*Q: You say with the broom flying. You mean literally they put a broom up?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Why did they do that?*

DILLON: I don't know how old it is or where it came from, but when a new ship goes out on a trial run, if the captain agrees that it's seaworthy and ready to go to sea, he ties a broom to the bridge or the mast or something, to indicate it's been approved. So that was always an exciting time for us.

I drove a carpool of three other women, left before daylight in the morning, came back after dark at night. It was an hour-and-a-half drive. And was, of course, working six days a week. There again, it was a very, very broadening experience for me, and it was a marvelous atmosphere because there was a minimum of paperwork, there was a minimum of nonsense. It was one of only a couple of experiences I've had in my life where you could see the results of your labor. No one was interested in excuses, no one was interested in delays. We were there to get the job done. There were no committees or feasibility studies or budget reviews. We did whatever we had to do to get the ships at sea.

I was there for, I guess, almost a year and a half, and by then, you know, very frankly, the schedule was taking its toll on me. I also felt that--and I think the world was beginning to realize--we could see the light at the end of the tunnel regarding the war. So I decided I would take a position back in the city of San Francisco. Again, I was very fortunate. I was asked to handle the export licenses and the import quotas for Burns-Philp Company, a very, very large, very well-known export-import trading company, which exported to and imported from the entire Pacific Basin. I believe it's still in existence, but at that time it was a monster company. I prepared all of the export licenses, because during the war the United States Government had to approve any exports--*any* exports--and set established import quotas. So once again, this was a new and different experience for me. I expedited the licenses, I made improvements in their preparation, I set up liaison with the appropriate offices, and so on.

Then 1945 rolled around, and the war was coming to an end, and the United Nations Charter Conference was planned for San Francisco late that spring. I wanted very much in some way to have some contact with the conference and what was going on there. Also, my sister and I had decided that with the close of the war, we'd take the small amount of money we'd be able to save and try to attend university full-time. So, knowing we were going to do that in the fall, I resigned my position and took a temporary job with RCA, which at that time was not the corporate giant it is now, but it was large and was the place you went to send international cables. It was the Western Union of the international world.

I worked there on a temporary and part-time basis and helped them handle the tremendous international cable traffic. They were having this unexpected volume as a result of the United Nations Conference; a lot of press traffic, for example, a lot of government reports and so forth.

*Q: What sort of work exactly did you do there?*

DILLON: It was basically secretarial work, typing and preparing cables, going over to the conference, getting the material, bringing back and preparing it. It got me inside the door. At the same time, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce contacted me again and needed a temporary secretary for their World Trade Department. They wanted their whole filing system revised and reorganized. They wanted their reference library reorganized and all of it documented. They anticipated that I could do this in that time-frame of two or three months, and, of course, it was a marvelous opportunity for me, once again, to be in an international office.

Again, I was fortunate. The manager of that department was a young economist, Kenneth H. Campbell, just not long out of Wharton School of Finance, who was very much respected in international trade circles and international economics. He seemed to very, very much appreciate my work, and we developed a good working relationship. His wife was a delightful person, and both of them [became] lifelong friends until their deaths some years ago.

Mr. Campbell probably could have been called an early mentor in that he was interested in expanding my field of knowledge, helping me develop further in my career. He would refer articles to me that he thought I should read. He would suggest periodicals that he thought I should subscribe to. He would lend me books that he thought I should read. And during the United Nations Conference, when he and his wife Toby couldn't attend the diplomatic functions that they were often invited to, he would pass his tickets to me. Which was a marvelous thing. I would take a girlfriend or my sister and attend these wonderful diplomatic conferences. I recall, for example, meeting Pandit Nehru (Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, the sister of Jawaharlal Nehru. She headed the Indian delegation to the UN Conference), who headed up the India delegation and was, I think, the only woman at the conference and was one of the outstanding leaders of the conference, of course. I met several members of our own delegation, of course, and among them was a man who was, again, to take an interest in my career: the young Commander Harold Stassen from Minnesota, who just a few years earlier had been the governor of Minnesota and at that time the youngest governor in our history. He was the youngest member of the United States delegation to the conference. He's still alive and is the only surviving member of our U.S. delegation at this time.

An associate of his was in San Francisco a few years later, a young attorney from Minnesota by the name of Warren Burger.

I was particularly interested in following the Soviet delegation and their interesting participation. They came in a ship and they lived on the ship while they were at the conference. It was docked in the Bay and they went back and forth from their own ship.

That was a very, very exciting time and really it was perhaps my first introduction to the real world of international diplomacy. It was the first opportunity I had. I followed all of the developments of the conference. Later on, I did a number of papers on the United Nations conference in connection with my university work.

I was in San Francisco, you see, almost continuously from 1937 until 1953, and that was most certainly the place to be. I had an awful lot to learn and that was the place to learn it.

*Q: Yes! Your work always had a lot of meat to it, didn't it?*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: You weren't just in the typing pool, typing.*

DILLON: No, no. I loved my work. I love people, I love challenge, I love life. People who say to me, "There are no opportunities," or, "I'm bored," I simply am unable to understand. Opportunity, even for women, even then, was everywhere around us.

*Q: Especially then. It was sort of a breakthrough right at that time for women, and many of them, of your group that we are now talking about, took advantage of it and that's where they really got their start. And then they didn't let go.*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Too many [women] did.*

DILLON: Right. I think the Second World War opened up some things. It didn't solve any problems and there was nothing definitive, but it opened up opportunities that had to be opened up under the circumstances. So that was a contributing factor.

My sister and I then came back to Indiana University, hoping we could get some kind of full-time meaningful study under way there. Unfortunately, very shortly she became seriously ill and the situation went from bad to worse. She ultimately, as I recall, made it through two years. I did, certainly. But the circumstances really consumed what little monies we had available, and were a terrible, terrible drain, especially on me because I loved her so much and we were so close. I wanted her to do this thing. I wanted her to get well, of course. We were there alone. Our family was still out on the West Coast. I felt that I had to do everything I possibly could to support her and see if we couldn't work our way through it. We couldn't. So that spring, it was obvious we were going to have to get back to work.

Mr. Campbell, for whom I had worked briefly at the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, had asked me, while I was there, to handle some personal and confidential correspondence for him. He had been asked to take an assignment, an appointment, with the United States Chamber of Commerce in Washington, D.C. as the head of their Foreign Commerce Department. While we were together in San Francisco, I handled that paperwork for him. I wrote his letters, I typed his résumés, his *curriculum vitae*, and kept his confidence. That is so important. I found throughout my career that saying, "No, I won't tell anyone. Yes, I will keep your confidence," is a very, very important factor in all

kinds of situations. Even in my later diplomatic career, whenever I gave my word that I would keep a confidence to whomever about whatever, I kept it. This builds, in turn, a trust in you and a confidence in you that is irreplaceable.

Mr. Campbell never forgot that little personal service I rendered for him. In the spring of '46, he called me from Washington and said, "Betty, I need you here with me. What I inherited here was a rather stagnant situation. The Department needs overhauling, needs reorganization, it needs some new blood. I need you here. Can you come?"

Well, of course, the timing was perfect for me. I was going to have to go back to work. It brought me for the first time to Washington, D.C.

*Q: What were your first impressions of Washington?*

DILLON: I was overwhelmed, of course. It was a long-time dream. Washington then was, as you know, something of a small town. I found it delightful. I found a learning experience around every corner. The intellectual and cultural atmosphere was superb.

*Q: And yet there was only the one theater.*

DILLON: Yes, but there was that theater. There were museums. I was quite active, again, in my church work during that period, and our church group, the young people's group, would go on Sunday afternoon on an outing. We'd go to a museum, we'd go to the Cathedral, we'd plan some specific trip. I found that very, very rewarding and interesting.

*Q: Did you go to Washington by train, Betty, as most people did?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: How did you feel when you came out of Union Station and saw, right ahead of you, the Capitol?*

DILLON: It was like a dream.

*Q: It's unforgettable, isn't it?*

DILLON: Yes. Mr. and Mrs. Campbell met me at the train. As I recall, we took a short drive around the city, just to orient me. They had arranged for a room for me with a retired lady, a woman retired from the Chamber, and I began work. Again, my duties and my responsibilities were much greater than just those of a clerk-typist or a secretary. I arranged board meetings and committee meetings. I was responsible for the official minutes. I supervised other personnel. I advised Mr. Campbell on reorganizing procedures and on personnel matters.

*Q: How big an outfit was this, Betty?*

DILLON: The United States Chamber, of course, is extremely large, and it's at H and Connecticut, a huge marble building. It was large in those days, and it's extremely large.

*Q: Oh, yes. He was the director, was he?*

DILLON: No, no. He was the World Trade Department manager, just as he was in San Francisco.

*Q: I'm just trying to get a feel for how many people he had.*

DILLON: In our department, maybe 15, including some international economists. One gentle man I remember was a liaison to some of the international organizations which were already getting under way for the post-war period. There were the annual meetings of the Chamber. It was United States business in action. It was a huge, effective lobby.

*Q: In effect, then, you were an executive secretary at that young age?*

DILLON: Exactly. I didn't use that phrase, because it isn't used much anymore and some people don't understand what it is, but that's exactly what I was.

Incidentally, I may have mentioned this earlier, and I would mention it for the young careerists who might be referring to this material: knowing that I was going to have to work, I left high school with the skills for being a very good secretary. I could type (and we had only manual typewriters in those days) at almost the world's speed record. I took dictation at conversation speed and could take verbatim notes for board meetings, committee meetings, and so forth. I hear these days a lot of young women saying, "Well, who wants to work as a secretary? I'm going to start at the top." I would suggest to you that working for a few years as a secretary is not at all a bad way to start. It's a marvelous way to listen, to watch, to learn, without having the responsibility for the things that are going on around you. It's marvelous.

*Q: And to know how things work from the inside out.*

DILLON: Exactly.

*Q: Yes, I quite agree. I think young men should do it, too.*

DILLON: Sure. Why not? In those days there was no way to copy material but retype it, you see.

*Q: Those awful carbon papers!*

DILLON: I was one of the few people who had a heavy enough touch to do seven clear copies at one time. (laughter)

*Q: I take off my hat.*

DILLON: These things mean absolutely nothing now, because they're passé completely. But what I'm trying to say is if young people will work as secretaries, learning, when they type a letter, read it and understand it and rationalize and justify and think about why the boss made that decision, think about what the response is going to be when you're filing, don't just say, "This is A, so I'll put this piece of paper under A," but think of the whole system. Think about how you're going to retrieve that piece of paper. Think about the logic of grouping things together. There's a thought process involved. Of course, that's one of the things that still applies today, not so much to filing pieces of paper in folders, but to computer programming. It's the same process, the same mental process.

*Q: There is an added fallout from that attitude of involvement. We can see it very easily from the way these employers of yours wanted to mentor you.*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Because they're people, too, and they love enthusiasm. It makes them feel as if they're accomplishing something. A very good point.*

*You say you lived in Washington and rented a room. Could you remember where that was, what area?*

DILLON: Oh, yes. It was in the 1400 block of Newton Street, Northwest. I think that area is coming back into its own now. It was dilapidated for many years. The lady I lived with passed away many, many years ago. But at that time it was convenient. There was a bus or a streetcar, maybe, but in any case, a bus came right down 14th Street and the Chamber of Commerce is at the intersection of 17th and H. So it was very convenient.

*Q: At that time, am I not right in thinking that 16th Street was the place to live?*

DILLON: Indeed, it was. A beautiful street. Lovely buildings, apartment buildings, even some residences, I think, farther out. It was always a pleasure to go down that street.

*Q: What about that wonderful park on 16th, which nobody dares go in anymore? Meridian Hill?*

DILLON: Meridian Hill. I understand some work is being done on that. They've started the fountains again, and I'm hoping that it's going to once again be the place to go.

*Q: Was that a place that you would go in those days?*

DILLON: Oh, yes. It was beautiful.

Where Carter Barron Theater is now, it was not there at that time, but I think there was a small outdoor amphitheater where we went occasionally. There was a fine Methodist Church nearby which was not far from where I lived. I taught Sunday school, sang in the choir, and was junior high counselor for my youngsters. As a young adult at the church, I participated in community surveys, welfare surveys, youth activity surveys, and so forth, because there was quite a grouping of churches there at 16th and Park Row: There was a Mormon church, there was Unitarian, and so forth. We tried to set up a program of cooperation and coordination from the standpoint of community Christian activities.

We also cooperated on establishing a program at the Industrial Home School for boys.

*Q: Where is that?*

DILLON: The school itself was a detention center. It was out on Wisconsin Avenue just below the Cathedral. There are other buildings in there now. There were some big old brick buildings there. It was an unfortunate situation because all of the boys that were being detained (I believe they were all minors), for whatever reason, were thrown together there. So you had little boys, even perhaps pre-school, who had been abandoned, thrown in with 17-year-old murderers. It was a very bad situation. Through our church activities, we set up a volunteer organization, went there one or two evenings a week, wrote letters for the boys, visited with them, played sports with them, whatever.

I developed a very close relationship with one of the youngsters who had been abandoned. He was, I guess--it's hard when you look back--he must have been seven, eight years old, maybe.

*Q: Poor little thing.*

DILLON: And a beautiful youngster, beautiful, soft-spoken little boy, obviously with some class somewhere in his background. I brought him with me each weekend. I brought him to Sunday school and church activities, and we had dinner together on Sunday. Then I would take him back Sunday evening. I enjoyed that very much. Ultimately he was reclaimed by his mother. He didn't much want to go back with her, and he tried to encourage me to make some effort to keep him with me, and I couldn't, in good conscience, do that.

*Q: One question arises in my mind, Betty. These were the days of segregation. Were these children all white or were they all black?*

DILLON: Many of them were white. I don't recall.

*Q: You mean it was mixed?*

DILLON: Oh, yes. He was white. There were black boys there.

*Q: Oh, they did mix them?*

DILLON: But, as I recall, not so many.

*Q: I'm very surprised.*

DILLON: Not so many. And you may be right. Perhaps the ones that were there were there temporarily, in transit to another school.

*Q: Did segregation bother you?*

DILLON: Segregation bothered me, of course. Segregation, as a problem, had not yet fully blossomed, and there weren't that many of our black friends in the Washington, D.C. area proper. We just didn't, unfortunately, have that much contact with them at any level. Of course segregation bothered me. I was absolutely color-blind, and for that matter, I suppose I could say race-blind. Many of my associates and colleagues, I realized many years later, were Jewish, Orthodox Jews. At the time, the thought didn't cross my mind. I didn't look for that kind of a racial identity and so forth, and I've always been grateful that I have that kind of a personal orientation.

*Q: Indeed. But all of your co-workers at this Chamber of Commerce would have been white, wouldn't they?*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: The only ones you would have met black would be the people who kept the building clean, I suppose.*

DILLON: Sure.

*Q: We forget. We forget.*

DILLON: I remember that while I was staying in the room on Newton Street, the Marian Anderson incident took place at Constitution Hall. She was an outstanding soprano soloist, mezzo-soprano, I believe, a black singer who was great beyond greatness. She was invited to appear, as I recall, at Constitution Hall, which is, of course, the Daughters of the American Revolution institution, and they refused to let her sing there. The lady I was staying with felt this was quite proper.

*Q: You were a member of the DAR, but maybe not at that time.*

DILLON: Not at that time.

*Q: And how did you feel?*

DILLON: I was appalled that Marian Anderson would not be allowed to sing in our nation's capital, in this great, great concert hall. I didn't have words with my landlady about this, but I would ask some gentle questions, such as, "Why not?" or "Why shouldn't she sing there?" or "I don't understand the problem." But I saw that I was dealing with a southern lady who, for her 65 or 70 years, had been so oriented, and we simply didn't discuss the issue. At one point she said, "The first thing you know they'll be sitting beside us in Constitution Hall."

*Q: You wouldn't get anywhere. Were you one of the ones lucky enough to go down to the Lincoln Memorial when she did sing?*

DILLON: No, I didn't.

Q: That would be something to say you'd been there.

DILLON: Oh, yes. I don't recall why I didn't. It's possible I was out of town. I went occasionally to our family place in Indiana, and it may have been something like that.

*Q: From your schedule, it sounds to me as if maybe you were working someplace! (laughter) How you fitted all those activities into one day!*

*Now, all of this time that you were doing these very fascinating jobs, did you feel any discrimination against you because you were a woman?*

DILLON: There was one incident. It had happened in San Francisco. I had applied for a position that was advertised. It was a secretarial position to the president of a small airline. I worked for him for a few weeks. He was a very bright man, and I think was under-utilized and under-occupied, because the airline was not operating its own aircraft at the time. That may have excused some of his conduct and behavior. In any case, it became clear to me very quickly that he was something of a womanizer, as they say these days. But I was a very professional person and very businesslike, and it didn't occur to me that his personal life would in any way have an impact on me or my career.

One Friday evening, he came back to the office late in the afternoon with the treasurer of the corporation. They opened the bar in the office and he had a drink, which was not uncommon in those days, and I think it still is a common practice in some areas. They asked me to join them a little bit later when I finished my work. I don't think I was drinking in those days. In any case, if I had a drink with them, I held the glass in my hand, which is something I learned to do over the years. But we began talking about the company. I would say the conversation, for the most part, was on business, but it was an informal conversation.

At some point the man informed me that he was going to Los Angeles that night. He was going on the train, because it was a Friday and he planned to be there the weekend and take care of business on Monday, and he asked me to go with him. I made some very

businesslike excuse, "No, thank you. It would be very nice, but I have plans for the weekend."

Not very much later that evening--and none of this was very late, seven o'clock or something--just as I was leaving the office, a couple of young ladies came to the office. They left with the men, and just a few minutes later, the phone rang and it was my boss' wife. She asked for him, and I said, "Oh, I'm sorry, they've already left for the train station." (laughter)

She was very casual and said, "Oh, I'm sorry I missed him. He's gone on south, then."

I said, "Oh, yes, they're on their way to Los Angeles."

She said, "*They?*"

I said, "Yes, the group has left." I thought nothing more about it. I had a nice weekend.

On Monday morning, I went in at nine o'clock. He called me into his office and he said, "I'm sorry it hasn't worked out here, and you're fired."

I never was quite sure if it was because I hadn't gone with him or because I had told his wife where he had gone, or both. But in any case, that was one of--I guess the only time in my life I was fired, and it was for that specific reason.

*Q: Really. I would say you were very fortunate that that is the only form of sexual discrimination or harassment you ever had. That is really quite surprising.*

DILLON: I don't mean to say that there wasn't subtle discrimination. I was extremely patient and tolerant and understanding. I was working as a secretary, not in competition with these men, so I always played the role of the subordinate and, as it were, kept my place, always supporting them, aiding them, assisting them. That was my job, after all.

*Q: And made the coffee.*

DILLON: No! I never in my life made a cup of coffee, served a cup of coffee, nor was I ever asked to.

*Q: Really? Well! That is something. (laughter)*

DILLON: In later years, as I became a top-level person in the government and industry, I did, because I was asking other people to do it for me under those circumstances, and I felt I should take my turn.

*Q: Yes, but that's quite a different thing. Puts it on a different plane. Then that one little thing that has sort of become a symbol for women's subjugation never happened to you.*

DILLON: No. And I really don't know why. I was not the kind to make coffee and serve. I'm sure it just never occurred to them. If it did, it didn't hang in their minds very much.

And here again, I sometimes blame women for some of these things that are visited upon them. There are ways to make known that you're not there to make coffee without saying, "I don't think it's my place to make coffee."

*Q: Yes. You can just be too busy.*

*One thing, all through this, you mentioned "my career." Right from the beginning, you seemed absolutely certain you would have a career. You weren't going to drop out, get married, and have children the way so many of your peers did?*

DILLON: No.

*Q: That was a very fixed thing in your mind, wasn't it?*

DILLON: Yes. Yes, it was. There was never a question of career versus marriage, although I feel sure if I had gone ahead and married one or two of the young men that I was quite close to in my early years as a young adult, there would have been conflict, because by then I was career-oriented, I was caught up in internationalism, the global view. I was hard-working and, if I may say so, dynamic and driving. And there would have been a problem.

*Q: And idealistic, too.*

DILLON: And idealistic. Of course, there was a problem when I finally did marry.

*Q: Yes, but you always expected to do something with your mind in the outside world, rather than just in the home?*

DILLON: Yes. Why not?

*Q: Yes, yes, exactly.*

*How many years did you work for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce?*

DILLON: I was there about a year and a half when a marvelous opportunity came along. A friend said that a major presidential candidate was opening his Washington office in preparation for the 1948 elections--this was in '47--and was looking for a topnotch executive secretary to, as it were, run the office, and they thought I should apply. I very much hated to leave Mr. Campbell, but I discussed it with him and he said, "Betty, this is an opportunity of a lifetime. We're over the worst part here at the Chamber, and feel free to apply."

The candidate was no less than Governor Harold Stassen, and he was a major candidate, very nearly becoming the President of the United States. That year and a half in his Washington office, which culminated in attendance at the Philadelphia Republican Convention, was one of the most expansive of my career.

*Q: Let's go into detail here, Betty, because these campaigns that I keep hearing about from different people sound so exciting. What sort of thing did you do as the executive secretary? Keep all the threads in your hands, the running of the campaign?*

DILLON: No, no. This came later. No, the running of the office. I was a secretary, and campaign managers came and went for Washington visits. The governor came and went on many frequent Washington visits. State chairmen came in. I planned and called and arranged press conferences. I took care of all of the travel and hotel accommodations for all of these people. I arranged the catering for dinners or luncheons or whatever political functions were necessary at the time. But, of course, it was like sitting in the eagle's nest with respect to what was going on with his campaign and the other campaigns nationally.

That year, of course, the competition for the Republican nomination was between Senator Robert Taft on the far right, ultra-conservative, Governor Stassen on the far left. I've always felt he was liberal and he was always referred to as that, but kinder people say he's a moderate. And in between was Governor Thomas E. Dewey, and that, of course, is where the convention finally came down. They nominated him and, as you know, he was defeated by President Truman.

*Q: Yes. Do you think that had Stassen, who had a much warmer personality--let's face it, Americans go for the warm personality, even when it isn't on TV; it comes through on newsreels and speeches on radio and so forth--do you think Stassen might have defeated Truman?*

DILLON: Yes. And many political analysts felt that way.

*Q: It would make that much difference. Dewey had no charisma. "The little man on the wedding cake," as Alice Roosevelt said, and she was a Republican.*

DILLON: Yes. The press hung out at our office a great deal, because Stassen was news. Often they would sit around and talk among themselves or talk with me, and they painted a very dismal picture of Governor Dewey. They would come there straight from press conferences with him. I recall one prominent newsman coming over, furious, saying that he had just come from a conference with Dewey, who was reclining on a couch, sipping a lemonade throughout the press conference. (laughter)

*Q: Imagine what they'd do with that now. (laughter) The wimp factor!*

DILLON: Exactly! But you're quite right. I think political analysts and many watchers felt that Stassen was an electable candidate and this was an unfortunate development.

*Q: Very warm individual, and he caught the attention of young people.*

DILLON: Yes. The young people, young adults, students. He was the young person's candidate. There was very little room in the Republican Party for that kind of thing, and there's almost none now, unfortunately.

*Q: Really? I thought they made a big pitch to the young people.*

DILLON: They've made the pitch. I think many yuppies, if I may use that term, are associated with the Republican Party, but the kind of grass-root political activism that tends toward moderate-to-liberal thinking on some of the major issues of our day then and now, wasn't seen in the Republican Party then and I don't see it in the Republican Party now.

*Q: You said you went to Philadelphia. Did you have tickets to go to the convention?*

DILLON: I was on the staff there, you see.

*Q: So that permitted you to go in and out?*

DILLON: Oh, yes. It was very exciting. It was only one of two conventions I've attended, but it's an exciting process and one I wish every American could participate in at one point or another. Of course, now we have television, and you can, in fact, indirectly participate.

*Q: And perhaps hear more of what's going on than if you were there. I understand they're a madhouse.*

DILLON: They are. Stassen had been Wendell Willkie's floor manager.

*Q: Oh, had he? I hadn't realized that.*

DILLON: Yes, years before. We followed the same tactics on the floor of the convention that he had followed with Willkie to nominate him in, I guess, 1940. We released balloons, we staged demonstrations, and put on a very effective show. But the Dewey machine, while less showy, was a very cold and calculating political machine.

*Q: And went around collecting all the votes. Deals offered, that kind of thing? Yes, well, that's the way politics is. What chance did Taft have?*

DILLON: I think many people both in the party and outside the party, as well as a large majority of the voters of America, felt that he was not the man for the times. We were in the post-war era, we were in a period of not only recuperating from the war, but developing, expanding, reaching out, new technologies had come in, social and political

issues were before us, and there was a feeling that we didn't need an ultra-conservative for that period.

*Q: Also, he was not an internationalist.*

DILLON: No. And here we were with a brand-new United Nations. The World Federalists were even organizing and prominent, a bit more extreme in their thinking, and the world had become international during the war. We woke up after the war to a very small planet and a very international world.

*Q: Yes, and the power had shifted from Great Britain to the United States and to Russia.*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: It was a shock we're still getting over.*

*Getting back now to Harold Stassen, was he a man who could evoke great loyalty among his people?*

DILLON: Yes, but again, he had a cadre of Minnesota people that, of course, had been very loyal to him ever since his governorship, some congressmen, some political figures. But his campaign and his organization extended far beyond Minnesota, which I think was a mistake that some people, even in the party, made. They looked upon him as a local kind of candidate, and he wasn't. Some of his major support came from the eastern seaboard, as well as the far west.

*Q: Very highly thought of at university campuses.*

DILLON: Oh, yes. He was president of University of Pennsylvania later, of course.

*Q: Can you recall how close Stassen came? By the time they took a vote, his hopes were gone, were they? There's so much maneuvering before they ever get to take a vote.*

DILLON: Yes. It's been so long. I have some files on that period, but very few. I sometimes confuse the Philadelphia convention with the 1952 Chicago convention. But as I recall, '48 was the one at which he came the closest. He was most popular then. I think the first delegate count, the first official vote, gave him a very, very sizable number of delegates, and Taft a sizable number, and Dewey. But as I recall, Dewey had the largest number from the very start. I can't even at this point remember the number of ballots that they had to take.

*Q: Of course, Dewey had run before.*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: So therefore, he had everything in place, didn't he?*

DILLON: Yes. Herb Brownell, who later became Attorney General, was, I think, then his campaign manager.

*Q: I suppose you must have gotten to meet all kinds of people who either then or later became very prominent in the Republican Party?*

DILLON: Yes and no. Stassen was not accepted by the party. You see, that was precisely the problem. So while, yes, we made their acquaintance there and talked with them and visited with them, it wasn't the kind of thing that you carried away with you and developed a political base from.

*Q: I see. It would just be next to them at a dinner or something.*

*Were you there when there were "skull sessions," as we used to call them, of the people, taking notes and that sort of thing?*

DILLON: Oh, yes, for the Stassen [people]. But you see, once the convention gets under way, it becomes unbelievably hectic. The pressure is unbelievable. Then much more than now. And time is so short, sometimes there are just minutes to run from one delegation to another, to win them over or to trade numbers of delegates and so forth. That kind of thing is done on the spot by floor managers, by state chairmen, and as a rule, the candidate himself remains in a suite somewhere and is in touch by phone or personally with the people doing the negotiating.

*Q: On a given day, where would you be? Would you be down on the floor or would you be up with Stassen?*

DILLON: It would depend. I was not directly involved in any of this. It boils down to a very small number of people that actually get involved in this kind of thing. I would be in the Stassen headquarters, perhaps on a given day among the observers in the balcony.

*Q: Would he ask you to go out and get a feel for things and come back and report?*

DILLON: No.

*Q: He had his staff people. As you describe this, I'm just wondering, is this a very sensible way to arrive at a decision on something as important as selecting the President of the United States, making little deals like that under tremendous pressure? It would seem to me you're putting the premium, as you do in a law case, on the man with the most skill and the man who's done it the most times. Would you agree with this?*

DILLON: I agree with you. It went on then. It's going on today.

*Q: I think we have a terrible way of picking our presidents.*

DILLON: We're not a democracy. I sometimes grow weary of hearing us referred to as a democracy. We are *not* a democracy. In the first place, we weren't established as a democracy; we're a republic. In that connection, I'm pleased you mentioned that aspect of this whole thing, because we have Harold Stassen to thank for direct primaries. At the time of his 1947-48 campaign, he felt that the people should be involved. There were just a small number of so-called direct primaries at that time, and he investigated the legal procedures involved for opening up indirect primaries, for moving away from the statewide political conventions where nominees were supported or selected. He said, "We need to take these choices to the people."

I remember Ohio particularly, because one of the men who had spent a great deal of time in the Washington office at the time I came on board there was the Ohio campaign director, and did a marvelous job; very subtle, very astute politician, and Stassen won the Ohio primary, a huge number of delegates for the time. We cited that as an example of how this kind of process should be taking place, you see.

I feel that there's a great deal of reconsideration indicated in connection with our political process.

*Q: I think anything done under such terrible, terrible pressure--I know the same thing takes place, as far as pressure goes, at these international summits that we have. Rozanne Ridgway has described to me how they stay up 'til 3:00, 4:00, 5:00 in the morning. She said, "I just have to sort of get in training before I go, or physically I won't endure." Now, what kind of a way is that to do business that's this important?*

DILLON: Yes. I recall coming out of a Geneva conference at dawn.

*Q: My word! Then you just get in that sort of light-headed thing where you get silly.*

DILLON: Exactly. We used to call it "silly time." (laughter)

All of this may seem a departure from my career directions, but in fact, it wasn't at all, because Stassen was very much an international figure. He traveled internationally, he was known internationally. He was very much aware internationally. He was the first candidate to write a book on his positions. He wrote a book called *Where I Stand*, and put his positions there, many of which had to do with international relations, particularly in the post-war era. And having been a delegate to the United Nations Conference in San Francisco, the charter conference, he was particularly interested in international multilateral cooperation.

*Q: Once he didn't win, he went back to what he'd been doing before, I suppose?*

DILLON: Practicing law and whatever. We closed the Washington office, of course, within days, shipped things to Minnesota.

*Q: Is all that stuff in the Minnesota Historical Society now?*

DILLON: His papers are being left to the University of Minnesota. We tried very hard to get him to leave them at Princeton, which was one of the projects I worked on while I was at Princeton later in my career. At one point he was inclined to do that, because the Dulles papers are there. But ultimately he's made a final decision that because Minnesota--he was governor there, he was close to Hubert Humphrey, and the Humphrey papers are there and so forth, so they'll be there.

*Q: So what did Betty do then?*

DILLON: Betty went back to San Francisco. (laughter)

*Q: Oh, did you? And what happened when you arrived in San Francisco?*

DILLON: I had an opportunity to take a position that I thought, for the first time, would lift me out of the secretarial category. One of the men I had worked with at Burns-Philp Company a few years before had started his own international trading company, a New Zealander. He knew of my work with Burns-Philp and asked me to come with him as an assistant and import manager, handling a lot of his orders and purchase orders, repeat orders, developing and redeveloping in the post-war area some of the markets that had been wiped out in the Pacific Basin by the Japanese encounters there.

It was an excellent position. I had a title for the first time, other than secretary, and very much enjoyed the work. But I felt that I couldn't see myself going very far with it, and, frankly, he wasn't very successful, so it was a very brief encounter.

I did have then an opportunity to go with a firm that handled the Philippine Airlines account. Aviation, especially international aviation, had been one of my longtime interests. Again, I was working as a secretary, but again as an executive secretary.

*Q: What title had you had in that first job?*

DILLON: Assistant to the president and import manager.

*Q: You worked as an executive secretary for the company that handled the Philippine Airlines?*

DILLON: Philippines Airlines account. I was secretary to one of the partners, and it was a fascinating new commercial venture. It was a sales promotion company. They were paid a percentage of the profits that their client companies made, so our income was in direct

relation to the effectiveness of our sales promotion campaign, which I thought was a very interesting way to approach commercial development.

I asked to work almost exclusively with the Philippine Airlines account, because they had many others, of course. I was told that I could, as appropriate, so that I would often go back and forth between our offices and the Philippine Airlines offices, maybe taking the layout of a timetable or get approval for a press release, which I sometimes wrote. I remember a Philippines Airlines DC-6--DC-4? DC-6? Goodness. It was a long time ago. Set a record for crossing the Pacific. I don't remember what it was, but it was the fastest that any commercial aircraft had come from Manila to San Francisco. We had a press release on that, which was very well received, and got some good publicity.

*Q: You were developing markets for these people, was that it?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: It was not a real advertising company, was it?*

DILLON: We handled their advertising.

*Q: That was part of it, as well. Okay.*

DILLON: Yes, the whole program. We did everything from prepare their box ad for the Yellow Pages to design and produce posters, gorgeous commercial posters, to print their timetables and their promotion pamphlets and leaflets, to issuing press releases and handling any publicity, and so forth.

*Q: I see. The whole package.*

DILLON: I enjoyed that tremendously, and once again it was an international experience. I felt that although I didn't have an opportunity to go to the Philippines, I read about it, I studied about it. I talked with any of the crews I could meet. I became close friends with the chief stewardess of the Philippine Airlines, Ning Basa. I mention her name only because her brother was the first Filipino killed in the Second World War. He was a young man, of course, and one of the airports outside of Manila was named after him, Basa Airfield. I'm not sure if it still exists.

We became friends, and I enjoyed visiting with her, because she flew all over the world, wherever Philippine Airlines went.

During this time, the late '40s, the Stassen group back east began to be in touch with me. An attorney friend of Stassen whom I'd met earlier was coordinating the campaign nationally: Warren E. Burger. 1952 was looming on the horizon. Just their communication served to keep my interest in the political arena alive. So I volunteered to be a precinct chairman for the Republican Party, and I did that mainly because a new group had taken over San Francisco's Republican Committee, a new young group that had

become fed up with the old-timers, with the machine politics, with the ultra-conservatism, and they had managed to have themselves voted in and were developing a marvelous new political program. I thought it might be exciting to be a part of that. They knew, of course, of my association with Stassen, and they felt, as we all did, that come 1952, surely he would be the man.

In a very short period, a matter of months, even, I was advanced from precinct chairman to assembly district chairman, to congressional district chairman for the Republican Party. I was the first woman in California to head a congressional district for the Party.

I was working all of this time, of course. I was also going to evening school, as I told you I have done throughout my career. I was attending international relations classes at the University of San Francisco and studying, with a private tutor, my French.

*Q: Good heavens!*

DILLON: I soon saw that if I was going to be really active in politics, I would need more time than my position with Philippine Airlines was taking. That is, more free time over and above what I was having to give to Philippine Airlines. Through some political connections--and I don't remember--someone said, "There is an airline that gives free space to the young Republicans in San Francisco. We understand they're looking for a secretary."

The airline was operating its aircraft on the Korean airlift and had to expand and balloon almost overnight. And they weren't prepared for it, so the president of the airline was having problems between management and operations. The pilots and the operations people over at the airport in Oakland wanted to do things one way; he and his small management staff had a limited budget and had certain ideas about contracts and how they should be performed, and there was something of a breakdown between the two groups.

So he asked me to come on as a special assistant to him, to the president, to do the management study of where the problems were and how they could be corrected. Again, it was a marvelous opportunity. Everything was at my disposal. I could talk with anyone, I could look at anything. There were no limits on my thinking and my research, so it was a marvelous opportunity for me to explore, not having done exactly this kind of thing before, and experiment and draw up a very good study. It was good. I still have the paper. (laughter) I was reading it just a year or two ago. It was good!

So I left my position with the Philippine Airlines account and came to work for Overseas National Airways, which at that time was the largest supplemental air carrier in the United States. There were only a couple at that point. In connection with doing this study, and since some of the office space was being used by the Young Republicans, the company became interested in what I was doing politically, and said, "Look. Stay on with us. You can do some more management work for us. But we'll give you whatever time

you need to do your political work here." I'm not so sure but what that would be illegal these days. (laughter)

*Q: Yes, probably would be. Yes.*

DILLON: It certainly wasn't then. It was very much appreciated by everyone involved.

In 1950, I believe it was, there was a major national Republican meeting--it may have been the national committee--in San Francisco. We hosted it. Stassen was the keynote speaker, as I recall, and was certainly a prominent personage there. So once again, I set up the program in San Francisco for him, sponsored his visit there, made all of the arrangements and so forth. By then, you see, I was very active with the San Francisco and California committees.

Now we've come into the era of Richard Nixon. He had been a young congressman from southern California, who, incidentally, became a congressman when interested citizens ran an ad in the paper for candidates.

*Q: Really?*

DILLON: And he was selected. (laughter) But he was doing well with his career. He was on the rise, and the Stassen organization and the Nixon organization were working very closely together. As a matter of fact, we sometimes took credit for having pushed Nixon along in California. But then we were also involved with Senator William Knowland, very conservative publisher from Oakland, and with Governor Earl Warren, who was conservative, if not uncolorful.

In any case, the national meeting there was tremendously successful, and Stassen received the reception that we anticipated he would. I had set up appointments for him with all of the key people in the state and had begun picking a slate for the 1952 primary.

At this point, Overseas National asked if I would begin to fly the line as route support.

*Q: What does "route support" mean?*

DILLON: Well, that simply means you fly on the aircraft as a company employee to do whatever you need to do. I was to check on the personnel at the stations. We had a station in Honolulu and contacts in Wake, if we had to land there. These were DC-4s, mind you, that we were flying back and forth across the Pacific. Tokyo was our turn-around place for the Korean airlift. The military took it from there.

So I began a very, very enjoyable couple of years going out quite frequently and coming back, reporting to the president. I recall late in that period, the pilots and maybe even the flight attendants were considering organizing. They were not unionized, and it was helpful to have me with them and out on the line, meeting with them and talking with them. They didn't organize as long as I was with the company.

I also did a special project for the president of checking out airports and maintenance bases--I believe it was this period--with a view to their ultimately doing commercial charters. They weren't happy in Oakland, and they were debating whether to move farther out and take over old military airports or hangars or whether to come back east or whatever. So I did quite a bit of that, but all the while, you see, remaining active in politics.

*Q: It must have been a very busy, yeasty time in your life, I should think.*

DILLON: Yes. In 1951, Stassen started organizing again and I was asked to be his northern California campaign director. The two men that he named for southern California were not enthusiastic about the campaign. I regretted, and I think he regretted later that he didn't make a different selection for the south, because nothing happened down there. Ultimately, whatever was done in California was done by us out of my northern California office. I put together a tremendous slate for Stassen, and we filed signatures, but while we filed the signatures, we didn't qualify, so he was not filed in the primary. It didn't matter, because California was the last of the primaries, and by then the handwriting was on the wall, so it wasn't that important. By "the handwriting on the wall," I mean the Eisenhower campaign.

*Q: Yes. Well, also Taft apparently had quite a machine. I guess he inherited the Dewey machine.*

DILLON: Yes, he did. Very strong. That was his strongest effort. As a matter of fact, I can certainly say, political analysts have said, and it's been published that the Eisenhower campaign, as well as the Stassen campaign and maybe some of the other minor interests, were more than anything else a "we have to stop Taft" campaign. Stassen was described as a "stalking horse." Once the Eisenhower campaign became really strong, got under way, it became quite clear to everyone that the Stassen delegates would be important.

*Q: To Eisenhower.*

DILLON: To Eisenhower. Yes.

*Q: What did you think of the actual--or maybe I'm jumping ahead too fast--the convention in Chicago? What did you think of all of that maneuvering about the southern delegates, the Texas delegates? How did you, as a Stassen person, feel about Eisenhower's people in that?*

DILLON: Eisenhower was less an organization person than Stassen had ever been. He was not from the political ranks, he'd never run for public office. He was not a politician. He was a convenient hero for the Republican nomination and for the election itself, to get the Democrats out. He was electable, and he was popular enough that he was seen as someone who could stop Taft.

The maneuvering: even though we went into that convention with a sizable block (seems like it was 150 Stassen delegates) it became very apparent it was going to be Eisenhower by the second or third ballot as I recall. But you may remember that it was the Stassen floor manager that grabbed the microphone and swung delegates to Eisenhower, the block that nominated him.

*Q: I do remember that. One political writer has said that many people wanted to switch from Taft. They had been promising their votes to Taft before. In fact, Taft had almost all he needed when he went into the convention. He had all but 16. Can you imagine? By the time it started, he really had more than enough, but then they started the floor fighting over the delegations and which ones should be seated.*

*This political writer says that many, many people wanted to vote for Eisenhower and simply were looking for a way to do it. I wonder, was that a feeling among your group? Or were you holding out for Stassen?*

DILLON: The Stassen people stayed put for a few votes, as I recall, certainly from the standpoint of personal loyalty. I don't think any of his close associates or any of us supporters ever thought about abandoning him until the final decision was made.

*Q: That's why he had a big block to give.*

DILLON: Exactly. They stayed put. As far as the fights over the delegations, I think in part that was one of the first conventions at which there was that much ferment. In part, that may have been a result, you see, of this '48 and '52 move, started and initiated by Stassen, to take these selections out to the people through direct primaries and to the people to select their own delegations. That's when you began to get this hassle, this tussle between different factions within states.

*Q: So philosophically, you people would say to Eisenhower's people, "Go for it!"*

DILLON: Sure. He would certainly be our second choice.

*Q: There wasn't any real animus that you felt? Was there much bitterness left over from that maneuvering? It was very dramatic on the television. I wasn't in the country, but I read about it.*

DILLON: No. The conventions are so tense and so fast moving, so much pressure, that really it's only in retrospect that you kind of look at things like that, assess their meaning, and rationalize them, and then say, well, it was good, bad, or indifferent. At least most of us took a pretty cold analytical view of the situation. Now, to be sure, many of those doing the direct negotiating become very angry under those circumstances. I mean, after all, they're going 'til all hours of the night, their ties are loose, they're in their shirt sleeves, they're screaming and yelling at one another. They're the people that sometimes become

angry when it appears that there's been a breach of confidence or a breaking of the word, that kind of thing. But I don't recall seeing our people being that bitter about that particular fight.

*Q: The Taft people might have been.*

DILLON: Yes. Exactly.

*Q: But then I suppose they have to throw that aside, because they want to win in the fall.*

DILLON: But you know, one of the things I learned during these years I worked in the Republican Party--and I became inactive after this period--was they would rather keep things in-house, keep it among themselves than win.

*Q: Really?*

DILLON: I've seen this in local elections, and I suppose, to a certain extent, you could say that about the Dewey nomination in '48. He was told, the Party was told, the world was told repeatedly, "He can't beat Truman. He's not electable," and still they went ahead. He was the Party man.

*Q: And yet they all believed he was going to beat Truman up until the last possible minute.*

DILLON: Sure! Well, they do believe it.

*Q: You believe whatever you want to believe.*

DILLON: But it doesn't work.

*Q: Well, Truman was very unpopular at that time, very unpopular at that time.*

DILLON: Sure.

*Q: They cut off their noses to spite their faces.*

DILLON: I'm afraid so. Very, very often. The situation during and after the '52 campaign was an interesting one, because while the Republicans had decided to go with Eisenhower after some of these hard-fought local battles, he still was not an insider. When he came into the White House, he brought in people that were not insider Republican politicians, and this caused a great deal of dissension. My observation was that the White House and Republican National Committee and some of the delegations on the Hill had some serious liaison problems.

*Q: I can imagine that they would. Here the Party had been waiting 20 years to get back in, and they get in and they're not the ones hired. I see. I hadn't thought of that. So he wasn't all that popular among the Party, not among the old guard, certainly.*

*After the excitement of this campaign, again your people had to go back without having gained the prize. Did you work for Eisenhower at all? Did you continue to do anything in that?*

DILLON: No, and many of the Stassen people didn't. I think not because they were bitter or upset or didn't like Eisenhower, but it was simply a let-down period.

*Q: I suppose Eisenhower had his own people by that time.*

DILLON: Yes. Oh, sure. Absolutely. Of course, the Stassen people, in a similar way, had no place to go, because we had never been accepted as Party insiders by the old guard, so to speak.

*Q: Stassen was perhaps just a little bit too early for his own good, wasn't he?*

DILLON: He certainly was.

*Q: Because there was in place this monolith, if you will, that you couldn't move.*

DILLON: The pressmen said so often in '48 that Stassen's problem was that he was not a Republican, he was a Democrat. He was in the wrong Party. And there were serious suggestions in public, in the press, that he might be considering running as an Independent or switching to a Democrat. But he had such a long history of Party loyalty, such a long history, I wish that some day someone would look at what he did and has done for the Republican Party and somehow pull it out and bring it to light.

*Q: Indeed.*

DILLON: He made a tremendous contribution since he was a youngster, with young adults and with the Party in Minnesota, with the Party nationally.

*Q: I don't think changing parties ever works out too well, anyway. Look at John Connolly.*

DILLON: Look at Reagan and Bush.

*Q: Yes, Reagan and Bush. Gosh, I'd better be careful what I say! (laughter) It doesn't always work out. I forgot about Reagan. But Reagan did it very early on, apparently.*

DILLON: 1960.

*Q: Was it that recently?*

DILLON: Yes. During all of this period we're talking about here.

*Q: But he wasn't that well known, except as an actor.*

DILLON: He wasn't, no.

*Q: And whoever thought he'd be in the White House?*

DILLON: So there was something of a splitting up of factions after '52. But shortly after I went back to San Francisco and was finishing up some things for the airline, I learned that Stassen had been appointed to the Eisenhower Cabinet. He was to be Administrator of Foreign Aid and the Mutual Security Agency which were combined then and they still are under different names (AID). He was charged with pulling together all five of the existing foreign assistance programs. There was ECA Marshall Plan, the Greek-Turkish Aid Plan, there was IIAA in Latin America, there was TCA in the Middle East, Technical Cooperation Administration, the Point Four Program. And they were scattered and duplicative and overlapping.

*Q: Mutual Security--what was that?*

DILLON: Agency. He was director. It simply was the security part of our overseas assistance effort. It still exists in other ways. I don't mean by that the CIA or something; it was simply the military assistance consideration.

*Q: I understand. Yes.*

DILLON: At that point, Stassen contacted me and asked me to come back and work in the management branch of the new umbrella organization in 1953. I was a special assistant in management.

*Q: That would be a Civil Service rating?*

DILLON: No, it was what we called an excepted appointment. I suppose it would be called a political appointment. I never really viewed it as that, because it was certainly an existing functional assignment, but I suppose that's in part what it was. He wanted someone to look into and oversee on his behalf the monstrous problems that had developed as a result of the combination of these five organizations, these five sets of people, and to make an effort to get good, qualified people to come in, especially technical people--we couldn't get enough of them--to see that personnel procedures and practices were streamlined and expedited.

*Q: Didn't you have an awful lot of extra people hanging around, if there were five managements?*

DILLON: I didn't come until the fall of '53, and before I arrived, they had gone through the so-called "Stassenations."

*Q: Did those mean RIFs [Reduction in Force]?*

DILLON: Yes, they were RIFs, and he personally did it.

*Q: Is that so?*

DILLON: He said he didn't want anyone else to be blamed for it or to take the responsibility, and I'm told that he would sit long, long hours into the night with individual personnel folders in his office, making individual decisions.

*Q: And that is when all of the different organizations went through their--*

DILLON: Were combined.

*Q: Yes, in his. But I mean State went through a similar thing.*

DILLON: They probably did.

*Q: I guess all the organizations were told to cut out dead wood?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: I didn't realize. I never heard of "Stassenization."*

DILLON: It made him a very unpopular person with his own people in many ways, except that those who were kept on were very loyal, of course.

*Q: Of course they were. Would you happen to know the percentage he had to get rid of? Any idea?*

DILLON: I don't remember, because I wasn't back here yet when that was actually done, but it was a large number of people, many of them, as I recall, with Civil Service status or some kind of tenure. But they were given special legislation to create the new Foreign Operations Administration, make it a Cabinet post, and make it effective and productive in the post-war period.

*Q: Veterans at that time were given points that would help them stay on.*

DILLON: But you know, with five international organizations, each with its own executive staff, its own controller, its own program people in agriculture, program people in military assistance over here, program people in health care, and so on, sometimes we ended up with four directors for health or three directors for agriculture. So it was a monstrous undertaking.

I had been privileged to type up and go over with Stassen some of his early drafts for the reorganization plan that came out of the White House creating this FOA.

During that period, I was there almost five years, it was a very, very trying time. It was challenging, and I enjoyed the work in that I learned a tremendous amount, but I was in a very difficult position. I was, in fact, representing the administrator at the same time I was a newcomer, an outsider, trying to work with people who had been in these organizations for many years, were experienced and so forth. I think I contributed a great deal. I recall drawing up the personnel procedures that helped expedite the files and that kind of thing, management considerations. I signed off on every personnel action in the agency for four years--every one.

We wanted very much to get qualified people, but we were already beginning to realize that an agriculture expert, *per se*, does not necessarily make an effective technical assistant specialist. Many of the skilled technicians that were available to us couldn't learn languages. They had no cross-cultural communication tolerance. Many of them, of course, had physical problems which ruled out their going. Many of them, family situations.

One of the things that I was particularly interested in during that period were some very early tests drawn up by consultant psychiatrists or maybe clinical psychologists, who were consultants to the Office of Personnel, some early testing that they tried to design to enable us to identify those people who would make it and those who wouldn't. Likewise, those people who would be apt to communicate cross-culturally and apt to pick up some of the foreign language, through testing before they went over.

As I look back, it was a very crude effort. It was a questionnaire kind of thing, a few pages, but apparently we were on the right track, because at one point I traveled among some of the programs overseas. I went to a couple of the ECA missions in Europe. I recall, I think in The Netherlands, we had the remnants of something, and Spain, and over to Greece and to Lebanon, where we had a TCA, Technical Cooperation group, and through Egypt and back. One of the things I did on that trip was make it a point to interview and visit with and observe those individuals to whom the experimental test had been given before they came on board, and ascertain whether or not they were fitting in, doing well, working effectively and productively. When I came back, we compared my findings with what tests had shown, and they were 100% right on.

*Q: Is that so? What year did you take that trip?*

DILLON: That was in '55, the winter of '54-'55, I believe.

*Q: Was this your first time in that part of the world?*

DILLON: In that part of the world, yes. I had been in Japan a great deal, you see, for the airline. Incidentally, I *loved* Japan. I loved it! I was there enough, I was beginning to pick up the language. I love the Japanese culture and the people. Mind you, at that period it was still occupied. And I would visit with Japanese that were still associated with the military. They had found ways to make them guards on airplanes or something, under our supervision. I would visit with them. I got out into the countryside. I look back, you know, I'm not sure I would do it again. Here is a country we had just defeated, a country that apparently hated us.

*Q: But they didn't once we won.*

DILLON: Well, right. And I'm not so sure the people--you know, the same old story: war is not among peoples; it's among governments.

*Q: They had tremendous respect for any authority, and once we had won, they admired us.*

DILLON: But I loved them. I loved the countryside and the country. So that was my first international travel. But this 1955 trip on behalf of the administrator was my first trip in the other direction.

*Q: How did you enjoy the Middle East, Beirut and Cairo?*

DILLON: I loved Beirut. Lebanon was a beautiful country. We had a marvelous program there. I think back to that visit sometimes. That was the only time I was in Lebanon proper, and I think, oh, what they've done to it, because it was a beautiful country, a country that was progressing very rapidly. It was a sophisticated country and had a key role to play in the eastern Mediterranean.

I was in Cairo for a visit of a week or so, and met with our foreign aid director there. That was an interesting visit for two reasons. One of the other things I was to explore throughout this trip was the possibility of programming technical assistance to work with women's groups in the developing countries. Once again, Harold Stassen's idea. He said, "We're not going to be able to influence agriculture production unless we influence agriculture practices, and to do that, we have to reach the women in most of these countries." He felt women had a very key role to play in the post-war era and in the economic development of most of these countries. So I was to, wherever possible, meet with any women leaders that might be there, talk with our people about what they knew about women's roles and so forth.

In Cairo, I found prominent women leaders, from the most part from very well-to-do families, who were already literally screaming and yelling about women's rights and the role of women.

*Q: University graduates?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Many of them in England, probably.*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Or maybe no. They have good universities.*

DILLON: Oh, yes. Egypt has good universities, but many of them educated in England. These were some middle-aged, some young women in their thirties, forties. By no means violent activists, these were sound, mature, sophisticated women who were concerned about their country and women's role in development throughout the world, and were establishing some very effective programs and organizations.

*Q: On birth control issues, that type of thing?*

DILLON: No, I don't recall hearing about birth control.

*Q: This was to educate girls?*

DILLON: Education, health programs along with it, charitable programs, the need to reach some of these young women and girls through hospital programs. I remember visiting the TB sanitarium. They were all actively involved as volunteers.

Interestingly enough, at one of those visits, I think it was the TB sanitarium, Prince Faisal was visiting there also. A small group of us met with him and talked with him about the role of women. His personal ideas, of course, were very well known, and I don't think they changed much during his lifetime.

*Q: Which Prince Faisal are we talking about?*

DILLON: He later became King Faisal and was assassinated. Saudi.

*Q: Oh, a Saudi. Prince Faisal of Saudi Arabia.*

DILLON: He was then the crown prince and later became King and was assassinated. I do remember his saying, "Oh, I think women are wonderful and they have a great deal to contribute, especially in the kitchen." (laughter)

*Q: I know. I know.*

DILLON: Then he laughed, you know.

*Q: Oh, well, all right.*

DILLON: He was a very, very clever man.

*Q: Yes. A terrible loss. Isn't he the one whose nephew shot him, or some member of the family?*

DILLON: Yes. So that trip and those visits were extremely interesting and educational for me. Also in Egypt, we were at that time trying to decide whether or not to build the Aswan Dam. We ultimately decided not to, unfortunately.

*Q: Having promised.*

DILLON: Yes. So I talked informally and generally with some of the Egyptians about that and, of course, with our own mission head there, who was a retired admiral, a very prominent admiral. I can't recall his name now. I recommended very strongly that we go ahead on it, but, of course, my recommendations were very small compared to those who were making the decisions.

*Q: It's interesting to see this pulling going on, because here's Stassen trying to open up everything throughout the world for international cooperation and help people get on their feet, and at the same time, John Foster Dulles was clamping down and saying, "We are going to have a real Cold War, and if you're not with us, you're against us."*

DILLON: And Allen Dulles.

*Q: And Allen Dulles, working clandestinely.*

DILLON: And their sister [Eleanor Lansing Dulles]. I have heard it said in academic circles at Princeton while I was there that Stassen's fall came as a direct result of "the Dulles machine." I think the expression was that he was "caught in the Dulles meat grinder." And that may, in fact, be what happened.

*Q: Dulles was so powerful. He certainly produced a very unhappy Foreign Service, I can tell you. And he was there for so long.*

*As you go back and read history, there are so many "if onlys" and "what ifs," aren't there? You can't go back and do it again.*

DILLON: While I was working at FOA for those four or five years, I was still going to evening school working toward my degree. I was doing some transportation economics work at American University, and a friend approached me and said, "There are scholarships available to transportation economics students which allow them to obtain a pilot's license." Once again, my long-term interest in aviation came to the fore, and I was thrilled by the possibility. I learned that these scholarships were endowed by Arthur Godfrey, a well-known pilot himself, as well as a radio and TV personality, and that, indeed, they covered all of the expenses which permitted outstanding scholars to obtain a

pilot's license. I applied and received one of these scholarships. So in 1954, I guess it was, I soloed in six hours and got my license in the minimum number of hours, which I think was 35 at that time, and shortly afterward bought my own small aircraft. I was flying out of the old Hybla Valley Airport south of Alexandria, which hasn't existed for many years.

*Q: Where would you go?*

DILLON: Around the region, and occasionally to our family home in Indiana. There was a Civil Air Patrol squadron operating out of Hybla Valley Airport, so I started flying with them. I flew the CAP planes. We had one or two small planes there. And, of course, made my own plane available for any search-and-rescue missions that the squadron was asked to undertake. I enjoyed it very, very much. I enjoyed the men in the squadron. I was the only woman. I enjoyed my association with them as fellow pilots, and we all loved aviation.

*Q: How were you accepted by the flyers?*

DILLON: I was accepted as a very good pilot. I was a very good pilot, and they often told me so, and they knew it. We were on a pilot-to-pilot basis. The question of man and woman didn't come up. I became commanding officer of this squadron. One of the first, second, or third women to become commanding officers.

*Q: And this was by election, was it?*

DILLON: It was by appointment from wing headquarters here in Washington, but they were very careful to feel out squadron members and assess the situation before making the appointment.

There was the possibility for a paramedic unit to be associated with the squadron, parachutists and nurses that could jump in case of crash sites where people might be injured or need evacuation. They occasionally practiced their parachuting there at the field. I felt that if I was commanding officer, as I was, and that this unit was going to be operating under my commandership, that I should jump. So I did. (laughter)

But I wasn't all that successful. I broke my leg on the first jump and didn't jump again-- not for that reason, but because I felt I had done it once. I knew what it was all about, and that was the purpose of my having done it in the first place. I didn't know my leg was broken at the time and walked on it for several hours, thinking I had sprained my ankle. (laughter)

*Q: Did you really damage yourself?*

DILLON: No. It was a green-split break, but that put my leg in a cast for six weeks. But I was glad I did it and, as I said, I then knew how to do it, I knew what my parachutists were doing.

*Q: Yes, but wasn't it frightening to leap out into air that way?*

DILLON: It wasn't if you're trained for it. I didn't go through extensive military training or anything of that kind, but the parachutists there instructed me on what to do and not to do. I oversaw the packing of the chute and so forth. But you do it automatically. It's something you've made up your mind to do, and it's a mechanical thing, and you do it.

The one surprise I had--and it was a delightful one--is where you are after the chute opens. And the quiet. The thing that surprised me was I was--I don't remember how high, a few thousand feet off the ground, and it's quiet up there. You're above the noise of the earth and you float down through this quiet. Of course, in just a few seconds, the earth is coming up very fast to meet you, and you have to get organized. But it was very interesting and an enjoyable experience.

*Q: It doesn't sound too enjoyable to me. I'll take your word on that one. How often did you fly? How much of your time went to this?*

DILLON: Oh, I often flew after work in the evening, in the summertime when there were long daylight hours, and both Saturday and Sunday over the weekends. I put in a great deal of time. Which is advisable. If you own an airplane, after all, that's what it's there for.

*Q: Was this all volunteer, this Civil Air Patrol?*

DILLON: Oh, yes. It's an auxiliary of the Air Force and it is there to search and rescue in case of crashes. If a plane, any kind of a plane, is down in your area, you're contacted by whoever has made the contact, and you participate in searching for the crash site and rescuing, if necessary.

*Q: What type of a plane did you buy?*

DILLON: My first plane was a T Craft, Taylor Craft, a two-place plane, which I enjoyed very much. It has different characteristics from the plane I owned later, which was a Piper Super Cruiser, which was three-place and was a little more powerful and more forgiving.

*Q: These are single-engine planes?*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: Now, don't tell me that you know all about how the engine runs, too. (laughter)*

DILLON: Well, I didn't maintain my own aircraft. As a matter of fact, there were very competent aircraft engineers in the Civil Air Patrol, and they took care of that for me.

*Q: I suppose they do it for fun, too.*

DILLON: Sure. But I must say, I was there on the scene and I had a very good sense of what the engine was all about and what it would do and what it wouldn't do.

*Q: And all of this time, of course, you were working in the Stassen organization?*

DILLON: In the foreign aid program.

*Q: I shouldn't say Stassen organization, but he was the administrator. When did Stassen leave that?*

DILLON: It must have been '57. I'm not sure. A new administrator came in and there was a rapid succession of administrators. I have to admit that the change of administrator changed my role.

*Q: Did Stassen feel he'd had enough and so he left? Or was he really pushed out by the Dulles cabal?*

DILLON: My impression is he was pushed out, and not only by the ultra-conservative Dulles group, but the Republican Party, which in any case was at odds with the White House and was not sympathetic policy-wise to any foreign aid program. In that sense, I think Stassen was a misfit, as he has always been.

*Q: We've jumped right over and we must go back and pick up Joe McCarthy. Of course, by 1957 he was finished. But he was certainly extremely unpleasant while he was there, and he was always after anybody who knew anybody who had ever known a Russian. In the agency for foreign aid and development, he must have had some fallout.*

DILLON: Interestingly enough, he didn't. I don't recall any direct attack on individuals in FOA or, for that matter, on Stassen himself. I simply can't recall anything significant along that line. We were all appalled by the hearings, of course, and by what he did to many of the very competent people in the Department of State, to many of the very interesting personalities in our cultural sector.

*Q: He went after the Army, too.*

DILLON: And military.

*Q: And called George Marshall a traitor.*

DILLON: It was interesting to me to listen to other people talk about him from time to time, and some of the analysts. As a matter of fact, some of the psychiatrists in the group that I had worked with on the experimental testing were talking about him from time to time, and for fun, I suppose, were analyzing him from their standpoint as professional men, as they listened to the hearings; and his attitude, his language, his conduct, and so

forth. I recall one social occasion at which they were discussing him and they said he can only be called a very sick man, very sick man.

*Q: So in other words, you people did not feel the terrible strain?*

DILLON: We did not feel [it] directly on the organization. I guess he was so busy with other--

*Q: Did you happen to know any person or people at the time who were directly affected by McCarthy and his nefarious methods?*

DILLON: Not personally. I have to say I did not know anyone affected.

*Q: That was fortunate, wasn't it? But you must have breathed a sigh of relief, along with the rest of us, when he got his comeuppance. How did you and your friends feel about Eisenhower taking so long to lower the boom?*

DILLON: I think a lot of people were wondering what in the world was going on. I'm not sure why the White House kept tolerating it. Of course, there were other people to blame, too, it wasn't just the White House. The country tolerated it. Our government tolerated it. It was a difficult problem to get at. The man was an elected senator. He had been rather bright and productive in his younger years, his first years up on the Hill. So I suppose many people were to blame for letting it go on as long as it did.

*Q: You said that Eisenhower was outside the Party machinery, and it was really the machinery that permitted this to go on. Perhaps he felt he couldn't act or wouldn't have any effect.*

DILLON: I think that certainly was a consideration. I would guess it was a consideration in the delay, the postponement of any immediate action.

*Q: You said that your work changed as a new person came in, a new administrator and several administrators came in. What happened to you? Were you eased out, also, or did they just take away your work?*

DILLON: No, neither one, actually. My mechanical work was still there. I was still approving all personnel actions, working closely with the Office of Personnel. I served as a congressional liaison on management matters and on appointments and personnel. I was a liaison to the Republican Committee. We had terrible pressure put on us by them to make patronage-type appointments. Because FOA was outside of Civil Service, you see, we were free to appoint from anywhere, and that gave the political machine an opportunity to bring people in that couldn't be appointed in Foreign Service positions or Civil Service positions.

So there was tremendous pressure on us, and I had to provide the bulwark that held them at bay with respect to a lot of these people that could never be successful in a very difficult foreign aid program in very trying and challenging situations, people who really were looking for ambassadorships or plush plums and that kind of thing. And at the same time, urged them to find people who might be qualified and help us recruit those people and bring them in and convince them they should go overseas. So there was the negative and the positive aspect.

Those things kept on, you see, but I was no longer invited to senior staff meetings, and the extra interesting assignments no longer came along, one of which, incidentally, we overlooked. Because of my aviation interest I concerned myself with the transportation office of the foreign aid program, and because of my recommendation, they were expanded to include an aviation staff. We gave technical assistance to several countries for the first time in the field of aviation, and had aviation experts in FOA to formulate and support those programs. Those were the kinds of programs that I had enjoyed participating in under the previous director and were no longer a part of my work under the new directors.

So in 1958, I left FOA and was invited by Overseas National Airways to come back to the company as an assistant vice president. Korean airlift was over, of course, with the cessation of hostilities over there. They had begun a large commercial charter operation and felt that they needed someone to administer the program and to handle liaison with the Civil Aeronautics Board, because approval had to be received from the board for each charter.

*Q: That must have been a very interesting work, dealing as it did with people.*

DILLON: It was extremely interesting. Again, I enjoyed it because it was a successful program. As I recall, that first summer was the \$3 million charter summer, which, in 1958 or '59, was a sizable program. It would be small now by comparison. But I designed forms, made some changes in the contract forms they were using. I had written a handbook interpreting the charter regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board as a consultant for another--as a matter of fact, for some aviation attorneys, and I was able to utilize that. I trained, had some sessions with some of the salesmen who were working directly with charter groups. As a result, for that summer program, all of our charter applications to the CAB were approved. And the company was very pleased about that.

*Q: These were package deals? Were these for passengers?*

DILLON: Yes. An organization would charter an entire aircraft to go to Europe for a two-week tour or a one-month stay or whatever. At that time, they were not into packaging as much as they are now. In other words, the travel agent, or an organization would have the tour available and would seek a charter airline to take the group over and bring them back. But it's seasonal and it entails a great deal of concentration on scheduling the aircraft, because you can't come back empty, or you should come back empty as few

times as possible or you've wiped out your profit. But the problem is, everyone goes over at the same time and everyone comes back at the same time, so our operations vice president had a real challenge. But it was a very successful year.

I recall that we had a sales meeting that summer in New York at the Wings Club. I was the only woman involved, as usual, and we had to get special permission for me to attend the conference there.

*Q: From the management?*

DILLON: From the Wings Club. Yes. They either didn't allow women or allowed them only at certain times on certain occasions, but we had to get their permission.

*Q: Did this bother you to be the only woman in all these things?*

DILLON: I've always been the only woman. I'm quite comfortable with it. It doesn't bother me in the least. And I've been the first woman in every position I've held after I left the secretarial ranks, save one, and in that case I was the second woman.

*Q: So you're sort of an explorer, aren't you? An adventurer. I suppose you can blaze new trails that way. It may, in a way, be easier, because people don't know what to expect and you set the pattern.*

DILLON: Exactly. I think two things: you have to be good, you have to work hard. You have to show accomplishment lest you reflect badly on other women in career fields. But secondly, you really need to forget in a way that you are a woman, but on the other hand, you know, there are advantages to being a woman. Those are overlooked sometimes. Sometimes the advantages take different forms, but there are advantages. Sometimes we can say things and do things and get away with things that a man in the same position could not.

*Q: Did you feel that you were a pioneer for women? Did you feel the weight of all your sisters coming behind you?*

DILLON: No. I really didn't think a lot of it. During the early years of my career, we didn't have the major women's organizations that have done such a wonderful job through the last couple of decades. Those didn't exist, and the issues hadn't come up definitively and problems hadn't polarized as they have since that time. So really, some of us in those early years were loners, in a sense. You had to make your way in, carry your own weight, and be responsible for your work and your advancement.

Now, over the years, I've helped other women, especially young women, to advance in their careers, to expand their responsibilities, to attend training courses, to have opportunities that might not otherwise have been opened to them. I don't mean that I was oblivious to what was going on with women all this while, but I didn't join organizations,

make issues of it, and so forth. I just worked twice as hard as everybody else and let it go at that.

*Q: Were you ever in the position where you could mentor women or a woman?*

DILLON: Yes and no. As far as long-term mentorship goes, no. But I've certainly sponsored some young women in one or two undertakings and took the responsibility for it. I regret to say that on at least one, and maybe two, of those occasions, it led to naught. I recall, later in my career, sponsoring a young woman for a management training program to which a woman had never been sent, and I felt this gal, who was in her mid-thirties, had everything going for her. It was in her field, and she had worked very responsibly on my staff, and I felt she could handle it. It was a good opportunity to have a test case. I really had to kick and scream and yell and pound desks to have her accepted. She was, and just shortly before the course started, she came to me, kind of giggly, and said that she had just become engaged and was going to be married shortly, and she regretted that she couldn't attend the training course. (laughter) There were no women considered for that course for years after that. But that was an exceptional case. For the most part, women are appreciative and take advantage of opportunities given them.

*Q: Too bad, though, when something like that happens. As you say, it throws things back. 1958-59. How long did you work with this charter air outfit?*

DILLON: About a year. I have to say at this point that I had been married in 1955. My daughter was born the following year, and so I, for the first time, had those responsibilities at home, and that makes a difference.

*Q: So all the time you were under such pressure in your job at Washington, personnel problems, you had a little baby to take care of, too. How did you handle that, Betty?*

DILLON: Grandmother. (laughter) We tried babysitters, we tried all kinds, pre-school and so forth, but nothing worked. Consequently, my mother and father spent a great deal of time with us. As Katherine became older, they took her with them over to the farm in the summer and gave me a bit of a respite.

Unfortunately, I was divorced in 1960. My husband and I were the best of buddies. We still are, but our lifestyles were totally incompatible.

*Q: Was he also working for the government?*

DILLON: No, no. He was a commercial pilot. He was an aerial photographer when I met him. We shared a love of aviation. He became an agriculture pilot while we were married. That entailed traveling, of course, following the seasons, and here I was, already a mid- to top-level government official, obviously destined for international appointment, and those things weren't reconcilable.

*Q: No. You couldn't use the same home base, could you?*

DILLON: No.

*Q: That's too bad. But you're still good friends, so Katherine sees her dad all the time.*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Then you left the Overseas Airways?*

DILLON: Yes. When I was divorced in 1960, I felt that with the baby to raise and with heavy career responsibilities at the same time, that I should really think of some long-range security. I converted my five years of previous service, applied to the Civil Service for the certification, was accepted, and was appointed an air transport examiner at the Civil Aeronautics Board in charge of Africa, the Middle East and the Soviet Union.

*Q: Air transport examiner. That gave you Civil Service status, did it?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Africa and Middle East. What did you examine?*

DILLON: The Board's international route positions--there's obviously one for each country where United States air carriers serve, and they're the positions that draw up recommendations for route certification and bilateral negotiations. It's in the Bureau of International Affairs, this function is, and the examiners are responsible for preparing for the Bureau, for submission to the board, positions on bilateral air transport agreements between the United States and other countries which leads to our airlines being able to serve there, and more often than not, entails an exchange so that the airlines of the other country can serve the United States.

Now, that historically was the role of these positions. I was given Africa and the Middle East because I was the junior examiner, that is, the newest one. I think we all felt that this regional grouping would be the least active and put the least pressure on me for a while. Quite the contrary. 1960, as you recall, was the beginning of the period during which the nations of Africa became newly independent. I discovered that no one at the Board, nor in the Department of State, had considered the implications of these political changes and the implications of each of these nations becoming a sovereign nation. We had served them, to the extent we had in Africa, under bilateral air transport agreements with the colonial power. We served Nigeria through our bilateral agreement with the United Kingdom. We served Dakar through our agreement with France. Now these were countries in their own right, and there was no bilateral agreement in effect.

I pointed this out to the chairman of the board, Chairman Allen Boyd, a very competent man whom I enjoyed working with very, very much, indeed. He became concerned. The

Bureau became concerned. It was simply that we had not focused on the long-range implications of these political changes.

So I was asked to draw up a paper with respect to each of the countries we were serving, the status of our service there, the status of the certification of our airlines, the points we weren't serving that the airline was certified to serve, and including any future prospects for expansion of our route system. This didn't take long, but again, in the process, doing a great deal of research on it, I found that the whole continent really had been neglected.

*Q: You had all of Africa?*

DILLON: Oh, yes. And the Middle East, and the Soviet Bloc.

*Q: Good heavens!*

DILLON: But you see, over the years, Pan Am had served the west coast milk run, Dakar, Roberts Field, Accra, Lagos, and down to South Africa. TWA had been certified to serve North Africa, but had never implemented the certificate. They served Cairo and, I think, were serving at that time Nairobi beyond Cairo. But these were sort of cut-and-dried things that everyone took for granted. They hadn't been changed for years, hadn't been looked at for years, and I don't think even the airlines had assessed them properly.

So one thing led to another, and Chairman Boyd discussed this with the Department of State. There was a committee established about that time, probably by the Kennedy Administration, you see, which came in in '60. A committee was established called IACIAP, Inter-Agency Committee for International Aviation Policy, which Governor Averell Harriman chaired, one of my heroes of all time. A marvelous man. It met infrequently, obviously, because it was high-level representation, but through that channel, Chairman Boyd was able to bring to the attention of the top level in State Department, in the FAA--DoT did not exist then--and even the White House, the fact that we were a bit amiss in our consideration of air services in Africa.

So the Department of State named a man, who was working in Alaska on something or another and had, I think, worked at the Civil Aeronautics Board years before, as a consultant to consider this problem. He came down from Alaska once a month or something. That obviously wasn't going to get the job done, so Chairman Boyd suggested that I be detailed to Department of State for about a year, or however long it took, to do a thorough study and develop recommendations for an air transport policy for Africa and the periphery.

*Q: What a fascinating assignment!*

DILLON: It was marvelous. This was a most enjoyable period. I thoroughly enjoyed it and I'll never forget it.

*Q: Physically did you move over to State?*

DILLON: Yes. Oh, yes. George Ball was in the Department at that time. His office was involved. But I was sitting somewhere on the seventh floor. It's been a long time ago. I had some secretarial service, but I did most of my own typing.

State Department assigned Al Stoffel, a very senior career officer, to the project, as well. I wrote the paper. It was, I think, 300 pages long, and it covered not only our air services to and through Africa, but it took up the question of African aviation services. For example, were each of these newly independent nations going to want to establish their own international airline? Would we encourage that? Would we discourage it? Would we sell them the equipment? If so, how? What about the airports which had been built and maintained by the colonial powers? What was happening to them? In many cases, maintenance was provided under an ongoing intergovernmental agreement, but as far as expansion or new airports were concerned, you see, that hadn't been looked at. What about en route facilities on a continent that is very, very underdeveloped in places when you come to air services?

*Q: This coincided with the explosion of jets, didn't it?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: I mean to say the dissemination of jets.*

DILLON: Yes, quite so. Of course, many of the new African nations were wanting their own large aircraft. They wanted to establish their own flag carrier, although they really didn't fully understand the serious economic implications of such a project.

So I tried to pull it all together for all of those countries that were in any way seriously involved.

*Q: Did you recommend that many of them should have their own airline?*

DILLON: In some cases, yes. In some cases, airlines were already under way and I recommended ways that we could appropriately support those efforts, appropriately in the sense of what was good for them and still what was in the best interest of our own U.S.-flag carriers. I wanted to see expansion of our own U.S. airlines all over the continent.

*Q: But also you could sell an awful lot of Boeings.*

DILLON: Exactly! Exactly! The aircraft sale. Not only Boeings, but the smaller aircraft that our airlines were replacing, which were, in fact, more suitable for the short hauls of the African airlines. The question of expanding airports, runways, the question of en route facilities was a serious one.

So it was a major policy paper. I was--and I am--extremely proud of that accomplishment.

*Q: How long did it take you, Betty?*

DILLON: The better part of the year. As I recall, there was no set beginning date and ending date, but it was the better part of 1962, and I recall that that winter of '62, I went to Africa for a couple of months and visited the key countries, met with aviation officials, met with our people in the embassies, met with technical assistance missions, and wherever it was appropriate, talked with colonial power representation.

*Q: Which countries did you go to?*

DILLON: Senegal, which is a key point for us. In most cases, the European citizens were still operating the airports. There had not been any noticeable changeover so far as personnel went. Airport managers were French or British. Aircraft engineers were French or British. There just were no Africans trained to do that.

*Q: That independence all seemed to have come about so quickly, didn't it?*

DILLON: Well, I'm not sure anyone thought that it was really going to happen, or if we knew it, we didn't want to believe it, or something. You could see it coming down the road, but nobody was ready for it. I remember arguing in my paper and in oral presentations for training of the Africans. There were those who just said, "You cannot train an African to fly an airplane or operate an airport." FAA men, State Department people! "Forget it, Betty. That's way down the road. They're not used to the wheel yet." Really!

*Q: The arrogance!*

DILLON: In formal meetings! It's incredible! So when I went to Africa, I very purposely flew on Ethiopia Airlines, which some people would argue is not truly black African, but it was even then piloted and operated by Ethiopians.

*Q: Who had trained them, Betty? The British?*

DILLON: TWA. Years ago, you remember way back when Betty was getting aviation started in the foreign aid program?

*Q: Yes.*

DILLON: At about that, or even a little earlier, TWA had a controlling interest in Ethiopian Airlines and got it going, trained the Ethiopians, turned it over to them, which clearly showed it could be done.

*Q: Of course.*

DILLON: I stopped at Roberts Field, which was built and maintained by Pan American since the beginning of aviation history. There were serious communications problems there, and, indeed, there are almost to this day. I had someone approach me when I was in Sierra Leone just a couple of years ago for USIA, and the chargé said, "Betty, could you please come with me over to meet the director of civil aviation? We have some serious problems. They're trying to charge military aircraft for overflying this area because Roberts Field is not handling some of them." I was there for some other business altogether, but I went. But there had been serious problems back in the '50s. So I spent a little time there.

I went on to Accra, Ghana, and Lagos, Nigeria, which is a major transportation point for everyone. I traveled internally in these countries from the standpoint of looking at what their needs were with respect to developing an internal air system and how that would be tied into international air service.

In Accra, I remember going up to the northern part of Ghana, and out of Lagos I went up to Kano in the northern part of the country and looked at the airport there. Then somewhere along the line, they had a civil air attaché. I guess he was assigned in Lagos at that time. They assigned him to accompany me from Lagos to Nairobi, which meant taking this Ethiopian Airlines flight through Addis and down to Nairobi. We had an excellent visit in east Africa working with the East African Airways people there--British, of course. I do remember being in Nairobi during the Cuban missile crisis.

*Q: Did you have much to do with the staff of the different embassies--the American embassies?*

DILLON: Oh, sure.

*Q: How did you find the quality of the personnel?*

DILLON: I've always been a great admirer of our Foreign Service personnel and our career people in the embassies and most ambassadors. There are some ambassadors that I can't include in that compliment. But as far as our personnel go, I think they're outstanding. I've always admired them as a group, and I found them to be outstanding on this trip.

Having said that, however, I must point out, as I did in my study, that there was no expertise for handling aviation matters.

*Q: That's true.*

DILLON: The economic counselor was sending in travel statistics, such as they were, from time to time, or he was having dinner at the home of the chairman of the board of the airlines sometimes and reporting that. But there was no one able to assess the

transportation potential, the different modes of transportation within country, the international route development aspect, and so forth.

*Q: It's a whole discipline in and of itself.*

DILLON: It's a whole discipline. It's a highly technical one. Partly because of my study and partly because I think the time had come, more civil air attachés were sent overseas. There was one sent to Beirut, there was one established in Nairobi, much to my delight.

*Q: Was this a result of your report?*

DILLON: Yes. It was certainly a part of that whole thrust at that time. The embassies were very, very cooperative, very interested, and very concerned. In east Africa, I was not only in Nairobi, I was in Uganda and down in Tanzania and Dar es Salaam.

*Q: You really have covered Africa, haven't you?*

DILLON: And covered the waterfront. I did not go south of there, and I'm glad we didn't, as events have transpired.

Let me say that this report was submitted to my own board chairman at the Civil Aeronautics Board, who then presented it to the International Civil Aviation Policy Committee, and it was submitted to all of the agencies involved in the United States Government, which meant it had to have Board approval, FAA approval, Department of Defense approval, CIA approval, State Department approval, of course, in two different bureaus, both political and economic side, and at the White House. There was a transportation advisor, someone who became involved. It was approved without change throughout the United States Government, and implemented.

*Q: That is amazing. I never heard of a report that wasn't chewed to pieces.*

DILLON: I don't mean to sit here today and say that every last thing that was in that report has since been done and was extremely successful. Some things took longer. There may be a few things that were never implemented because of the passage of time or whatever. But the major recommendations were accepted throughout the government and acted on and established as policy. In other words, that's where we wanted to go.

*Q: And they didn't even change your language?*

DILLON: No. I'll never forget when I presented it to the Board, to the Civil Aeronautics Board, in a formal meeting. The chairman presented it, and I was sitting there with a handful of observers, ready to answer questions. One of the members of the Board, whom I admired very much; he was an older gentleman, had been on the board for some time and was very well qualified and very reliable; listened to the chairman's brief presentation and they had all had the study for a couple of weeks to study and read and consider. He

listened to Chairman Boyd's presentation and then he raised his hand and he said, "I propose that we approve this unanimously." And I was just flabbergasted. Well, everyone [was].

*Q: I would think you would be.*

DILLON: Well, they didn't right off, of course. There was discussion, but the board did approve it and it initiated new route proceedings to undertake the establishment of more routes for our own carriers. We started selling aircraft to Air Afrique. I worked closely with Air Afrique.

*Q: Tremendous opportunities for our industry.*

DILLON: One recommendation was that, in an effort to keep Nigerian Airways from flying all the way to New York and losing money, they block off seats on the Pan American route, sell tickets in their own right, the "blocked-seat" proposal. That was adopted and implemented.

But the major proposal that I was so proud of and it was implemented was a direct east-west service from Lagos, Nigeria to Nairobi. Pan American World Airways started serving, and I was so keen on that. For one thing, they're both English-speaking areas. There is a lot of traffic between the two. The only way to get from one side of the continent to the other was the Ethiopian Airlines flight up and around and through Addis. There were just many reasons for doing it. It served to expand our whole flag-carrier services to eastern Africa.

I mentioned earlier en route facilities. We found that no air service had been flown directly over equatorial Africa, and there were no navigational facilities, you see. So that had to be considered by FAA. They had to send technicians out to see what was involved.

*Q: And they were put up, the facilities?*

DILLON: Whatever was required. I think they did something in Burundi or central Africa. At a halfway point they did something.

I left the board three years later, and at that time everything was going beautifully. I heard that the African route carried Pan American economically for years after the rest of its network had fallen by the wayside. I don't think a U.S. carrier is serving Africa now, which just appalls me.

*Q: What happened? You mean this is when everybody started splitting up the pie different ways?*

DILLON: I've been away from it for some time now. I guess Pan American got into financial problems.

*Q: Overextended, maybe?*

DILLON: I think overextended, perhaps, but something happened in recent years to U.S. aviation. It hasn't marked up. It should have held its own. It should still be leaders in the technology, in the economic service, in every aspect of commercial aviation. It hasn't held its own.

*Q: Do you think deregulation has anything to do with it?*

DILLON: Yes. I didn't agree with deregulation. It's created chaos. The technical aspects of it were never taken into account.

*Q: They don't check the planes, apparently.*

DILLON: No. Well, that and saturation of certain airports in certain regions, certain areas. If you just, figuratively speaking, turn everybody loose that wants to fly an airplane, you have to consider how many airplanes are going to want to come in to O'Hare Airport at a certain given time of day.

*Q: They all want to arrive at the same time?*

DILLON: It's a saturation point. That kind of thing, I think, was not given enough weight when those decisions were made.

But anyway, back to Africa. For several years, that was our policy. I don't think a policy was ever adopted to change it or to replace it. I was very proud of that accomplishment.

I should mention that during my tenure at the Board, the U.S. began negotiations with the USSR for exchanging air services between New York and Moscow, pursuant to Eisenhower's 14-point set of technical exchange agreements. So I was involved in some of that preparation and was a member of one of the working groups during the negotiations.

As a result of the African work, a very nice thing happened to me in 1964. I was selected by the CAB as a candidate for the mid-career fellowship program at Princeton University in the Woodrow Wilson School. The board had not previously sent a candidate. I was their first one. And there had not previously been a woman in the program from anywhere. The chairman very graciously sent me up to Princeton in the CAB plane for my interview. They supported me and backed me in every way.

*Q: You were the first woman selected.*

DILLON: For the mid-career fellowship program at Princeton. For one year I was in residence at Princeton, co-sponsored by the University and the CAB. It's a marvelous

program. Considering that I was someone who had had, for many, many years, to go to evening school here, there, and yonder, to find myself in the midst of this intellectual feast at Princeton was overwhelming. It was just magnificent, and I tried to in every way take advantage of not only my purely academic participation, but of the atmosphere and the overall environment that is the Princeton institution. I call it an institution because it was that; it's more than just a university.

*Q: Betty, did you feel not ready because you didn't have that piece of paper that said you had graduated from university?*

DILLON: Sure. I was surprised that they selected me because I didn't yet have an undergraduate degree. But they felt that my experience and background apparently made up for that.

*Q: Did you find that in the academic courses you had trouble keeping up?*

DILLON: No. As a matter of fact, the mid-career program does not require the participants to meet course requirements. Mid-career fellows tailor their individual programs to best serve their career needs and the needs of their government agency, you see. Mine, for example, included a core seminar in top management; a transportation economics seminar; an economics of development seminar with Sir Arthur Lewis, Nobel Prize winner for economics, a marvelous, outstanding man; and diplomatic history.

I asked if I could please meet the course requirements.

*Q: I knew you would! I was just waiting for that to come. (laughter)*

DILLON: I have to do everything the hard way. (laughter) I wanted to, and I did. I wrote all of the examinations, I prepared and submitted all of the papers. I prepared a paper, submitted it, and presented it orally to the top management seminar. I was graded. As I recall, I got Bs and one C or something, but the thing is, imagine, you know, at mid-career, being put down in the middle of the Princeton University Graduate School and being asked to participate in this level of seminar and this kind of intellectual activity, together with young man and a handful of young women who were just out of the finest universities, were top-level scholars, you know. That in itself, just being there with them, was a marvelous experience for me.

*Q: Very stimulating. What did all of this activity result in?*

DILLON: We were certificated as fellows in public and international affairs. Princeton Fellow in Public and International Affairs.

*Q: I see. Was there a ceremony, Betty, for the awarding of this?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Did you go through with it?*

DILLON: Oh, yes. There were 12 of us, mid-careerists, and there were a couple of what they called NIPA, National Institute of Public Administration Fellows, in the same group. Oh, yes, we had a very nice closing ceremony.

*Q: But the whole group didn't necessarily go for certification?*

DILLON: Oh, they were all certified.

*Q: They were?*

DILLON: Oh, yes. And I would have been. I could have chosen just to, in effect, audit the seminars and do the reading. You participate to the extent you want to and need to. Of course, if you're here at Princeton University with this marvelous opportunity, all of us participated to the maximum. It was just that in my case, I felt I had special needs. I wanted to meet the course requirements.

*Q: When you finished with that, that would be May or June of '65?*

DILLON: Then I made what many people have told me was a serious mistake in my career direction. I went back to the Board just briefly and then was contacted by a top man in Washington, no one that I had worked with before or has any particular relevance to this history, and he explored with me the possibility of my going into Peace Corps. In the mid-'60s, now, you see, the whole world and certainly our country was involved in a number of very serious things. The Peace Corps was a part of all of that. He said that Peace Corps had not had a woman country director. Now, mind you, it was five years old, but they had not yet chosen a woman to be a country director. He wondered if I shouldn't go and talk with them. I knew little or nothing about Peace Corps. I just knew it was a marvelous thing that existed somewhere. I knew basically what it was.

I had just come out of this very, very wonderful experience with the CAB, both in the Board and at Princeton, and I hesitated very much to leave the Board under those circumstances. I consulted a longtime friend of mine, an elderly woman who had been my French tutor here in Washington: Madame Haidar Bey, of French and German parentage, who had married a Turk, very much a cosmopolite. She and I had become fast friends over the years, and I'm sure by then she was 80 years old. We had lunch, and I remember very well saying to her, "I've been approached about this Peace Corps thing. It sounds like a marvelous opportunity. I don't know what to do. Do you know anything about it? What do you think I should do?"

She was very quiet for a minute and then she said, "Well, Betty, if you're asking me, I think you should do it, but I must tell you, if you do, your life will never be the same." I didn't fully realize then what she meant, of course.

I did do it, and those six years in Peace Corps (because I was one of the fortunate ones that had the one-year extension of the legislative limitation), those six years in Peace Corps were undoubtedly the most rewarding, the most educative, the most formative years in my entire life. My daughter was with me throughout that period, and it had a noticeable effect on her life, as well.

*Q: We forgot to cover what happened to your daughter when you went to Princeton.*

DILLON: She was with her grandparents. I had a house here in Arlington, and they were here most of the time. I came weekends a great deal. We were together over the holidays, Christmas, for example. Incidentally, Kathy and her grandfather came to Princeton for a visit while I was up there, and it was a marvelous experience for all of us. I can't at the moment recall why my mother didn't come, but my father enjoyed it tremendously. He was very proud of me. Even as a little girl, Kathy enjoyed the experience up there.

*Q: Good. Anyway, you did accept this offer to be a director in the Peace Corps and you went.*

DILLON: Yes. What I was offered was, they wanted me to serve as a deputy director first, and I was very pleased that was the way they approached it. Sargent Shriver, then the director of the Peace Corps, offered me Tunisia or the Ivory Coast. It was a very difficult choice for me, because I knew the Ivory Coast from the work on Africa and Tunisia, as well, but North Africa is a different part of the world. I told them I would go either place they wanted me. So they sent me to Tunisia.

We hesitated about considering that country because it's a Muslim country and we weren't sure how the government and the Tunisians would accept a woman as a senior staff member of the Peace Corps, because I obviously would have to travel all over the country, work with government officials, and so forth. I had fluent French, which was a plus. I must say, as I said to many, many people since, that I have never been received as graciously and known the cooperation and the understanding and the assistance that I received from Tunisians at all levels, from ministers all the way down to the farthest villager. There was never a question of my being a woman or why was I there or any kind of an incident or an insinuation, even. Never. I would even go so far as to say the atmosphere was much more receptive than it has been on occasion in the United States. (laughter)

I was in Tunisia for a few months only, when the director became seriously ill. He had hepatitis and had to be medically evacuated. I became acting director and served as acting director for the better part of the year, until the new director arrived.

Shortly after that, I was appointed the first woman country director in Ceylon, Sri Lanka. Incidentally, the ambassador refused to approve my appointment in Colombo. My own

ambassador in Tunisia went to bat for me. I was approved and by the time I arrived, a new ambassador was at the post.

This became a very difficult period for me, again, because my father was seriously ill. As a matter of fact, just before I left Tunisia, we received a cable that I should return at once, that he was seriously ill and probably would not survive. Peace Corps brought me home immediately. He did make it through that bout. It was a horrendous period for several reasons. That was going on, and it was a terrible drain on me emotionally because my father and I were very, very close. At the same time, while I was home with him, the Peace Corps offered me the directorship in Ceylon. So here I was torn between my father, who was dying, and accepting this marvelous appointment as first woman country director, not only for the Peace Corps, but for any foreign assistance program from any country. No country, including the U.N. system, at that point had appointed a woman to head a program abroad. So it was unusual.

I had those two pressures on me. Wouldn't you know, right in the middle of all of this, back in Tunisia the student riots got out of control. They became very serious. I had just walked out of my house, shut the door. I'd brought my daughter with me. Then I began hearing through State Department and the Peace Corps that they burned the cars in the embassy compound, they pinned the ambassador to the floor by shooting through the windows. It was a very, very bad situation.

The embassy was just three or four blocks from our house, and because we had two young Tunisian girls living with us, two students, and they had often brought their friends from the university to the house, I thought, "Oho! They know exactly where we live. This is the house where the Peace Corps director [lives], and I'm sure they'll go directly from the embassy over to my place, and goodness knows what they'll do there with no one there but the girls going and coming."

I asked to go back as soon as possible. They were not issuing visas to Tunisia. I said to someone, "Well, I'm concerned about my daughter and my ongoing plans." I said something that left them thinking my daughter was still over there. That certainly was not my intention; it was not a fact. But they somehow got that impression, and based on that erroneous impression, they issued a visa. I have the only visa, a special visa, issued to an American to go to Tunisia during that period.

I went back, found the house fine, intact. The two Tunisian girls were there. I said to them, "My goodness, I'm so relieved. I was so afraid the university mob would come on over here." At this late date, I think I can put this in our oral history. I've kept it a secret for many, many years. But one of the girls said to me, "Oh, my, no, Mrs. Dillon. They wouldn't have touched your house. We used it for headquarters." (laughter)

*Q: Oh, no! (laughter) Oh, isn't that priceless.*

DILLON: Isn't that marvelous? (laughter) I left the country as fast as I could get my effects packed.

I did accept the Ceylon appointment, of course. I talked with my father at great length about it, and he wanted me to do it. He was, again, very, very proud and pleased, and he said, "Betty, by all means you must go."

I arrived in Ceylon in--I guess it was the spring of--goodness. Where are we? Spring of '67? Fall of '66? Somewhere along there. Spring of '67. The program had been asked to leave the country a year or two before because of the change in government, so I, in effect, was taking the program back in. I went six months ahead of the volunteers. I had to get offices, I had to get transportation, I had to hire local staff. I had to set up. I had to take what programming had been done, pick sites, visit all the sites, and so forth. And I was alone, so it was marvelous. I received very nice cooperation from the embassy, but I should remind both of us that Peace Corps in those days was far removed from the embassies. We didn't go near the embassy for any reason. It was a very independent, non-political operation. When I called on the embassy, they were very helpful, extremely helpful and cooperative. But getting all of this done on my own was a real challenge.

*Q: It must have been. What language did you use out there?*

DILLON: English. It had been a British colony, you see.

*Q: And enough people could speak it?*

DILLON: About 80% of the Ceylonese are Buddhist (Singhalese), and 20% Hindu (Tamil of Indian background), which is what's caused the big problem that's going over there now.

I had been there just a few months when I received a cable that my father was dying and that, once again, I should come immediately. He was not expected to survive. Peace Corps had given me one compassionate leave from Tunisia for that purpose, and felt they couldn't do it again. They didn't object to my taking leave, but they said I'd have to pay my own way home which I did. I didn't get there in time. He had passed away. I stayed for a couple of weeks. My mother was drained at that point and not terribly well. My sister was with her.

And I went back to Ceylon. On the way, Peace Corps asked me to conduct large completion-of-service conferences for groups in Turkey, in Delhi, in Bombay, which were extremely interesting.

*Q: What purpose do they serve?*

DILLON: A volunteer group is called together for usually three days, at that time to discuss their experiences, the nature of their programs, their successes, their failures,

draw up recommendations regarding Peace Corps's presence in the country, particularly with respect to programming, suggestions regarding training, and so forth.

That has changed over the years, and completion-of-service conferences now are conducted almost entirely for the purpose of counseling the volunteers with respect to their re-entry and their ongoing careers. There's a vast difference now, a vast difference between what we did then and what we do now. At that time it was basically a programming and training exercise. Of course, we received invaluable information from volunteers who, after all, are the Peace Corps and had gone through this wonderful experience.

*Q: Debriefing, in a way.*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: So did you take your daughter back with you? Was she with you in Ceylon?*

DILLON: Mary Katherine was with me in Tunisia and with me in Ceylon. I really asked a great deal of her throughout these experiences. Both countries were marvelous for her. She matured and became a very sophisticated girl. She was ten when she arrived in Tunis, and thirteen when we finally left Ceylon. She attached herself to Tunisia and has been back there since and was back there recently with me. It's our second home. She loves it. We have many Tunisian friends there.

*Q: What schooling did she have when she was there?*

DILLON: Yes, that's important. In Tunisia she went to the diplomatic school, because the local school systems were in Arabic, and that was too much to undertake.

*Q: Was that diplomatic school supported by the embassy?*

DILLON: In part, it was. It's called the American School. It still exists and has expanded and is doing a wonderful job. I can't at this point recall what funding precisely there was. Some private funding, of course, and some embassy funding. It was disappointing.

*Q: Local teachers?*

DILLON: American teachers, some of them former Peace Corps volunteers who had been teachers of English as a foreign language or a second language.

*Q: Hired locally?*

DILLON: Hired locally. But I think the big disappointment was with the other students. They were children of diplomatic families, many of them American families. We didn't cross paths even socially as families. They were the diplomatic community; we were

Peace Corps. Kathy resented that, in the sense that she had very little in common with her fellow students. She did join the Girl Guides, but there again, there were Tunisian girls involved, which she very much appreciated.

*Q: There were no Tunisians in this diplomatic school?*

DILLON: No. For example, she often remembers that at recess, the students would go into the back yard of the school grounds and throw rocks at the Tunisian shepherds across the fence. This was not Mary Katherine's idea of why we were in Tunisia.

*Q: No, I wouldn't think it would be.*

DILLON: The classes were in English, of course. So when we went on to Ceylon, she said, "Mother, I want to go to a local school." I discouraged it, but she insisted. Ceylon had been a British colony and was English-speaking, so we thought we had some alternatives. We approached Bishops College, a very fine girls' school, which taught in three streams: English stream, Tamil stream, and Singhalese stream.

We put her in the English stream. There were about 500 Ceylonese girls in the school. She was the only foreign student. It was not easy: it was extremely difficult for her. Not because she didn't love the school and like her teachers and she had some very wonderful Ceylonese girl friends, but the system was quite different. The girls sat and wrote down every word the teacher said. It was a lecture system. You memorized your notes and you were examined based on your memory of your notes. There was no discussion, no show and tell, no intellectual intercourse of any kind.

I know one day I picked her up at noon and she was white as a sheet. I realized something had happened. She got in the car and started crying. It turns out that in her geography class, the western hemisphere was not on the maps. Well, you know, it's way over there on the other side. (laughter)

*Q: "Here be dragons."*

DILLON: So she had held up her hand and asked the teacher if she could say a few words about her country to the girls in the class who might be interested. The teacher had hit her with a ruler on the wrist for interrupting the class. "We don't talk in these classes."

Well, it literally made Kathy sick. She was nauseated and heartbroken and disappointed and confused. We had a long talk about it. She was ten years old, eleven years old. I pointed out that sometimes teachers have bad days, too, and that this was an unusual situation. They hadn't had a foreign student at Bishops College before. She accepted all of that, mullied it over, went on back, and coped with it. She coped so well that at the end of the school year, when they had the grand march at graduation exercises and the end-of-year festivities out on the parade ground, the principal of Bishops College found an old

warped record of John Philip Sousa's "Red, White, and Blue" and played it in her honor for the grand march.

It was such a credit to what youngsters can do and can be when they're challenged in an overseas foreign environment. I knew what she had gone through to get to that place. She was loved by other students, she was respected by the teachers, and had really made a place for herself.

*Q: Bless her heart.*

DILLON: We loved Ceylon. She loved Ceylon. She traveled with me, both in Tunisia and in Ceylon, as I went out visiting volunteers and checking out sites and around over the country. We often took one of her girlfriends with us just so she would have company of her own age to discuss what they saw. We found very often that Tunisian girls or Ceylonese girls would not have been to these places before in their own country. They would not have been very far from their hometown or village or outside of Colombo or Tunis, so we were educating them at the same time, you see.

*Q: Did you find that she came to you often for reinforcement as the year went along, or did she not come back confused anymore?*

DILLON: We were very close. We always have been. We managed to have little discussions most every night, maybe not about a problem, but about how things were going or something good that had happened. As far as I know, there was no other serious incident that really shook her up. She coped.

*Q: But did this have any effect on her educational progress? I mean, switching gears the way she had to from the inquiring type of learning that is taught in the American schools to this rote memory, which doesn't stick with you.*

DILLON: I don't see that as having had an impact. She was only in that system for the one year, and by the next fall we came back.

*Q: And she was learning so many other things at the same time, yes.*

DILLON: She's an excellent scholar and is still in the academic field doing research. She has lectured at George Washington University.

*Q: What is her field, Betty?*

DILLON: Philosophy. She studied in France for two years recently at the *Ecole des Hautes Etudes de Sciences Sociales*, and so she's an excellent scholar. I would say she combines very much the intellectual curiosity approach to learning and the research, note-taking, listening, memorizing approach. I would say she combines them well.

*Q: Very good. I know sometimes students have a lot of problems switching from one type [of learning] to another among Foreign Service children as they move around the world. Sometimes it can be quite traumatic.*

DILLON: It can be very traumatic. I think when people say that children in foreign countries have such a marvelous opportunity to learn and mature, they're quite right, but often times they don't realize the toll it takes. They don't realize the pressure it puts on the child and on the parents and what we all go through to bring about that learning experience.

*Q: Yes. So you were in Ceylon just the one year?*

DILLON: I was director for about a year and a half. My mother's health failed. She had a stroke. The program was well set there, so I felt I should come back.

I recall that Kath and I were on our way home and had to overnight in London April 4, 1968 and heard the news of Dr. Martin Luther King's assassination on the radio in our hotel room. Washington was burning when we arrived there the next day.

Peace Corps assigned me temporarily to the Chicago regional office, where I was director for the midwest region, which was recruiting and some re-entry programming.

I actually lived at the homeplace in southern Indiana during that time and commuted the weekends to Chicago, and gave my mother some support. Then Peace Corps transferred me to Washington as director of special services, where I served for two years.

*Q: What does the director of special services do?*

DILLON: That office is responsible for all of the unusual things in Peace Corps and all of the problems in Peace Corps. It processes all early terminations; it handled medical evacuations, as far as the processing of them went; it was responsible for emergency-leave cases, getting volunteers home if a family member died, or for some other reason they had to come.

*Q: Personnel work.*

DILLON: Personnel, yes. Deaths overseas were handled through that office. My daughter refers to those two years as the period during which we slept with the closet light on. Twenty-four hours a day for two years, seven days a week, I wore a beeper. I remember being terribly impressed about how many people die in the middle of the night in the world. Parents dying. Get a call at 3:00 a.m. and you have to find the volunteer in the bush of East Africa as soon as possible, get them the word, get them home as soon as possible. A volunteer is killed somewhere around the world, and you are the one to get the family on the phone in the middle of the night, maybe because of the time difference,

you see. All of those terribly mean and emotional things that happen when you have thousands and thousands of people working in 65 different countries.

During the two years that I was director of special services, more volunteers died in service--17--than had been lost for the previous six or eight years of Peace Corps. There was no explanation for it. Two were lost in an earthquake in South America; two were killed in a car-train accident in East Africa; one was struck by lightning in West Africa; one disappeared off the face of the earth and to this day has never been found--not a trace of him. There was no pattern to it, no explanation for it. But those things were trying.

I should point out that this period was especially difficult in the Peace Corps. We were at the height of the anti-Vietnam war protests and the civil rights movement. Many of the young volunteers were very much involved, directly and indirectly. One day they set on fire to one of the Peace Corps administration building and seized our main headquarters building. An emergency senior staff meeting was called. Myself and others made suggestions. Finally the director said, "We're going to adjourn to the Army-Navy Club." When I asked what I could do to be helpful he said, "Go home and come back on Monday." Women were not allowed in the Army-Navy Club.

We did something very constructive during that period. I brought in a young man who had been a volunteer in India when I was in Ceylon, Michael Longstreth, and we had developed a lasting friendship which exists to this day. I brought him into Washington to serve as my special assistant, and we set up a management information system on all of this. That had not been done in Peace Corps, and we felt it was time that a data system could be useful. Numbers were getting large enough that we could begin to get some indications from data. We set up the whole system, programmed it, and submitted [it].

I remember how very pleased we were when they brought the senior staff together and we made a presentation and submitted the first data runs and the analyses that we could make from them. Early terminations were a big chunk of our work, and it would show, for example, which countries were losing volunteers through early termination at a higher rate.

*Q: Just couldn't take the climate or pressures?*

DILLON: Sometimes the climate. Sometimes it was--

*Q: Disease?*

DILLON: A bad training program. That was one of the things that showed up. Inadequate staffing. As soon as you saw a figure like that stick out then you could begin to analyze and make inquiries and draw conclusions, and very constructive work could be done.

We were commended for that. Mr. [Joseph] Blatchford was Director of Peace Corps then, and he was very pleased with this data processing we were doing.

I remember an anecdote having to do with this presentation. You were asking earlier about sexual discrimination. When I made the presentation to the senior staff, I thought it went rather well. We had prepared graphs, and I was quite well prepared on the subject. Mike was there to back me up. He had done most of the nitty-gritty work on it; it was a good presentation.

Afterward, one of Mr. Blatchford's assistants came over to me with a strange look on his face. He said, "Betty, that was an excellent presentation. If I could have closed my eyes and not been looking at you as a woman, I could have sworn you were a man." (laughter)

*Q: (laughter) Isn't it awful?*

DILLON: "I could have sworn a man was talking."

*Q: Because it was so good.*

DILLON: It was so good.

*Q: (laughter) Honestly!*

DILLON: He didn't even realize what he was saying.

*Q: Well, that's the awful part, that they don't when they make remarks like that. So if you ask if they're sexist, "Me? Never!"*

*When you finished this, did you leave? Your six years were up. You obviously had an extension to complete this work.*

DILLON: Yes. There's a five-year legislative limitation on employment in Peace Corps, or service in Peace Corps. I applied for, and was given, one of the few one-year extensions, so I served six years. Then the crunch came. Unlike many Peace Corps people, I was a careerist in government, you see, and had to begin looking to government for my next assignment. Almost all of the other Peace Corps people at that time were from outside of government, and they went back to their jobs, wherever they were.

I discussed this with Mr. Blatchford and his deputy and senior staff, and explained to them that I was career Civil Service, that I hoped to continue my government career, and since we were facing this limitation, would they assist me in pointing the way? They very graciously did. They had been pleased with what I had done, especially in Special Services, and, I think, wanted to assist in any way they could.

They apparently contacted the White House and State Department, and interviews commenced with respect to my appointment in Montreal.

Now, I should make one thing clear about the Montreal appointment. People have said to me from time to time, "Oh, that was a political appointment." It was *not* a political appointment; it was a presidential appointment, which may imply political assurances, which I gave them. I assured them that I wouldn't embarrass them at any point politically. But it was a presidential appointment, and I retained my Civil Service status.

The mission at ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization) had a history of utilizing people who either were career government people in one sense or another, or had served in government.

*Q: Let me get this straight. All the time you were in the Peace Corps, you were under Civil Service?*

DILLON: My Civil Service status continued. That doesn't mean that any position I was in was a Civil Service position, because Peace Corps is not accepted as--

*Q: That's why I was confused. Yes.*

DILLON: But because I had Civil Service status, that status continued. I kept it.

*Q: And you kept it when you went to Montreal?*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: Although you were not under a Civil Service slot there?*

DILLON: Right. It's presidential. When I left Peace Corps, I began to realize that the six years had, indeed, had a serious impact on my outlook on life, on my outlook toward other countries, other peoples, on my own emotional makeup, on my understanding of the human race, and it really confirmed and bolstered my belief that people everywhere are human beings with very similar problems and similar concerns, similar needs, no matter what country, what race, what religion. It bolstered a sense of practicality and realism that we've gotten away from in the United States.

When you live in a country, in an environment where survival is the only priority--food, clothing, and a roof over your head--for so many people, you realize that we have too much in the United States. We not only have enough, we have too much in this country. It's a great country. I love my country intensely, but we have too much. And never is it more noticeable than when you come directly from a developing nation back into our economy, our culture, and see the priorities that we've established for ourselves in recent years, and realize how very unnecessary a lot of it is to human existence.

You also learn in other countries a different approach to the meaning of human life. Many other countries have what we very often refer to as a fatalistic approach. That's overly simplistic and has almost become a cliché. I rather see it as an acceptance of life,

particularly with respect to time span. You realize how short the human life is and how little it impacts, really, on the lives of others, on our countries, on the planet earth. Things that were important before you went over seem very unimportant when you come back.

I learned to respect the peoples of the farthest village not for what they've accomplished, because most of them have not accomplished anything by our measures and standards, but for their peaceful and easy acceptance of life and their acceptance of their lives at that place and in that time.

In the United States and in other more progressive countries, we've developed a drive, we've developed an intensity, that really doesn't do justice to the meaning of life and what it's all about and why we're here. This is very difficult to put in words, and all of these words may sound like a bit of jargon, and I know that some people would say I'm a romanticist or I'm overly dramatic about it. All I'm trying to do is explain those differences that I felt within myself and that I have observed within myself and my daughter as a result of that exposure for six years. And it is a profound impact.

*Q: Certainly you deserve credit for opening yourself up to accept these changes. So many people go overseas and come back more confirmed in American materialism, and look down their noses at other people because they don't have all the bathtubs and washing machines.*

DILLON: Exactly. My daughter and I were on a train going from Leningrad to Moscow a little later in my career here, and we had no escort at that point. We were on a semi-official trip, but we were on our own. In the other end of the car we were traveling on was a small group of American tourists, and I heard one of the women say, "It's just like these communists. They can't keep the windows on the train washed." (laughter) My daughter and I looked at one another and thought, "What a tremendous loss. Here she is in a great country, one of the powers of the world today, in a great country in the sense of history, with this marvelous opportunity to see and hear and learn, and all she can notice is that the Soviets haven't washed the windows on the train."

*Q: She had her blinders on.*

*Part of the reason, I think, don't you, is because we have always had this huge moat around the United States, and we haven't had the seasoning process that they've had in the rest of the world?*

DILLON: Certainly. In the last century and until not so long ago, we were, indeed, isolated, physically isolated. Now, thanks to our own technology, ironically, it's a very small world. We're part of an international family on a very small planet.

*Q: And we happen to have been given an awful lot of natural resources, which leads some people to think they were chosen.*

DILLON: Yes. You said we were "given" a country with a large number of resources.

*Q: We "took" it, you mean? We took it away from the Indians.*

DILLON: Having worked so much with the American Indians and having an Indian heritage myself, we must always remember that we "took" it, too.

*Q: You're absolutely right. I'm glad you caught me up on that.*

DILLON: But you're quite right. We were blessed with this tremendous--or we *were* blessed with this tremendous wealth of natural resources.

*Q: In a temperate climate.*

DILLON: Yes. Climate is very important. We found that out in Ceylon, which is right on the equator. And it's easy for Americans to say, "Why don't those Ceylonese get off their--you know--and get to work and clean this place up and bring in free enterprise and so on?" Well, if you live in Ceylon on the equator, where it's 99 degrees day and night, 100% humidity day and night, no air-conditioning, day after day, year after year, no getting away, no leaving--

*Q: Very debilitating.*

DILLON: Free enterprise and all of the drive that goes with it seems a little bit inappropriate.

*Q: That's true, very, very true. Did you find the heat a bother to you?*

DILLON: Yes, it did. It wasn't a serious problem.

*Q: I suppose you did have air-conditioning?*

DILLON: No. Peace Corps did not have air-conditioning, no. We had a lovely house, small house, with tile floors and sliding doors that opened on both sides of a big living room, so that there was almost always a little movement of air through there. The birds used to fly through the living room. (laughter)

*Q: And you couldn't use what they use in the desert, could you, the air coolers? You have water dripping in the machine and then you blow the air over. But you already had too much water.*

DILLON: The water was dripping off of everything already.

*Q: True. So it wouldn't work there, would it?*

DILLON: Your clothing is mossy and moldy.

*Q: A lot of mildew on shoes and that sort of thing?*

DILLON: Spiders in Ceylon were tremendous. Spiders are my phobia, I suppose. I don't like spiders. Some of them had a place in our bathroom. They were as big as my hand, the spiders, and they moved very quickly, almost like some of the tarantulas out west, just almost faster than you could watch them. I didn't like them *at all*. One of them used to hide on the opposite side of my closet door, but I could tell he was there because he would hang by one of his legs over the top of the door, and it looked like a coat hanger. (laughter)

*Q: Were they poisonous?*

DILLON: I don't know. I never inquired much about them. I used to call the house boy, who, of course, was Buddhist and wouldn't kill anything. I would insist that he get them out of my bedroom, and he would bring all of his paraphernalia. He had brooms and mops and dustcloths and a lot of things. He would ultimately corner the spider, throw a dustcloth on it, scoop it up in the cloth, take it outside and shake out the cloth on the lawn. Well, of course, the spider beat him back in the house. (laughter) And this went on and on. But you get used to it.

*Q: What sort of food did you eat? Did you buy your food on the local market?*

DILLON: Oh, yes, in both Tunisia and Ceylon, always. It was excellent.

*Q: Exclusively?*

DILLON: Exclusively. We never used the commissary or PX. Nothing.

*Q: You never sent away?*

DILLON: No, no, never. We found the food in both places to be excellent. There are nice, fresh vegetables available. The meats in Tunisia are beautiful. Tunisian markets are superb. Ceylon is a little less so, but you can find most anything there. The dish in Ceylon is hot curry, of course, and we became addicted to that. When we traveled out over the island, we stayed at the Ceylonese rest houses. Some of them are very, very nice. They're like small hotels, motels, very small, just to accommodate travelers, whether they be Ceylonese or foreign, around the country. We always stayed there, ate there, and some of the curries they serve are so hot that they'll blister your tongue and lips. But we got used to them and loved them. My daughter is quite a gourmet cook, and she loves to fix curries, as well as couscous from Tunisia.

*Q: What sort of social circles did you make? Mainly with the local people, that is, the Ceylonese and the Tunisian people?*

DILLON: Sure.

*Q: Of course, you undoubtedly knew the people of the diplomatic missions. But you only saw them on business?*

DILLON: Only on business when we needed to. I didn't accept social invitations, and they didn't send them, because they knew Peace Corps was removed from the diplomatic community. We made many Ceylonese and Tunisian friends. The Tunisian friends we have to this day. Of course, you must remember, as a Peace Corps country director, my primary concern and my responsibilities had to do with the volunteers. I had, in Tunisia, almost 300 at the time I finally left there, and in Ceylon we brought in 65, a smaller group. But just the same, if you have the responsibility for that many people under those conditions, you have your hands full.

Before we leave social invitations--at Thanksgiving in Colombo Ambassador Andrew Corry asked me if he could send an invitation to me and Kath for Thanksgiving dinner at the residence. I think it was the thought of mashed potatoes and gravy that got us, so I told him we would accept if invited. It was a large formal sit-down dinner. He, a bachelor, seated me at his right, and Kath only a few places away. She was the only child there. Only later did we learn that there had been a terrible controversy among the embassy families about who would be invited to the ambassador's table: This was his way of putting some of the "manipulators" in their place!

*Q: You saw them [the volunteers] a great deal, I suppose?*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: You went around?*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: But you always lived in the capital city?*

DILLON: Well, we lived in the capital city in Colombo, for example, but I traveled constantly doing site visits--constantly. Many directors don't do that, but I feel you have to, not only to keep in touch with the volunteers, but to keep in touch with their supervisors, their counterparts, their co-workers, regional officials, keep touch with the programs that they're working in. You have to.

*Q: And if they're young people, they need that all the more. Of course, people in the Peace Corps can be any age at all. They always could.*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: But the bulk of them were quite young.*

DILLON: Even then, in Tunisia we had one older woman and she was quite elderly then, a teacher, Nora Hodges, and I understand she's still alive. She's in her nineties and very active in New York doing some big project. In Ceylon we had one or two couples that were retired, early retirement. So they were beginning to come in then, older people.

*Q: I should think older people would be very effective.*

DILLON: They are. They really are, except that they very often cannot get the language. It's very interesting.

*Q: Oh, I hadn't thought of that. Yes.*

DILLON: Unfortunately, they can't cope with communicating in the language. But apart from that, they do very well. I've had some very effective volunteers in both countries, older volunteers, who found ways to communicate. They couldn't get the language, but you know, you can communicate through body language, through drawing pictures, through whatever, and they served their whole term that way.

*Q: Did you find they had more problems of health than the younger ones?*

DILLON: No. It's hard to say, because proportionately there were fewer of those then. But I would say percentage-wise, the percentage of oldsters versus the percentage of youngsters, no.

*Q: They were tough old birds or they wouldn't have gone out there! (laughter)*

DILLON: Exactly! (laughter)

*Q: And they would have the patience that young people might not have?*

DILLON: The younger people, in Colombo, especially, had a very high medical incidence there. There were always volunteers at the house recuperating or waiting for medical evacuation, one kind of problem or another. And I remember my daughter was always fascinated with all of this. She was 11 or 12 by then and very close to the volunteers. They thought she was a better volunteer sometimes than they were. But I remember one morning we woke up, as you always do in the tropical climates, at daylight, and she got up and went out through the house to check and see who'd come during the night or who'd left or if everyone was all right. She came back into the bedroom, slammed the door, and stood back against it, and said, "Mother, you'd better get up. The Jobs are here and they're pregnant!" (laughter)

*Q: The house that you lived in, in each of those places, are they rented by the Peace Corps or do you go out and get your own house and have an allowance to cover it?*

DILLON: The answer to both questions is yes. I went out and got my own house, but the Peace Corps paid for it.

*Q: I see. You don't get to a post and have a place ready for you?*

DILLON: No. No, no.

*Q: Certainly you wouldn't in Ceylon, because you had to do everything in Ceylon. So in other words, you can select where you want to live, then?*

DILLON: Yes, yes. We can talk about my more recent Peace Corps tour in Tunisia later on, I assume. There are some things different about it from this earlier period. But in the earlier period in Tunisia, we found our own house, centrally located, very accessible to volunteers for obvious reasons, not far from the embassy. It was a more modern villa. It had certain Arabic aspects to the styling, had big verandas and terraces, a lovely little garden, a very pleasant house. As I mentioned earlier, the two Tunisian girls were our guests there for the year and a half we were there, and were attending school in Tunis.

In Ceylon, obviously there was none there because there was no program there when I went there, so I found this very nice little place that was typical Ceylonese, fairly modern construction, one story, with tile floor, which is cool and you can keep clean. There are not only spiders, there are centipedes and things like that. So you need to keep the floors clean. A lot of windows to let whatever current of air might be coming through. Two bedrooms, usually an extra bedroom for visiting volunteers, sick volunteers. Small kitchen.

But in both of those cases and most certainly in this more recent case, which we'll discuss later, I chose places that were convenient and comfortable, but at the same time were in keeping with the role of Peace Corps in that country. In other words, they were modest and not out of step with what, for example, the Ceylonese or Tunisian government officials might be living in at that level.

*Q: And it would be staffed by local people. You mentioned a houseboy.*

DILLON: Yes. In Ceylon, I had staff forced upon me. I got there saying, "I'm not going to have all these servants. This is Peace Corps. I don't want locals working as my servants." But then it was impressed upon me that there is a very high unemployment rate and that really you're doing a great service to these people by employing them. So we had a marvelous Singhalese Buddhist house-boy that was a member of the family. He would bring in a friend to be the dhobi, the laundry man. Somewhere along the line, a gardener showed up and I brought him in. But we paid them very little, it was nothing out of my pocket, and it meant a great deal to them.

*Q: You probably fed them, too, which was very important.*

DILLON: They were very much a part of what went on. In Tunisia, we only had one cleaning woman who came once or twice a week and did basic cleaning. If I had people in or a big dinner for volunteers, she'd help with the cooking and that sort of thing.

*Q: But otherwise you did the cooking?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: What happened when you took trips? Who took care of your daughter?*

DILLON: If she wasn't with me--

*Q: You did mention she often went with you.*

DILLON: I took her wherever I could, weekends, holidays, or occasionally took her out of school if it was an important trip. If that simply wasn't possible, in Tunisia we had what's called a *gardien*, a guard, but he's sort of a person that sits near your front gate and tidies up the garden and does errands for you and so forth. He was a young man who was very reliable and was always there. He lived in a little building out in the garden, and I could always count on his being there, and Kathy relied on him.

*Q: And she was able to prepare meals for herself?*

DILLON: Oh, yes. As a matter of fact, from almost that point on, Kathy was doing a great deal of cooking. Cooking is now her hobby.

*Q: You mentioned that. Isn't that wonderful?*

DILLON: She loves it. She always did. But it was interesting for her. She learned to make couscous with the Tunisian woman, and she knows things about making couscous that I don't. And all of the Arabic phrases for all of it she picked up very quickly.

*Q: It must have given her a feeling also that she was pretty important as far as the team goes.*

DILLON: Oh, yes. I remember once in Tunisia, I was contacted by a couple of visiting AID home economists. They had been brought over for a three-day visit. It was a boondoggle. They were passing through the country to see what was wrong with the nutrition of the Tunisians, and AID didn't know what to do with them, so they called me and said, "Could you explain to them what Tunisians eat? Because you and the volunteers know."

So in the middle of the day, I took them to the house and was showing them some of the ingredients that we had there, and Kathy came home from school and was helping. We had had volunteers there the night before and had a big pot of couscous, and some of it

was left over. So I said, "If you would like, we'll heat that up quickly. You can taste it and eat some of it, and you will see that it's very nutritious." From the wheat couscous to the vegetables to the meat; it's all there. "Oh, that would be wonderful!" So we heated it up and they sat at the table and tasted this and commented. Kathy watched, and she said, "Would you like some more?" They said, "No, thank you. This will be enough." And she said, "Well, there's plenty here, because after dinner last night, I went around to all the plates and poured them back in the pot." (laughter)

*Q: I can see she was a great help to you, wasn't she? (laughter)*

DILLON: Very frugal. The two poor ladies left shortly thereafter.

*Q: I think that would stop any conversation, bless her heart.*

DILLON: We had one very bad experience in Tunisia with Kathy. She and I had been visiting a site down in the edge of the Sahara desert and were driving straight back along the coast of Tunisia. We passed through Sfax mid-afternoon, which meant we could get to Tunis early in the evening. In those days, Sfax, which is now the second largest city in Tunisia, was a good-size town, but much smaller than now. The railroad was the edge of the city. When you crossed over the railroad tracks, there was really nothing between you and Tunis but four hours of desert.

So we stopped there briefly and got back in the car and started to leave. When we drove over the tracks, Kathy just fell over in my lap. She said, "Mom, I can't go on. I'm awfully sick." She'd been fine all morning, and I was shocked.

I said, "Well, Kath, what is it?"

"Well, I don't know, but I'm awfully sick. I feel terrible."

So I turned around and went back to a little hotel that the volunteers used there in Sfax, and got a room. By then I could see she was developing a temperature. It was early evening. Within a matter of three or four hours, her temperature went off the end of the thermometer. I didn't know any doctors in Sfax, I couldn't speak Arabic. It was in the night. I was using my French to work with the hotel. There was a little coffee shop and bar in the lobby of the hotel, and he had an old refrigerator with one little ice tray in it. That man stayed up all night freezing ice cubes in that one little tray so I could keep Kathy's temperature under control. About three o'clock in the morning, it broke. She was terribly nauseated, diarrhea, you know. Just everything went. Her temperature went down. By ten o'clock the next morning it was normal, and we went on our way.

*Q: Did you ever find out what she had?*

DILLON: Of course, I talked with the medical officers about it, and we assumed it was either dengue fever or one of the local fevers that strike and go on. She's never had a recurrence of it, however, and usually with dengue, like malaria, it recurs.

*Q: I wondered if it were a type of enteritis, which strikes suddenly. You must have been scared to death.*

DILLON: I was terrified. Absolutely terrified.

*Q: You feel so alone in a case like that. I'm glad that she recovered with no after-effects. She could easily have had convulsions with her temperature that high.*

DILLON: Yes, easily. So we had our good times and our not-so-good times. (laughter)

*Q: How nice that you had your daughter with you.*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: While you were away, your mother died, did she?*

DILLON: No, she died only in 1980, finally.

*Q: So all of that illness she had recovered from?*

DILLON: Partially.

*Q: You were talking about going to Montreal. What sort of paperwork or testing or whatever did you have to go through in order to get that appointment? Did you have to get recommendations from different people?*

DILLON: Not many. You see, the director of Peace Corps--. I think many of the other top people in Peace Corps who had served well and their full period were being placed or were being recommended by Peace Corps in an effort to help them with their ongoing careers. So I don't suggest that I was that much of an exception, but I did come strongly recommended by Peace Corps itself at the highest level.

Then I had to talk with the congressional liaison and assure her that there was nothing in my background that would be embarrassing in any way to the incumbent administration. I assured her there wasn't, that I didn't consider myself to be a political appointment. I served, I think, very effectively under both Republican and Democrat administrations.

I did have an interview at the White House, and I've forgotten the name of the--it's one of the very well-known names, the top presidential aide there that does this kind of thing. I assured him, likewise, that--

*Q: This is under President Johnson, is it?*

DILLON: This was Nixon already. This was 1970, '71. They were not entirely aware of my very early history, not that it would have mattered to them in politics, but they were aware that I had served at the highest levels under a Democratic administration, so understandably they didn't want to have my appointment be an embarrassment to them in any way, and I gave them those assurances.

I was then interviewed at State Department and found out, for the first time, what it was they were considering me for. Of course, I was elated.

*Q: You didn't know until that point what you were being interviewed for?*

DILLON: No. I knew it was a top-level international position. It was a marvelous combination of my aviation background and my international work. A perfect fit. They felt the same way, of course. They seemed pleased to find someone with that unusual combination.

*Q: Is that under State?*

DILLON: Yes. Oh, yes.

*Q: Is the Bureau back at the State Department IO; International Organizations?*

DILLON: IO, and the Office of Aviation in the Economics Bureau. Yes, it's a United Nations agency, International Civil Aviation Organization, which was formed in 1944, the year before the U.N. itself was formed, in anticipation of the role of aviation after the war. I learned that it carried ministerial rank. There had been some question about whether they should leave ministerial rank up there, and I assured them I didn't care, but they convinced me that it was important, and I was glad they did, because after I worked my way through the position and was up there a few years, it was a great help to have that diplomatic status.

*Q: Especially if other countries are going to have it.*

DILLON: But other countries didn't, you see.

*Q: But some did?*

DILLON: No. The representatives in residence, there's an executive council with some--it was then 30 countries. It's 36 now or something. They are in residence and serve on the executive council of ICAO. It's the only one of the agencies that has that kind of a year-round setup. They serve similarly on the executive council's committees. In addition to all of that, three are triennial assemblies of the entire 150-nation organization, and occasionally diplomatic conferences with special agendas.

But in that appointment as chief of our mission to ICAO, I was the first women to represent the United States to a United Nations agency. Now, that doesn't mean to say that Eleanor Roosevelt hadn't gone to UNESCO and this person or that gone to one-time conferences or one-time sessions, but in-resident chief of mission had never before gone to a woman.

*Q: Yes, because you're still quite early on. In this list, you know, you're number 12.*

DILLON: Is that right?

*Q: Yes, you're only number 12, and you went up there, according to this, in November of 1971. The first woman was in April of 1933, and in all those years, you can see where you are right there. This is the official list from the State Department.*

DILLON: I thought there had been more.

*Q: This list only has chiefs of mission on it, which is why Eleanor Roosevelt, for example, is not on here. But you didn't realize you were so early in the list?*

DILLON: No, I didn't! (laughter)

*Q: Well, you were, and you were also the first woman at a multilateral organization. All the others had been bilateral appointments.*

DILLON: Right.

*Q: You must have had to go to the Senate, then.*

DILLON: Yes, we had confirmation, but ICAO is a little-known organization. It has preserved its technical makeup, and indeed it should. It has a responsibility for very advanced technology worldwide and very important air services worldwide. So in that sense, it is not foremost in the eyes of our own government. It's a group of people who are aviation people, who are up there regulating and standardizing worldwide aviation every day of the world, and they do it so well and they manage, at that point, at least, had managed pretty well to keep politics out of it, so that it wasn't well known. It wasn't like sending someone to Geneva or Vienna to the Atomic Energy Commission or something.

Therefore, my confirmation hearing consisted of my being taken up to the Hill by a State Department liaison officer, calling Fulbright out of the Senate and--I'd have to go back through my notes--the Republican ranking member of the committee, and having them chat with me for a minute and go on about their business. It was a very simple and easy way to handle it. That way we avoided raising issues that might well have come up if we'd gotten into a full-blown hearing. It didn't waste their time, but still it assured them that here I was, able-bodied, reasonably bright, and ready to go.

*Q: Then they reported back to the full committee?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: That was reported to the Senate and passed with no question?*

DILLON: I went up to Montreal ahead of my confirmation. I'm trying to think. I went up in October for a brief orientation with my predecessor, and I went up the end of October, the first of November, and started work on a special appointment, because I hadn't been confirmed. Then my confirmation came through channels in December, I think, and full appointment was made.

*Q: How long did you have this session with your predecessor, the orientation?*

DILLON: First let me say that he was a man who had worked at the Civil Aeronautics Board when I was there years before. He had come in as a junior lawyer on our staff at CAB, so I had known him and worked with him there. Secondly, while I was still in Peace Corps, not long before this, I had gone up to Ste. Anne-de-Pocatière in Quebec to a Peace Corps training conference for some lectures and had stopped to see this man in Montreal, not having the wildest notion that ever I would be [posted] to Montreal. It was just a personal visit. We had talked a bit then about what he did and why he did it and so forth. So when I went back in October for some formal briefings as his successor, it really didn't take long. I knew what ICAO was all about. I had served on committees in the United States Government in Washington that handled ICAO positions. I think he and I had dinner one evening at their house and we chatted in the office.

*Q: Why was a change made at that particular time?*

DILLON: I understand that he resigned and I'm not sure why.

*Q: Personal, perhaps?*

DILLON: I think so. I've barely seen him since then. I think he's up in New England somewhere. He might have been a bit discouraged. Some of the things he had wanted to do, he had not been able to do. He'd been there, I believe, three years.

*Q: Came in with Nixon, perhaps, in '68?*

DILLON: Perhaps. Yes, I'll bet. Yes.

*Q: You were thrilled with this, I can imagine.*

DILLON: Yes!

*Q: What about the swearing-in ceremony?*

DILLON: The swearing-in was held down here in Washington.

*Q: You came back down?*

DILLON: Yes. It was arranged very nicely by the Department of State. It was in the assistant secretary's office, as I recall, or one of the reception rooms. I was consulted on the invitation list--many of my longtime friends and colleagues and associates came, people I had worked with over the years. The president of the Ninety-nines, which is the women's pilot organization internationally, came up from Atlanta; Mr. Tompkins, the president of Overseas National Airways, was there; some of the aviation attorneys that I had worked with off and on over the years; the man who had been ambassador in Ceylon when I went there as Peace Corps Director had since retired, he came and was very pleased. He always liked Kathy. The two of them had a great thing going. He was an older man, of course, having retired by that time.

*Q: What about heads of airlines? Do they come? Or representative of the airlines, do they come to swearing-ins of these people?*

DILLON: ONA did because I had been with them for so long. Someone from the Air Transport Association came, as I recall.

*Q: IATA, maybe?*

DILLON: ATA, our own U.S. Air Transport Association.

*Q: I wondered if anybody came from Pan Am, or if that's considered bad taste.*

DILLON: It seems to me that one of their Washington vice presidents came, a man that I had worked with a great deal when I was at the board. Yes. There was a group of probably 20 or 25. The chief justice, whom you will recall I had met in San Francisco in the forties as an attorney who later became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, was invited and accepted. Unfortunately, the swearing-in was about twelve o'clock noon, and a morning court session ran through that time. He was very disappointed. All of the arrangements had been made; the security men were out and so forth. But it didn't work out. Incidentally, the press release regarding my appointment and swearing-in stated Chief Justice Earl Warren had attended!

*Q: What a shame. Who did the actual swearing-in, the assistant secretary or chief of protocol?*

DILLON: The chief of protocol.

*Q: Then I guess you made a little speech.*

DILLON: Very, very briefly, yes. We all had champagne and cookies.

*Q: Of course, it's different with a situation like that because there isn't an ambassador from another country to come to the swearing-in.*

DILLON: That's right.

*Q: Of course, Kathy was there?*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: Mother?*

DILLON: No, she didn't come.

*Q: This sounds like a very civilized transfer you made.*

DILLON: It was very simple, very fast, very efficient. Within 30 days, you see, I was up there at work.

*Q: My goodness!*

DILLON: I'd sold my house here. There is no term on that appointment. Of course, you serve at the pleasure of the president, but oftentimes there is some kind of a rule of thumb. Our first representative up there had been there for 20 years, and everyone agreed that that was much, much too long. He died while he was in Montreal. I think in his last years he was rather tired of the assignment. It was too long. He was a very able man and very much revered and respected.

Others, an admiral had served for two or three years some years back. Some very outstanding people had held the position. Then in more recent years, someone had had a rather short term, I think one year or two. My predecessor, I think, was there three years. We discussed how long I should plan to be away, generally, and all agreed that three years was probably a pretty good period of time. It was long enough to get acquainted and be effective, and it still wasn't long enough to become stale and bored. I became so active and things went so well, I was there six years, six wonderful years.

*Q: I didn't know they left any diplomats in place that long! All the way through Nixon and through Ford and into Carter's term. That's a record of length of service.*

DILLON: Is it?

*Q: Oh, yes, far and away, yes. There have been four years here and there, but seven is far and away [the longest for a woman].*

DILLON: I enjoyed every minute of it. I accomplished everything that needed to be done, and the last year I began to notice that I was becoming a little bored with the whole thing. I knew all the players, I knew the game, I had gotten all our positions through, and I was ready to come home and to make a change.

*Q: Before you go up there, are you given instructions as to what they hope you will accomplish while you're there?*

DILLON: Generally, yes. I had briefings here, and, of course, I had worked in aviation so much that I knew generally what the issues of the day were and what the problems had been up there.

*Q: Who would brief you back here?*

DILLON: IO, the Bureau of International Organizations at Department of State. The aviation office on the economic side of State. Perhaps the Civil Aeronautics Board on economic issues. FAA on the technical issues. But my deputy up there was an FAA man, so that wasn't earth-shaking. I think I had a political briefing in State with respect to some of the countries that were in residence with me, because the Soviet Union had just been elected to the executive council and sent a council member who came on board the same time I did. The following year they voted China in, and we went through that political exercise. So I had some briefings in that regard. But you receive almost daily positions from the State Department in the form of cables.

There was a telex up there when I first went there, but the other end of it was in the Bureau of Economic Affairs at Department of State, and that was not wide and broad enough. And it was only a telex, so that the information and the requests for information and the reports didn't get circulated as they should when a cable comes down. So I took the telex out and started using the consulate communications links.

*Q: Did you encode your messages?*

DILLON: No. Once in a great while there would be something delicate enough that it had to be classified, but I'd simply classify them and send them to the consulate. No, the telex, of course--

*Q: Would be completely clear.*

DILLON: Yes, and that was another one of the problems with that kind of thing--to receive positions on a telex that was totally unclassified really wasn't practical.

*Q: No, I can see it wouldn't be. What sort of things were you supposed to be doing?*

DILLON: Well, the executive council, September through June, meets Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. It has three standing committees, the Finance Committee, which prepares the budget, reviews the budget. The secretary general prepares the budget, but it

goes to the Finance Committee and is submitted to the triennial assembly. It also handles housekeeping functions of the organization and the secretariat itself, which, after all, has a secretary general and I think there were 600 people in the secretariat, 600 or 700.

The Joint Finance Committee was charged with administering the North Atlantic cable facility for navigation of the North Atlantic routes. The Air Navigation Commission, which was the technical arm of the executive council, met on alternate days, Tuesdays and Thursdays, and submitted their work to us. So although they were almost parallel to the executive council, they were subordinate and all of their work came through the council just as the committee work did. It was set up that way because much of the highly technical work that the Commission did simply could not have been handled by those of us on the council. When you get into the microwave landing system and the collision avoidance system and spacing runway lighting and some even more advanced technological concepts, you need experts to treat those subjects and then bring them to the council for its consideration, question and answer, much as a Hill committee would consider a staff paper.

So we received the ANC work. There was an Air Transport Committee, which was a committee of the whole, that dealt with economic questions, the charges for en route facilities, for example, rates, although ICAO had not at that point gotten into rate setting or rates and fares considerations. There were general policy considerations that came out of the Air Transport Committee, and economic-type issues came before that committee, as opposed to the technical work of the ANC.

There was a Committee on Unlawful Interference, which was the hijacking committee. It was made up of nine members. Those bodies met on off days, as well as the Air Navigation Commission, and then at the end of a session, or if need be, during a session, they would submit their papers and findings and recommendations to the council. Then depending on the nature of the issue and the decision, the matter might or might not go to a triennial general assembly of all nations.

*Q: Are there many infractions of these international rules?*

DILLON: Well, sure, because the Chicago Convention which established ICAO has annexes attached to it, which are called the SARPs, the Standards and Recommended Practices. Standards are those findings of ICAO that nations are supposed to comply with, and if they don't, they have to explain to ICAO why they're not doing it. The recommended practices contain a large body of material that is simply that: it's recommended to nations that they follow these practices in the interest of safety and in the interest of economic operations. But the nations are not held accountable for the recommended practices.

*Q: There's no watchdog committee?*

DILLON: No.

*Q: And certainly no other committee to enforce.*

DILLON: Right. There's no enforcement. But you know, if you're operating airlines or even if you're not and you're a country that receives many aircraft, or you operate airports, safety is number one. Economics is number two. And it's to your own advantage to try to comply with these things. It's like people often say of pilots, "Is the pilot going to do his best when he's in an emergency situation with an aircraft?" Well, of course he is, because he's on board, too. So it is with the SARPs, but there's no enforcement. Having an in-residence council and committees and frequent worldwide meetings encourages compliance, you see.

*Q: Yes, I can see that. Did you find that this group of people from all over the world was an easy group to work with?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Really? Because they say the U.N. is a zoo.*

DILLON: This was marvelous. First of all, we all had some kind of aviation background.

*Q: Well, that's it. You all have your own special thing, and I think that does make more for esprit.*

DILLON: Many of the representatives sent by other countries are very skilled air transport pilots. Many of them have served in the military, as military command pilots, with thousands and thousands of hours in all kinds of equipment. Many of them have been airport managers or are specialists in navigational facilities. A few are less qualified, of course, like myself. Even though I have years in aviation, not all of it is that technical. But we all shared that common interest.

*Q: Do you all have to be able to fly?*

DILLON: No, no. Not necessarily. There are no requirements. You can send a dishwasher up there. The nation can nominate anyone they want to as a representative. But countries have been very, very good about sending qualified people.

So the council and the committees and the secretariat have as their common goal the safety and economic operation of worldwide air transport, and that's what holds them together and keeps them serious.

*Q: Why is it in Montreal?*

DILLON: I understand that that was part of the outcome of the Chicago Convention and the negotiations that went on there in 1944. I guess there may have been some political

considerations. I don't know, but it was decided then that the headquarters would be in Montreal. As you know, all of the other U.N. agencies are in Europe--Geneva, Vienna, London, Rome. Nairobi--there are some now down in Africa. But it was decided to put the headquarters in Montreal, and it's really not a bad choice.

*Q: If there is a crash somewhere in the world, do you people get involved in that?*

DILLON: Ordinarily the organization would not. Those who get involved are, of course, the airline operator, the government of the country whose flag it carries, the manufacturer of the equipment. See, Boeing maintains a great staff of specialists and accident investigators who can go immediately to the scene of a crash of a Boeing, no matter what Boeing, and participate in the investigation. Often the National Transportation Board of the U.S. sends a team. Occasionally a country will say they don't need to come, but that's very rare, very unusual. Sometimes there are unusual circumstances; others might be invited in.

ICAO, on a couple of occasions, has been invited to investigate a crash, and I'm thinking back to the time when during my tenure in Montreal the Israeli military fighter plane shot down a scheduled Libyan aircraft flight from Tripoli to Cairo. It had lost its way somewhere in the desert and gotten out over the Sinai Peninsula. It was a horrible incident. The military aircraft pulled up alongside it on both sides, could see pregnant women and children and so forth. Nonetheless, they panicked and shot it down, and over a hundred people were killed, as I recall. I think some survived.

Because there were some political--well, serious political overtones and because this was a daily scheduled flight between two commercial points, it was asked that ICAO send a special team along with all of the other investigations that were going on, a fact-finding team, and bring back a report to the council, which it did, a very thorough report. But that was a most unusual case.

*Q: Who doesn't belong to this? You mentioned that at the time you went up there, there were 30 countries.*

DILLON: It's a United Nations agency, so almost all members of the U.N. family belong to ICAO. They are the member states, 150, I guess now 155 states.

*Q: But they don't all have permanent reps up there. I see.*

DILLON: By states. At the triennial assemblies, they elect their executive council and in keeping with the Chicago Convention, that council reflects geographic representation, it represents provider states and user states, it represents large manufacturing states. So there's kind of a sense of solid, broad aviation representation on the council. But those state members are elected every three years, and are in residence in Montreal.

*Q: Including the United States?*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: Isn't it a member all the time?*

DILLON: Well, if we weren't elected at worldwide assembly, we wouldn't be on the council, no.

*Q: But we always have been?*

DILLON: We always have been. There were some political innuendoes a few years ago, even toward the end of my term. Politics was beginning to creep in primarily because of the Middle East situation. It was suggested through some political channels, that those states wanting the United States to take certain positions in the United Nations New York, or to modify certain of its policies would vote it off the ICAO council. This was kind of an indirect rumor type of threat, but, of course, it never came about, and I doubt that it ever will, for two or three good reasons: the United States is, of course, a leader in aviation technology and, of course, is *the* major contributor financially to the organization. So its presence there is very, very important for international aviation.

*Q: I just wondered, with the emergence of the Third World and the way they always voted against us at the U.N., if perhaps they might not spread out a bit.*

DILLON: That's very interesting. In my briefings before I went to Montreal, I was told that the four African nations on the council were non-cooperative, couldn't be relied on, and were a big problem to us. I was told that the Arab caucus--I think there were three states then, including Lebanon--very often voted with the Africans and this was a developing-nation conspiracy against the United States. I was told that the "banana republics" of Central and South America had their own thing going and we couldn't always rely on them. There were serious problems. It took me about ten days to get these straightened out. Really, the problems were of a personal nature. They were personality problems. They were a lack of diplomacy on our part. They were a lack of consideration of the other countries' positions and their needs and requirements, a lack of understanding of their cultures and their political systems.

I was told that as a woman going on the council, I couldn't expect the Japanese vote as often as my predecessor had. Well, we've already talked about my time in Japan, my love of the Japanese culture, the Japanese people. I went directly to my Japanese colleague, we went through some of the Japanese type formalities, getting acquainted and so forth. Not only did he support me *without exception* for the full time he was there, but just a few months after I arrived there, I was given the chairmanship of the Committee on Unlawful Interference and he accepted my vice chairmanship. And I suggest you really can't ask for more than that.

*Q: You certainly cannot, can you? That is quite a compliment.*

DILLON: But in doing that, we had to understand his way of doing it. I went to Mr. Hiroji Yamaguchi and asked him, invited him to be my vice chairman. I made it clear it would be a great honor for me and for the committee, that he was a very much respected and admired council representative. He said, of course, he would have to submit it to his government for approval, which he did. He set up an appointment with me, told me that he had "heard from his government," and unfortunately he could not accept it. Knowing the Japanese way of doing things, I said, "Oh, but I'm sure you can reconsider. I know that you would like to do it. I know we would be a marvelous team. Please reconsider." "Well, all right, I will do it."

But if you hadn't known that you must go through that marvelous polite and respectful exercise, someone else might have said, "Well, he turned me down," and walked away. (He later served in two ambassadorial posts for his government.)

*Q: Sure. And you're expected to come back and say, "Please."*

DILLON: Yes, of course.

*Q: You knew the little ritual.*

DILLON: The Committee on Unlawful Interference was the hijacking committee, an important one, because this was the period of the Cuban hijackings and airplanes were being blown up in the Middle East, hostages, and so forth. The committee was, for all intents and purposes, defunct, because my predecessor had wanted the chairmanship. The African nations, the developing nations, wouldn't let him have it. And he wouldn't let them have it, and the committee was inoperable.

*Q: Now, that sounds like U.N. New York.*

DILLON: Exactly! I called on each one of my African friends. I had just been steeped in African affairs for years, I knew their countries, we had mutual friends. I met their families. We set up a good personal rapport. As I said, within two or three months, I was offered the chairmanship. I was chairman for two terms. I was re-elected the second year and received just immeasurable support and assistance.

*Q: The secretary general asks you to take the chairmanship?*

DILLON: Sometimes it comes through the secretary general. It can be handled different ways. Sometimes you express an interest to maybe a close colleague, the United Kingdom representative or someone whom you know can handle it well, and he feels out the situation, and the rumor gets started. Sometimes the secretary general might come to you and say, "I think now we've got this group together or that group together, and if they want you, can you take it? Will your government approve?" It can come from [a] different direction.

*Q: I see. What size staff do you have at a mission like that?*

DILLON: Very small! (laughter) When I arrived, there was one Foreign Service officer, and she was the receptionist. There was a local-hire American secretary. I think there was a local Canadian part-timer or something, and, of course, the deputy mission chief, in effect, who is the air navigation commissioner.

*Q: He was from FAA?*

DILLON: FAA. That was about it when I arrived. ICAO built a fine new building, a very efficient one, as well as attractive, and we moved into it within the first year I was there. At that time, I thought it was a good time to make some changes in the staffing and in our representation. I hired a local receptionist and brought a Foreign Service officer in as the administrative assistant, which is what it should have been.

*Q: Makes sense! Why waste a Foreign Service officer on the reception? And anyway, it's nicer to have a local person, I think.*

DILLON: Of course. Yes. Then we added a junior Foreign Service officer, which helped tremendously on much of the research and paper preparation and the position preparation.

Then, of course, because there are many very technical panels, special committees of both the Air Navigation Commission and the council, there are visiting delegations constantly from FAA, usually with some State Department representation and so forth. So your efforts are augmented.

On the other hand, I found that very often those groups were, indeed, technical and have very narrow interests that they were there to pursue, and it was up to us to support them. Consequently, I often found myself doing the diplomatic side of their negotiating as a supplement to their highly technical work that was going on. The microwave landing system was a very, very good example, very technical panel of way-out experts.

*Q: How in the world does a microwave landing system work? Does it home you in or something?*

DILLON: Oh, yes. You land by it, but it's automatic. One of the reasons it was so crucial was, of course, first of all, its time had come, and a system like that was needed. But then you get into competition: the United Kingdom had developed one, the United States had developed one, and I think there was a third one from somewhere that was thought to be not a major contender.

So the panel considers these candidates, if you will, analyzes them technically, picks out their shortcomings, the technical faults, the problems they might run into. Mind you, these are often things that have barely gone beyond laboratory test. Then once the system is selected by ICAO, it goes to prototype, then it is perfected and honed down, not only by

experts up there, but by whoever is going to be manufacturing it and testing it and so forth.

*Q: Everybody has to use the same system in order that it will work, you mean?*

DILLON: Exactly.

*Q: I see. You can't put in one type here and one type there, because, like computers, they wouldn't be compatible. Is that it?*

DILLON: Exactly.

*Q: Oh, so that's big money.*

DILLON: That's big money.

*Q: And is there a lot of politicking up there and a lot of people coming up from the States to try to sell their product?*

DILLON: You'd be surprised how little there is. Once again, underlying even the politicking and even the financial considerations is this overall interest of safety of aviation and the bigness of what you're considering. You're talking about a generation of technology that will go on. The ILS, the Instrument Landing System, how long have we had that with us? So you're talking big decision, serious decision.

*Q: Indeed you are. So other things come in. What will be the best thing for the most people in the long run, actually does prevail, then. In any of these technical things, is one usually considerably better than another, so that it's easy to make the choice?*

DILLON: It isn't easy. In the case of the MLS, it certainly wasn't easy, not at all. I think there were six panel meetings over a period of a few years and, of course, research is going on back home all in the meantime.

*Q: No pirating of people's ideas?*

DILLON: No. There was a problem with ours and it may have been a concern with respect to the Doppler: the United Kingdom system, with respect to what they call shadowing. When a plane is coming in, as the microwave searches, if you will--it's very hard to put these things in simple terms--if there are buildings or hills, it fouls the search and you get what they call a scalloping effect of the plane. That obviously could lead to some serious complications. That, however, was corrected technically in our system, and our system, of course, was eventually selected.

*Q: Do you get involved in things like the development of the Concorde and opening up routes for that and what other countries are going to go for supersonic planes and so forth?*

DILLON: Not in ICAO. That's between the manufacturer and--

*Q: Yours is strictly the safety of the operation for the whole world?*

DILLON: The safe and economic operation.

*Q: I can see why one would have to be an expert in aviation just to understand the terms. You wouldn't be very effective otherwise.*

DILLON: That's right. Well, you could sit there and listen. I enjoyed it tremendously. The Committee on Unlawful Interference accomplished a great deal. We adopted another annex to the Chicago Convention on security, which was a major milestone. There hadn't been a new annex to the convention for many, many years, and it set forth standards and recommended practices for trying to cope with this hijacking.

*Q: You mean such as the machines and airports?*

DILLON: Exactly.

*Q: That came out of ICAO?*

DILLON: Curb checking and the security considerations, fencing airports and access areas, the so-called sterile corridor concept, where you go in, and once you're in and checked, you stay in. Much of this was based on U.S. FAA measures.

*Q: What about these new guns, though, Betty, that are all plastic? Isn't that something? What are they going to do about those, I wonder?*

DILLON: There's no way you can--as we often say about assassinations, if someone makes up his mind to do it, there are many different ways he can probably get it done. But what you can do is minimize the numbers of incidences and, more importantly, the effect of them.

*Q: So you would be involved, then, in working up these proposals for what to do at airports, and also worrying about how they would be paid for?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: You would propose that a tax be put on every ticket or whatever? I forget how--are they paid for by tickets?*

DILLON: No. ICAO doesn't do that, but obviously the economic considerations play a major role. Often the developing countries would oppose a "standard" or "recommended" practice, saying, "My little country simply cannot afford to put a chain link fence around ten miles of the airport. We cannot afford to hire ten more people and order six magnetometers." So it becomes a factor. Then you get into votes, whether you're going to make that requirement a "standard" or a "recommended" practice. If it's a standard, they're going to have to comply or explain why not. If it's a recommended practice, it's something they ought to do if they can get around to it. So very often negotiations would hinge on whether it should be a standard.

*Q: Did you find yourself in the position of talking to your friends from different countries and explaining, or did they understand it as well as you did?*

DILLON: The economic aspects?

*Q: The economic and even the technical aspects.*

DILLON: Oh, yes, constantly. Constantly. That's what I was there for, to negotiate all of these positions. Sometimes it was down to where you're going to put the comma, you know, in a formal document. Sometimes it would be a much larger vote on something like a major technology.

*Q: The people from the emerging nations, you said they send very qualified people. But did they have difficulties with these concepts at all?*

DILLON: No. They handled them as well, I think, as the rest of us did. The Nigerian representative had been an airport manager . . . Lagos airport, if I'm not mistaken, which is a very sizable airport. So he had a good grasp of what was going on.

*Q: Indeed he would.*

DILLON: We did have one chap from east Africa who wasn't quite up to all of this, but I'm afraid I took advantage of him. He adored me, and I would go to him and explain, in detail, what I thought was best for aviation, and sometimes I would even give him both sides of the picture--that is, "My government favors this, but other governments are saying they can't support it for these good reasons. Now, you make your choice." Very often he would vote with me because he knew he could rely on me and he didn't know what else to do.

*Q: That's really the sort of thing I had in mind. I wondered if you had to sort of play teacher.*

DILLON: But I would say that was very much the exception. He was only there about a year, and then went back to Uganda and, as a matter of fact, was a refugee from the Idi Amin days and left his country.

*Q: The reason I brought this up is because at the U.N. in New York, I talked with a representative from an emerging African country, and he himself is a product of French schools, and is a very sophisticated man, but he told me that many of his friends from other African countries become very angry and almost embittered because they don't understand all these things, and they feel that their thoughts, or just their wishes to get more knowledge so that they can make their own decisions are just steam-rollered. This creates so much bad feeling, and then, of course, they are against the "biggies", who do understand these things. That's why I thought it was important to put this out on the table about your organization.*

DILLON: Exactly. Exactly. Precisely. We do one of two things ordinarily. We go in with our position, and if he doesn't know what's going on, too bad for him. We want him to vote with us, and he'd better vote with us, and here's our position. You know. Or we just ignore him, leaving, obviously, the implication that he doesn't know what he's doing. Which is an insult.

*Q: That, I think, is even more insulting, don't you?*

DILLON: It is! It's an insult.

*Q: He's not worth fighting.*

DILLON: Sure. And hope that he won't vote, he'll abstain or something. So I've found throughout my international work and most certainly throughout this Montreal assignment, that coordination, cooperation, frankness, confidences, were important, and they worked. More importantly, *they worked*.

*Q: Yes, that's what counts, of course.*

DILLON: I recall the German delegate, a very fine gentleman who, incidentally, had spent quite a bit of time in Japan and spoke fluent Japanese, was there about a year when I first arrived. His office was right next to mine, so I used to stop there first as I made my rounds and let him have my position and try to find out if he had instructions, what he might be doing and how we could cooperate. He passed away while he was in Montreal, quite unexpectedly. But just a few weeks before that, I was meeting with him and he listened. He said, "Betty, this is a technical thing and I don't understand all of it. But you can count on me. It's obviously an issue that *the* Western nations, the major aircraft states, ought to be voting for, and I'll vote with you." Then he said, "Betty, wait a minute. There's something I want you to know. I've been in international work all of my life, and I've met with many, many people in many different situations, and now at last I can say I have met truly a natural-born real diplomat. You are it."

*Q: What a compliment! First somebody comes up to you at a hotel in Spain, and now this man.*

DILLON: I don't like to--I really shouldn't put that sort of thing in an oral history, but they were the things that made it all worthwhile.

*Q: Of course they were.*

DILLON: The long hours, the hard work, and lying awake at night.

*Q: And the patience.*

DILLON: And the patience. When one hears something like that, it makes it all worthwhile.

*Q: It seems to me that the cornerstone of your entire way of dealing is respect for other people.*

DILLON: Sure.

*Q: I wonder if perhaps--well, you said that there's an advantage to being a woman because you can say things that a man couldn't, and you could get away with them. But I wonder if it doesn't perhaps work the other way, too, that being a woman, you don't have to compete with men and you don't have to feel that you've got to thrust yourself forward and you've got to win this one and so forth, which so many men do bring to this. They feel if they don't get their point made and accepted, whereas you can afford, perhaps, to sit back and wait, take it easy, and they'll come back again. Because women have had to do that from the day they're born.*

DILLON: Sure. Sure. It's one of the advantages of being a woman.

*Q: You would agree with me on that?*

DILLON: Yes, I would indeed.

*Q: We've learned patience. Tell me, what sort of socializing did you do in Canada, or didn't you have any time?*

DILLON: Oh, yes, very, very heavy diplomatic social schedule. Very heavy. The council members entertained each one of the states at least once a session, sometimes twice, and there were special occasions of one sort or another. I entertained a great deal.

*Q: You had an allowance, I hope, for this.*

DILLON: Yes, a representation allowance, residence allowance.

*Q: Is the residence furnished for you?*

DILLON: There is no residence, and I fought that battle, too. I felt that we should have had one. After all, we founded the organization and had been up there since 1944, and are going to be there as long as it's in existence. The Department said, "Well, we might want to leave some day and we shouldn't purchase a residence." So I finally chose an apartment, and I was very glad I did. It was a very large, very nice apartment, walking distance from the ICAO building. I walked to and from work every day I was in Montreal, including through three feet of snow every winter.

*Q: Oh, I know, they really have snow, don't they? Did you have any help in the house?*

DILLON: I had a maid that came twice a week to do cleaning and so forth, and then, of course, when I entertained, which was perhaps at least once a week, many times two or three times a week, she not only would come, but I would have a bartender and servants and so forth.

*Q: The way you would do it here.*

DILLON: Sure, in an embassy residence. Yes.

*Q: What hours did you put in?*

DILLON: Oh, very long. Very long. I felt that there was a lot to be done, and there was. I was not happy with the way our positions were formulated down here in Washington. There was an interagency group called IGIA, Interagency Group for International Aviation, which had been established many years ago, and it had been intended as a high-level policy-level periodic-meeting kind of thing, but over the years, it had degenerated to the point where top-level people who were the actual members--that is, assistant secretaries or even under secretaries--didn't even know it existed. It never met. Two or three individuals way down in the working ranks were, in fact, formulating U.S. Government policy. That's one reason I felt it would be helpful to all of us if we removed the telex and got things into formal State Department channels.

So I spent a great deal of time sort of revitalizing things down here at this end, not that I came and went a great deal, but I kept after it. Up there I felt that a lot of the files on certain issues needed to be properly compiled and briefed and so forth. The size of the staff, of course, made it very difficult to do things that should have been done by a staff of eight or ten.

Also, especially the first two or three years, I spent a lot of time with my colleagues. I called on *them*. I invited *them*. I reactivated an informal group of the Western nations that had become inactive, and chaired it for a year so that we were coordinating our positions on some of these things.

I encouraged the Africans and the Arabs, the developing nations, the Latin American group, of which there were four or five, to form their caucuses and get together. Now, many people would say, "Oh, you don't want to do that, because they'll organize against you." But quite the contrary. I found that they began to educate one another, reinforce one another. We were sometimes invited into their caucuses to discuss something with them or give them our position. On a couple of occasions, I invited their caucus to meet in our offices, had a coffee hour and talked through something that was coming up.

Those things take a lot of time, a lot of time. You have to set up the appointment, you have to be sure that *you're* ready for it, that you've done *your* homework, and it has to be handled very properly and very appropriately.

*Q: When you first arrived, Betty, did you have credentials that you presented to the secretary general?*

DILLON: Secretary general, yes.

*Q: Was there a formal ceremony for that?*

DILLON: No.

*Q: Very informal?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: He's right in the same building with you?*

DILLON: Sure. The secretariat is there and all of the residents' offices, council offices.

*Q: Do people come to see you present your credentials?-*

DILLON: No, no. I think a State Department officer from IO came up for two or three days at that time, and went over some things with me. Yes, and went with me to the secretary general to present the credentials.

*Q: How did you manage to get another Foreign Service officer up at the post?*

DILLON: It was a junior Foreign Service officer, of course; it wasn't a full-blown slot. I just said, "We have to have it." Of course, I was accomplishing a lot. I was doing a lot, and they began to sense that one of the problems was, there just wasn't adequate staffing to do everything that needed to be done.

Not only did I take over the chairmanship of the Committee on Unlawful Interference, but I was active on the other committees. I initiated a review of the treaty arrangements for

administering North Atlantic navigation facilities through that committee, the Joint Finance Committee, which I chaired the following year for a year.

*Q: What was the investigation seeking to learn?*

DILLON: If certain facilities were still, in fact, necessary, such as the North Atlantic cable and other outmoded facilities, and especially the international financing arrangements. It's a cable.

*Q: Yes, I know it goes underneath the ocean.*

DILLON: If, in fact, it was still necessary. We also had what we call NDBs, non-directional beacons, which are very primary, basic navigational aides in Iceland and so forth. Were those still needed as a part of this North Atlantic system financed by the member states of the Joint Finance Committee? These things hadn't been looked at for years. We had just been going on and on, meeting and rubber-stamping a budget and so forth.

*Q: With satellites, is it necessary to have the cable?*

DILLON: At that time--and, of course, it was quite a while ago now--but we decided it certainly was. We did call a conference of all of the states involved, which was a sizable conference. I was asked to be president of that conference. The United States Government wanted me to head the U.S. delegation, and they said, "If you become the president, we'll have to send another head of delegation, and we can't do that." So I was the vice chairman. But in any case, the conference was--you know, sometimes we make wrong decisions. But that conference was very, very successful and it came out with very specific recommendations about how charges for this system should be reassessed and divided up among the participating nations, how it should be divided between meteorology and aviation itself, which non-directional beacons were no longer needed, and that kind of thing.

*Q: The underwater cable, is that an aide to navigation?*

DILLON: Yes, it was, because there are ships involved.

*Q: Ships which then help the planes. Yes.*

DILLON: Ships involved, as well. It was a very--I don't want to say primitive system--it's certainly not that, but it was an early system, and I would guess that by now it may not be solely needed for aviation.

*Q: It's still used, as far as I know.*

DILLON: Oh, I'm sure it's still in use, but, you see, other people use it, as well, particularly meteorologists.

*Q: I see. A very close connection between meteorology, of course, and the aviation.*

DILLON: So in initiating all of these activities, you see, we began to get a lot of activity. All of this activity going on and the accomplishments that we were realizing, I think, led State Department to come around to thinking that we needed more assistance than we had been getting.

Another marvelous thing happened very early in the assignment. It had to do with the proportion of contributions that member states pay into the United Nations member organizations. We had tried, the year before, to get a 25% ceiling on our contributions to U.N. New York, and we had also tried in ICAO, I believe in ILO, and one or two of the other agencies, and had failed. We were contributing, for example, in ICAO, 33%, 34% of the total budget. Some of the agencies in Europe were getting a much larger contribution from us, quite a bit out of proportion, really, to even the United States' role in these organizations. We, of course, wanted to cut down this percentage. UN New York had finally adopted the 23% ceiling in the fall of 1972.

There was a diplomatic conference called by ICAO in February 1973 for another purpose. As a matter of fact, I think it had to do with one of the major terrorism incidents, or hijacking incidents. It was a diplomatic conference. It was not a general assembly. All 150 member states were invited, and it was held in New York in the General Assembly Hall there.

At the last minute, my government asked me to make a move to have the contribution and assessment ceiling issue put on the agenda at that diplomatic conference. I was horrified, first because the conference was called for political reasons to begin with, secondly because it was being held in New York, and most of the 150 member states were going to utilize their New York delegations for this conference, and those delegations are politically oriented, not technically oriented. I was fearful that they would all come into the ICAO conference and do the same thing that they had done previously in ICAO and other agencies, which was vote down the assessment ceiling.

We pulled it off. As a result of ICAO adopting that 25% assessment ceiling, the door was opened and it was adopted throughout the United Nations system. Don't ask me how we did it. (laughter) It was one of the most pressurized situations I've ever worked in. It was one of the most demanding. It was excruciating. In the first place, if we had lost the vote, there would have been one more vote against the assessment ceiling, which would have further driven it into the ground. So it wasn't just an approval or disapproval situation; it was a positive or negative influence. Secondly, I just felt that it would polarize the political situation and maybe jeopardize some of the things we were going to try to accomplish on the other agenda items.

The Soviet Union asked for a secret ballot.

*Q: Was it their New York representatives in the Hall at this time or the ICAO?*

DILLON: Their head of delegation was a New York representative, and that was part of the problem. Their representative on our ICAO council was on the delegation.

*Q: But these were full delegations?*

DILLON: Oh, yes, full diplomatic conference. Oh, yes. I had, I think, five or six people on the United States delegation and backup support from the mission in New York.

*Q: But you were heading the delegation?*

DILLON: I headed the delegation. In ICAO, the rules say that if a secret ballot is requested, you must have a secret ballot to see if you're going to have a secret ballot.

*Q: It sounds like a child's game.*

DILLON: We went through that exercise no less than six times.

*Q: Why? I should think one would have told the story.*

DILLON: The Soviet Union didn't want the issue before the conference. They obviously didn't want the United States' contribution lowered. They repeatedly requested a secret ballot.

*Q: Naturally.*

DILLON: Of course, many of their friends and supporters not only went along with them, but for other reasons. The economically depressed countries wanted us to continue with a higher contribution and so forth.

Every time we were defeated, I'd ask for the vote again and they'd ask for another secret ballot. Finally, we consumed the day's time, the United States hosted a diplomatic reception that evening. We all used that to work with, particularly, the more friendly developing countries, Latin American countries, some of the Southeast Asian countries, and so forth. We made special representations to certain delegations who were represented by their council members from ICAO Montreal. I knew them, I knew I could rely on them, and I knew they were sensible people.

When we reopened the next morning, first thing, I moved to reopen the question. But in the meantime, I tricked the Soviets in a way. (laughter) I walked over to the Soviet delegation, shook hands with my colleague from Montreal. The New York man nodded, [said] something rather gruffly. And I said to my colleague from Montreal, "I'm going to reopen this question. Let's be done with this whole thing. You're not going to ask for

another secret ballot?" He said, "No, Betty, we won't. Let's reopen it." That's all that was said. We shook hands. The press was watching, the press took photos, the other colleagues were watching. So I walked all the way back to my position.

The meeting opened, and I asked to have the question reopened. Everyone turned to watch the Soviet delegation. A minute went by. Nothing happened, and I thought, "Oh, my goodness! This is going to work." Another minute went by, and you could have sliced the tension in the Hall. Morosov looked over at and kind of went this way [demonstrates], and I looked at him and went that way [demonstrates], and I thought, "Well, chair, get that gavel going. We're going this time."

And just then, the colleague, the head of delegation from the New York Soviet delegation, hit Morosov with his elbow saying, "Secret ballot. Secret ballot. Secret ballot." And Morosov was obviously very embarrassed. He stuttered on the microphone, stammered. He said, "Mr. Chairman, I'm very sorry, but I guess we have to ask for a secret ballot."

Well, this infuriated people who had seen me go over and shake hands.

*Q: Sure. Reneging.*

DILLON: We won in the secret ballot by two votes. (laughter) So it was an open vote, and then we won the open vote.

*Q: Oh, you voted not to have a secret ballot?*

DILLON: Right. Right. We wanted it open so that people would have to account openly for the vote, and they wanted it secret.

*Q: Then did you win the open voting handily, or was that by two votes, too?*

DILLON: Oh, no. We won very comfortably.

*Q: You would, you know. People wouldn't dare.*

DILLON: Exactly. No, the 25% assessment ceiling was adopted in ICAO, and that meant that the door was open, and it was soon adopted in other United Nations agencies.

*Q: Very good. I remember when that happened, too, but I didn't know all of this background. That's what makes it so interesting.*

DILLON: State Department was very, very pleased, needless to say, and we were all very happy. I think ICAO was pleased with itself. It knew that this was a fair issue. It knew what needed to be done, and I think the true ICAO participants were ready to do it.

*Q: Yes, and it seems to show how well ICAO gets along, too.*

DILLON: Yes.

---

*Q: We left off the last time talking about the time at the U.N. when you presented, as chairman to the U.S. delegation, the 25% ceiling on the contributions to ICAO, and it did pass after much maneuvering. In fact, having defeated the request for a secret ballot, you won the open ballot handily. Have I got that correct?*

DILLON: That's correct. I wouldn't say "handily." It took several years off my life. (laughter) We defeated the secret ballot by only two votes, 47 to 45, as I recall it, or something thereabouts. But then proceeded to the open ballot, and in the open ballot, we won handily, which was why we wanted it, of course. The 25% assessment ceiling was adopted for ICAO. Up to that point, the United States had been paying about 33% of ICAO's budget, which was not as much as we were paying in some other U.N. agencies, as a matter of fact. But the importance of this was that it was not only adopted for ICAO, but it was the first time a ceiling had been adopted in a United Nations agency after we had failed in ICAO and other agencies, and therefore it opened the door for the U.N. system to adopt 25% and for other agencies to adopt it, which they have. It is, in most agencies and throughout the system, accepted as a legitimate ceiling.

*Q: I see. Each one votes individually, each different organization within the U.N.*

DILLON: Oh, yes, they're part of the U.N. family. There are 14 technical agencies in the U.N. system. There may be 15 now. While they are autonomous in many respects, administratively they are part of an overall system. Their personnel systems are similar and personnel policy for the secretariat is often consistent with U.N. practice and so forth.

*Q: Was the adoption of this 25% ceiling pretty rapid in the other agencies after you finally made the breakthrough?*

DILLON: I really don't know, Ann. I think it came along rather quickly. That is, things move slowly in the multilateral circles, but within a year the effects had been felt.

*Q: That's very good. Did you feel you had proper and effective policy guidance from the Department?*

DILLON: On that issue or generally?

*Q: Generally.*

DILLON: No. I found it difficult from the start to explain to the Department of State, to have them fully realize that ICAO was different in the sense that it had an in-residence

executive council. We were in residence. I was working every day with 30 or 33 other delegations, formal delegations. The council met every other day almost year-round. The standing committees met two days a week during their sessions. So you had an ongoing day-by-day kind of situation, unlike the situation in the other agencies at that time. The other U.N. agencies met annually or quarterly or triennially, biennially, whatever, but they weren't in residence. There wasn't that ongoing, constant requirement for not only specific positions or *ad hoc* positions, but day-by-day involvement of policy goals and objectives.

I felt there was a great advantage to being in residence. You can develop close working relationships on a one-for-one basis with the other representatives. You can follow what's happening much easier. You have, through the representatives and through the secretariat, really a day-by-day informal, indirect contact with the world. By being in residence with three or four African delegations, you can have a pretty good sense of what's going on on the continent of Africa in aviation and in many respects, things reaching beyond aviation.

*Q: How do they choose the delegates? That is to say, they change all the time, except for the U.S. and some of the other big ones.*

DILLON: The representatives on the council or the delegates to the worldwide assembly?

*Q: The ones who live there. Don't they change?*

DILLON: The in-residence delegates, no. Well, yes, they do. The position, that is, the national representation on council is elected at the triennial assemblies by the 155-member worldwide organization, a United Nations conference, if you will.

*Q: That also is in Montreal?*

DILLON: They are often held in Montreal for the sake of austerity budget-wise. Sometimes for political reasons they're scheduled elsewhere. Occasionally the organization as an ad hoc diplomatic conference for some specific agenda item, as was the case at the time of the 25% assessment ceiling. Those can be held in Montreal or in New York. I don't recall--yes, there were conferences in Europe before I came with ICAO, a few of them. Many of the delegates, many of the member states, you see, have a very good argument that it's more expensive for them to send people to the western hemisphere or to North America than to Europe. Quite so.

*Q: If these are elections, then it's quite possible that it could be very heavily African or very heavily European?*

DILLON: No, because the Chicago Convention itself, which established ICAO, has set up some very excellent distribution policy guidelines. There has to be geographic representation. There has to be representation among and between what we call provider states, those who fly large airlines, operate large air transport companies, or are large manufacturers, and those who are users in the sense that they may not have an airline or

may not manufacture, but they have major traffic points and so forth. Actually, it's rather an intricate system, but a very good one, a very practical one. I often say that the Chicago Convention, in that respect and others, reminds me of the Constitution. It was very well planned and put together, and it holds up very well.

Back to your question about council representation. The fact that the state is elected to a seat on the council for the period between assemblies does not necessarily indicate who will represent that state on the council. Sometimes the state will send a person for one year or for one council session. More often, they appoint someone who will be there a couple of years, three years. Other states have been known to put individuals on the council, major states who are constantly re-elected to the council, and leave them there for eight, ten, twelve years. The United States' first representative on the council was there 20 years, but that was in the formative years of ICAO. It was too long. But for the three-year period for which they're elected, or the six-year period, it's up to the state to choose the person that will represent it on the council.

*Q: I see. When was the Chicago Convention?*

DILLON: 1944.

*Q: Which countries are there permanently, in addition to the United States and Russia? England, I suppose, and France?*

DILLON: Now on the council?

*Q: Yes. That doesn't change, I mean.*

DILLON: We went from 27 council states to 30, to 33 while I was there, as I recall, and I think now it's up to 35 or 36, simply because there were newly independent states coming along. It was felt that the council needed to be expanded. Since the beginning of ICAO, it's been the practice to elect to council, the major aviation states. That is, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, I believe has always been represented. Belgium and The Netherlands have, more often than not, been on the council, one or the other.

*Q: Switzerland?*

DILLON: No.

*Q: No? Not Swiss Air? What about Lufthansa?*

DILLON: Oh, Germany, of course.

*Q: Both Germanies?*

DILLON: No.

*Q: West Germany?*

DILLON: West Germany.

*Q: And the Soviet Union?*

DILLON: Now, at the time I arrived in Montreal, a Soviet representative arrived. The Soviet Union had been elected to council for the first time the year before. They had become members of ICAO and their airline, as I recall, was a member of IATA (International Air Traffic Association) or considering becoming a member of IATA. I believe that was the case.

In any case, the Soviet representative arrived the same time I did. I was learning a bit, and, of course, they were learning quite a bit. We enjoyed an excellent rapport. Their representative, Alexi Borosov, had been in air transport and was an air transport command pilot with thousands and thousands of hours in military aircraft and, I believe, some time in civil aircraft. He was a very fine man, a very congenial person, a very senior man. He and I hit it off magnificently.

I recall just shortly after I arrived, there was a United Nations Day in Montreal, and a large reception and banquet took place. I forget now whether it was the United Nations Foundation that sponsored it or the mayor of Montreal or whoever, but it was a very large formal occasion. I wanted to go, of course, representationally, and invited some of my council colleagues to make up a table. I invited the Soviet Union representative. His wife had not yet arrived, as I recall, but in any case, some of the other couples came, and I needed an extra man, and he accepted. It was a wonderful evening, a very, very enjoyable evening. I had a table of eight or ten.

After we left the table, the 200 people or so adjourned to have brandy and coffee or something. I was shepherding my guests around, and Borosov decided it was time to leave. People were beginning to filter out. He came to me and said, "I will take you home."

And I said, "Oh, no, thank you. I will have a car come for me."

"No," he said, "I take you."

I said, "Well, Mr. Borosov, if you're leaving now, I have guests that I must look after, and..."

"No, you come now. I take you." He was a charming gentleman. I would have gone most anywhere with him. (laughter)

*Q: He was being protective.*

DILLON: We had talked a great deal about both of us being pilots and so forth. We had a marvelous relationship. I said, "Really, I must stay and talk with my guests."

He said, "You talk too much to your guests," and he grabbed me by the hand and *pulled* me down the full long marble hall of wherever it was this reception was going on, and out the front door and into his waiting car.

*Q: How funny!*

DILLON: Of course, everyone was watching what was going on between the United States representative and the Soviet representative, because there had been much "watching", of course, as we were in the period of détente and this was the first [time] that the Soviet Union had been in ICAO, and everyone was watching. So here I went, literally running after him, pulled along, you see, out to his car.

Well, we got in the car and I later learned that he had already called for a car to come for him, but he didn't have a chauffeur-driven car. What he had done was get his air navigation commissioner out of bed and told him to bring the car down, because he was taking the United States representative home. Driving the car, therefore, was their commissioner, who had been Nikita Khrushchev's pilot, was in his own right a very, very competent air transport pilot, hair disheveled, half awake, you see, in a very bad mood. (laughter) He proceeded to start driving us home.

At this point, they had a very, very fine limousine, Russian-made, and red lights began coming on the dashboard. Ivan, the commissioner, said, "Alexei, look. All the red lights are on. What kind of a pilot are you? We're almost out of gas." (laughter) Well, it was only several blocks to my residence and to their residence, so we proceeded and made it without running out of gas. But it was a nice evening and a wonderful thing for them to do.

Later on, of course, as we proceeded through two or three years of working together, we became fast friends and enjoyed our relationship very much.

Ivan, the commissioner, was there for quite a while. After Alexi Borosov was returned home and was replaced, Ivan stayed on and became the council representative and was there the last time I was in Montreal two or three years ago when ICAO became involved in the Soviet shutdown of KAL-6. He was a very able member.

*Q: Much to be said for so much continuity, isn't there? So much to be said for that.*

DILLON: Yes, there is. Then, you see, within a year, we had the question of whether or not China should come on the council. This became another big issue. It was one that concerned my government, of course. This was during the period of Nixon's opening up China, of course, and I was very pleased that that took place. But ICAO had to delve into this thing and consider it, and it became something of a political issue, of course,

primarily because no one knew a great deal about China. No one knew a great deal about CAC, the Chinese airline, and the Chinese aviation capability and so forth.

You were asking earlier about government positions. When the issue of China's ICAO membership came before council, I was told to expect a very long and very detailed position from the United States Government. We still had the telex in place at that point. Very often my positions came at the last minute, and this one was no exception. Ten or fifteen minutes before we were to go into council chambers, the telex started spewing out this long stuff, page after page. I started reading it, thinking that I could tear it off, take it with me, and read my position statement in council. It soon became apparent, first of all, it was much too long for that. Secondly, it was very verbose. I felt it wasn't responsive to the situation in ICAO and in council, and it became far too complicated.

I read enough of it to get the gist of it, and went in council without my paper. As a matter of fact, when I had to leave the office at two o'clock and be in my position in the council, the telex was still spewing out rolls of this stuff. It was on the floor, it was everywhere.

When I gave my position statement in council, I emphasized the need for finding out from China whether or not they were interested in becoming ICAO members and whether or not they would be interested in sitting on the council and, in fact, sending some kind of representation to China or communicating with them before we became so engrossed in this big decision of whether to bring them in or not.

*Q: Sure.*

DILLON: Well, that was a very simple approach, a very practical approach, and after the meeting I was complimented by many of my colleagues for being sensible, for taking such an excellent approach to what had become really an overblown issue. It had very little to do with my government position that was spewing out of the telex. (laughter) But it served the purpose and was, in fact, the basis for ICAO's ongoing consideration of this problem. They ultimately sent the secretary general to China for excellent meetings there, and when we finally took decisions on membership and ultimately, in the assembly, on a Chinese seat on the council, we had a basis on which to make a sound decision.

*Q: Very sensible. We didn't say it before, but I assume Japan is one of the ones who always sends a member.*

DILLON: Japan has, I think, always been on council.

*Q: What do you think causes this lack of proper policy guidance and this last-minute rushing in with too much advice?*

DILLON: I was very critical of my government, and I still am, because I find it reactionary. We are a great country. The world looks to us for leadership. For many years in the international scene, and particularly in the multilateral family, although I've seen it

bilaterally, we have not exerted leadership. We react. We wait for someone else to lead, and then we formulate a last-minute position which reacts to whatever they have proposed.

*Q: Isn't this true right here in the United States? Look at the Gramm-Rudman bill.*

DILLON: Yes. Yes, exactly. I think the time has come for us to reconsider our role internationally and to find ways to demonstrate sound leadership, to come up with initiatives, to come up with sound, practical, solid positions that respond to the need.

*Q: Before the need is upon you in a crisis.*

DILLON: In a crisis situation. We're crisis-oriented, and I found that even then in my position papers in Montreal.

Secondly, the organizational factor has to be considered, and I mentioned this earlier in our interview. With respect to ICAO positions, the organizational structure that had been set up many years ago for formulating positions and setting policy had deteriorated to the point where two or three individuals were simply writing up position papers. There was no overall policy guidance. Those who should have been involved in formulating position simply didn't know anything about what was going on. I'm, of course, referring to assistant secretary level, under secretary level, even secretarial level, because those people had not been pulled into the IGIA, Interagency Group on International Aviation, the structure that had been set up procedurally to obtain positions from the various government agencies.

Having said that, thirdly, it's difficult to backstop aviation organizations because they're non-political--and we hope to keep them that way--and they are supported within our government by more than one agency or department. My positions, if they were technical, came from FAA. If they were economic, they came from the Civil Aeronautics Board. If they had a political overtone, State Department weighed in more heavily than usual. Sometimes if the shipment of parts or the trade picture became involved, Department of Commerce had to be consulted. So that isn't an easy set of concerns and positions to put together, to pull together. That was supposed to have been done by this inter-agency body called IGIA, which hadn't met for several years.

*Q: Just two or three people who were members of it were doing all of this?*

DILLON: Not the members. There were individuals at the working level who were, to the best of their ability, carrying on the good work, grinding out papers. But the real policy considerations and very often the major positions that had to be formulated, never got even to the deputy assistant secretary level, much less higher.

*Q: Where does this IGIA fit into the structure?*

DILLON: There was no Department of Transportation at that time. IGIA had a little secretariat, if you will, a person in FAA, who was the FAA IGIA representative, maintained all of IGIA papers which were numbered down to the last three or four decimal points, maintained a small library, and was something of a focal point. In Department of State, the Bureau of International Organizations, IO, was my home base, if you will, because I was a representative to one of the United Nations organizations, and they were charged with backstopping multilateral organizations.

At the same time, the Bureau of Economic Affairs in the Department of State had an Office for International Aviation with a long-time very senior officer there, who had the telex until I took it out, and was very much involved and really was *the* point from which my early positions came from State Department. There was some vying, you see, between IO and IA.

*Q: IO being . . .*

DILLON: International Organizations.

*Q: And IA being . . .*

DILLON: IO on the multilateral political side. IA in the Bureau of Economic Affairs on the technical and economic side.

That was one problem. Another problem occasionally arose between Department of State and FAA. FAA felt the Department was too politically oriented, was too much up in the clouds to backstop very practical, very serious, often very technical international aviation questions.

So all of this, you see, made it difficult to get timely, clear positions pursuant to some kind of overall policy guidelines.

*Q: I should say it must have. Which left you . . .*

DILLON: I one time said to a colleague, "You know, when you see on television the representative to an international organization informally, before TV, perhaps at his position during a session, and you see him open his folder, look at his papers, and then you see this look on his face? I know what he sees in his folder!" (laughter)

*Q: And what is that? Tell us.*

DILLON: It can be anywhere from nothing, absolutely nothing, to so much that it's not fathomable, certainly not in the context of a few minutes, or it can be totally irrelevant to what appears to be the issue before you.

Having said all of that, I don't want to disparage those hard-working people who have very effectively supported ICAO over the years, and I don't want to say that we haven't

been successful in spite of all of this, because we have. My predecessors were. I certainly was, and I understand my successors have been on behalf of the United States. But I feared--and I still do--that the United States leadership role in international aviation was what very often carried us through, rather than any formulation of sound leadership positions and policy.

*Q: Do you think, also, the fact that we were lucky enough to have very effective delegates caused the bureaus back in Washington not to pay so much attention to it?*

DILLON: Sure.

*Q: Because there were many other squeaky wheels.*

DILLON: Sure. It's much easier, I think, to deal with a purely political issue in New York as compared to trying to decide what we should do about the microwave landing system or some other highly technical or economic issue in Montreal. I found that once ICAO started moving in the direction of involving itself more in economic issues, that there was more of a response from Washington. First of all, because it's easier. Secondly, because it involves money.

*Q: I'm sure you've speculated, yourself, on why ICAO is such a successful organization and UNESCO such a disaster.*

DILLON: Aviation is a very serious business. If ICAO makes mistakes in its standards and recommended practices, disasters can result. Not immediately, but aircraft can be manufactured to operate less efficiently or less safely. Airports can be constructed at less than acceptable standards and so forth. Operations can be conducted over en route facilities that are less than acceptable. This is unlikely to happen, to be sure, especially since the major manufacturing states and operating states have their own very stringent standards, our own FAA, the CAA of the United Kingdom, and so forth. But the seriousness and practicality of aviation questions is a major reason for ICAO's successes over the years.

Secondly, I think the fact that representatives on the council of ICAO and, even more so, on the Air Navigation Commission, the in-resident technical arm of ICAO, are very well-qualified individuals. Member states have seen to it over the years that individuals who are well qualified in the field of aviation, either technically or sometimes on the economic side of things, or in the airport side or the airline side, what have you, but well-qualified individuals who have uppermost in their minds the safe and efficient operation of international air transport, are representing these countries. That assures that the goals of ICAO are met.

I've often seen representatives on council and in worldwide meetings either abandon their own government positions or compromise their governmental positions in the interest of what they believe to be the safe and orderly operation of international air transport. I have on occasion compromised my government's position because, in my good judgment, as

one with many, many years' experience in all aspects of aviation, I felt that something a little bit different was indicated.

*Q: I see. It's never used as a political payoff, the job in ICAO?*

DILLON: Not as a political payoff, to my knowledge. Our early representatives were extremely well-qualified men, top-level men from government and industry. I recall there was an admiral who represented us to ICAO for some time. In more recent years, I think there has been a tendency to have assurances from the representative to ICAO that there will not in any way be a political embarrassment. As I've mentioned earlier, that was so in my case. I was asked to assure the White House that there was nothing in my background or nothing in my political orientation that would be an embarrassment to the incumbent administration, and I, of course, could give them that assurance. I'm a careerist, I served effectively. Because I have served at the highest levels for both Democrat and Republican administrations, I could assure them I would work as effectively as possible as a careerist and as an aviation expert, as an international relations person, and be a credit in every way to whatever administration I was serving.

Now, I must say that my successor was a political appointment, which was a great disappointment to me and to ICAO. I think I can say that.

*Q: Was he qualified as far as aviation goes?*

DILLON: He was an attorney from Missouri. He had been a pilot during the Second World War, and that, of course, even at that late date, was an advantage, no doubt. But he was appointed at the request of a prominent senator. He had picked the position he wanted and apparently politically was deserving of it, and he was named as my successor. But to my knowledge, that's the first time a purely political appointment had been made.

My predecessor had been active politically, but he was a very well-qualified aviation attorney. He had worked at the Civil Aeronautics Board, had worked closely with airlines, and was qualified in his own right.

*Q: I see. And this other gentleman was simply a lawyer, but not--but you said that under him, however, things are still going well?*

DILLON: He was replaced a couple of years later, yes, two or three years later.

*Q: So it wasn't going so well under him.*

DILLON: I have no idea for what reason he was replaced. Perhaps he chose to come back. His successor was a man from United Airlines, I believe, who had worked in aviation most of his life. He's still up there. He's served for several years now, a very able and competent representative.

*Q: Certainly aviation is nothing you can play political games with.*

DILLON: No. Exactly.

*Q: It's very important. Or posture. The way so much posturing is done at the U.N.*

*Now, as far as running the actual mission, the actual nuts and bolts, did you do all of the administrative work? You ran the whole show? Or did you deputize somebody?*

DILLON: I ran the whole show administratively. My deputy was, as I mentioned earlier, the United States member of the Air Navigation Commission, which was in residence and met as frequently, or more frequently, than the council. So he certainly had no time, nor the qualifications, to administer the mission.

I prepared the budget, although being so close to Washington, I had the advantage of being able to talk with my executive director in the Bureau of International Organizations, and almost negotiate my small budget on the phone with him. But I did prepare a formal budget which was then reviewed and often supplemented by the Bureau of International Organizations for submission with their bureau budget.

I weighed in very heavily with respect to personnel, because I felt that the mission was not adequately staffed and it was not appropriately staffed.

Did we take up the question of Foreign Service officers in our interview?

*Q: Briefly we did. You said that you added a Foreign Service officer who was in the administrative end of things.*

DILLON: Well, what I did was change the positions. The only Foreign Service officer on staff when I arrived was the receptionist. The secretary was local hire. So I changed that and made it as it should be. I made the administrative assistant secretary, the Foreign Service officer, and hired locally a receptionist clerk-typist. In addition, we finally upgraded that position so it could serve as a secretarial position to the air navigation commissioner, and then I received approval to add a junior Foreign Service officer, who was a great help. He was qualified on the economic side and on the administrative side, and could assist me by sitting in for me occasionally on the Finance Committee or on the Air Transport Committee.

*Q: Let's digress a bit here. Tell me what you think about his training as an FSO. He obviously had been through the Institute and had the basic training.*

DILLON: I was disappointed. I had hoped to have someone that could really be of assistance to me in a very real and practical way. He could not do that.

*Q: Was this lack of experience or lack of training?*

DILLON: Both, perhaps. Both.

*Q: Was he a brand-new officer or had he had any other positions?*

DILLON: I'm not sure. That may have been his first assignment. I'm not sure. He was a young man with a fine academic background, very well intentioned. He was a bit slow and a bit slow to learn. We haven't mentioned his name, so perhaps I could cite an anecdote. He wanted very much to be a committee member, and I explained to him that in a multilateral forum, this is a very serious matter, even though the committees were not state positions in the sense that you sat on a committee as a member, an individual member, not the United States representative. But nonetheless, for all intents and purposes, you were representing your country. The wrong statement, the absence of a statement, everything you do, sometimes body language in those meetings, can have a great impact on decisions and on the role your country is playing.

He didn't seem to get this message. He still wanted to be a committee member. He was not there to do the nitty-gritty kind of thing that I needed help with. I finally, in exasperation, said, "All right. You want to be a committee member? This afternoon you go to the Finance Committee. You have the proposed ICAO budget for next year. You study it, as you already have, review it. You have our position on the budget in a cable. You go sit in the committee meeting."

We all had intercoms so that we could, when we wanted to stay in our offices, listen to proceedings in the council chambers. I turned on my intercom and was listening. He didn't speak. I didn't hear the United States member speak. At break time, at three o'clock, he roared into my office. He was perspiring, his hair was disheveled. He said, "I didn't know it was like this! I had no idea what I was getting into. I can't do this." (laughter) Just sitting before that microphone with the United States Government position before him, in the presence of some 15 other member state representatives, he realized the seriousness and the gravity of his presence there and the implications of anything he might say.

So from that standpoint, he had the good sense to realize what he'd gotten into, and I commended him for that. And that was precisely the purpose of my sending him in there, of course.

*Q: And he never went again?*

DILLON: No. He did become more and more of an assistant and more and more of a help to me. He did some research papers on basic positions that we needed and so forth, and, I think, provided a good service. But he needed to understand what he was involved in, and that you cannot just come into a multilateral organization as a bright young person, read a few papers, and go into the microphone on behalf of the mighty United States and say nice things. It's a very serious kind of thing.

*Q: Well, you certainly knew what you were getting into, because you had been thrown into that position in front of the whole U.N. in New York, the time they asked you to make the move for 25%, and you said it was-- and you knew what you were doing.*

DILLON: Oh, yes. But I was an older person, I had many, many years' experience behind me in international relations and aviation and so forth.

I might say, you recall when we started this oral history, I said that from the time I was a little girl, I knew I would be involved in international relations, and although my early career was not directly a part of international relations, I continued mentally to pick up every little thing, every little thing, to learn, to learn social amenities, to learn diplomatic custom, to read about countries, broaden my experience, and so forth. That, I think, prepares you for that time when it all comes together and comes out of your mouth in an international forum.

*Q: Do you think it was very helpful to you to have had all of your bilateral work before you went into multilateral work?*

DILLON: Yes, of course, because it's like walking before you run. If you've worked on a bilateral basis with officials or a delegation from one other country, you begin to get a feel for negotiation, for diplomatic manner, custom, behavior, diplomatic priorities. Then when you find yourself in a multilateral forum--I was negotiating with not one other country, of course, but 30 or 33 daily and 150 when I chaired delegations to the world-wide conferences and assemblies--you put all those pieces together.

*Q: Would you recommend that before anyone is given a stint at a multilateral organization, they have to have had experience? I mean, there's no way these things are ever going to be put into effect, but ideally, should they have had experience bilaterally?*

DILLON: Yes, I think that would be extremely helpful. Perhaps service in an embassy, or multilateral service, but at a level that enables them to learn and grow and understand. The problem is, if you learn only in the multilateral forum, you are inclined to gloss over many issues. You are inclined to see the world as a general, broad, multilateral set of circumstances.

A multilateral group is the coming together of a bunch of bilateral situations. Each representative on the council of ICAO had instructions from his own government. Now, very often those coincided with the other member's instructions from his region or from his set of interests and so forth. But he was there representing his country. Now, if you've had the bilateral experience, you're more inclined to keep that in mind and work as one-on-one or work with his country's interests in mind, and piece together all of those patches and come up with a multilateral view.

*Q: That's a very good point, indeed. Getting back to your young FSO, I wonder if you felt at the beginning that there was perhaps something wrong with his attitude toward the*

*assignment he was given. These people are selected after a rigorous examination and then winnowed down from 15,000 or 20,000 applications to the 200 who are accepted, they tend to think they're water-walkers.*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: I wonder, did he feel that way when he started out and had to be maybe whipped into line a bit? (laughter) Or not?*

DILLON: Obviously, he did, because his intention was to move right up and be a committee member.

*Q: I wondered if it were that, or that he just wasn't as aware as he should have been.*

DILLON: He wasn't aware. He wasn't aware. I have worked with bright young men who were aspiring and ambitious and pushy. He was not that. Quite the contrary.

*Q: He was not that?*

DILLON: Quite the contrary. He was slow, almost at times lackadaisical.

*Q: Do you think he was resentful of the assignment he was given?*

DILLON: Not that I know of. I've never known of anyone who was resentful of being assigned to Montreal, and certainly being assigned directly to a very important multilateral organization. I think that he was assigned early in his career and perhaps was simply not well prepared for the very heavy workload we had in the mission in Montreal.

*Q: I see. It was not one, then, of thinking he was too good for the slot he was put in, which is sometimes said of young FSOs.*

DILLON: Well, obviously he was aspiring to other things, but he wasn't qualified for it, and I think we finally got that message through to him.

*Q: Yes. He was the only one at the time, while you were there, that you had in that slot?*

DILLON: Yes. Yes.

*Q: The other one, the one who was upgraded--that is to say, you changed the slots around, and the one who became the administrative assistant, was that a man or a woman?*

DILLON: That was a woman. It was primarily a secretarial position, but much more than that, and I made it much more than that, an administrative assistant position. There's a tremendous flow of paperwork throughout ICAO. Working papers are issued by the

secretariat on a daily basis during the Council and committee sessions. There's paperwork that comes up from our own government, of course, position papers, telegrams, cables, IGIA papers, and so forth. So that someone at that desk needs to have a good sense of responsibility from the standpoint of seeing that the paperwork flows, it flows expeditiously, it gets to the right people in timely fashion, and is handled appropriately, among other things, of course.

*Q: Yes. She was the same person you had all the time, or did she also change?*

DILLON: After the local-hire young woman, who was very competent, but we changed the Foreign Service officer. I had one woman for two years and then, as a Foreign Service officer, she was transferred to Africa. The new FSO came in and was still there when I left. So I had three altogether over the seven-year period.

*Q: Approximately how long did the young junior FSO stay with you?*

DILLON: He had been there about two years when I left. He was still there. Two or three years.

*Q: When you changed these things around, did that mean you had to let somebody go? The former receptionist, did she have to go?*

DILLON: The former receptionist was an FSO, you see, so she was transferred. The former secretary was not. She was hired locally, had been hired locally, and had worked for the mission for ten years, ten or twelve years. She came to Washington with my predecessor as a secretary, worked with him for a while, and may then have acquired a position in the CAB. I'm not sure, but the last I heard, she . . .

*Q: That's why you were able to do this without hurting anybody too much.*

DILLON: Sure.

*Q: I see. It worked out very well, then. Did you have very many VIPs coming through?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Being Montreal in the winter, I should think you might.*

DILLON: Yes and no. I sometimes wished that there were more in the sense that it would have acquainted people with the goings-on at ICAO, made them more familiar with ICAO, what it is, what it does, and so forth. On the other hand, there were occasions when we had any number of VIP visits, one after the other. I did not have a CODEL [congressional delegation] while I was there, but the secretary of transportation came on one occasion, which I will get into later. But there were occasionally State Department people, the inspector general on one occasion, which I would like to discuss.

*Q: Yes, I'd love to hear about that. This, of course, added to your schedule, both work and social, I would imagine.*

DILLON: Of course, certainly social, because we always tried to have a reception or a dinner or arrange some special occasion for them. In addition, of course, we tried to arrange a very meaningful set of visits and appointments and so forth. We asked always that they sit in council for a short period of time, at least, and maybe on some of the committees and in the commission. We took them to the secretary general of ICAO for a courtesy visit and to the president of the council. Introduced them to a representative group of the other delegates, which I found my colleagues appreciated very much.

*Q: Yes, I can imagine that they would. Who arranged the actual setting up of the schedule and all of that? Would you tell your assistant, "I would like so and so done," and just make sure these things happened?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Would it be the woman assistant or the young FSO male assistant that would do that?*

DILLON: That depends. Setting up the schedule itself would be done by the woman, my secretary. I would say, "I think we should include this. I think we should include that courtesy visit here. Try to set up a cocktail here. Try to set up a dinner party this evening," and so forth, and she would take it from there, get back to me at the end of the day. We'd make some adjustments and so forth.

On the other hand, I did ask from time to time that the junior FSO participate, in the sense of arranging things or sometimes picking up some of the refreshments, seeing that they get to the residence, that kind of thing. But I felt that he was not very receptive to that kind of activity, so I didn't often ask him that.

*Q: Well, if he wants to go far, he'd better learn to be. It's an awfully big part of the business.*

*Did you have staff meetings?*

DILLON: Yes. I had a staff meeting Monday mornings at nine o'clock. I had the impression that staff meetings were not a regular part of business before my arrival, but my middle initial is "C," and I've been told over the years that it might well stand for "coordination." (laughter) I believe in it so strongly. I tried to get the staff together either early on Monday morning or late on Friday evening, to see where we were and where we were going, where we'd been and so forth.

*Q: Those were conducted along collegial lines, or were you always in charge?*

DILLON: I always chaired them.

*Q: You always chaired. Yes, of course, that goes without saying. But I mean, was it a structured thing, where you sort of told people, or did you discuss things?*

DILLON: I usually started by saying, "This is what my schedule looks like for the week. As you know, council meets Monday and Wednesday at and 2:00 p.m. and Friday morning at 10:00 a.m. Also I notice the Air Transport Committee meets on Tuesday and the Committee on Unlawful Interference on Wednesday. I don't have a position yet on this issue." And to my junior FSO, "Would you prepare a file for me on it?" This kind of thing. Then I would go around to the--after all, there were only five or six of us, and say, "What does your week look like? Anything you want to discuss?" And so forth.

*Q: So it was sort of hierarchical, but sort of collegial, too.*

DILLON: Sure.

*Q: A mix. Were these held in your office, Betty?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Where did you sit when you held them? Always in the same place? Or did you move around?*

DILLON: I very often sat at my desk because--and I have a habit of doing that, and I know it's not the way it should be done, but those meetings often entail paperwork. I needed to have an agenda in front of me or the position papers in front of me, all of my papers and notes, and my own work schedule for the week, which I always prepared early Monday morning, would be there in front of me. Also, my office was small, and it was just as easy, rather than ask somebody else to sit behind my desk, which can be a little awkward, just to stay put and have others around on the sofa or the chairs.

*Q: I do think these things have to give way to the physical amenities that are available.*

DILLON: Sure.

*Q: Because you can't always do it the way you want to. What about the local press? Did you have much to do with the local press? Did they have much to do with you?*

DILLON: No. I did have some press interviews when I first arrived, because I was the first woman to be accredited to ICAO, to the council in residence, and the only woman to date.

*Q: Really? Are you the only woman to date?*

DILLON: Yes. There hasn't been another woman. I laugh and tell friends I hope that wasn't because of my poor performance! (laughter)

*Q: Well, I'm sure it wasn't.*

DILLON: The press didn't bother us. They don't bother ICAO very much. They take it for granted, it's been there so many years. But early on, when I was appointed, there were some interviews, and I did have one very nice TV appearance, *tout en francais*, because we were in Quebec, and it was a French channel. They seemed to appreciate that very, very much. I was a bit squeamish about it. My French was good, but it was my first TV appearance in French nationwide, and I was squeamish. My colleagues, the Belgian colleague, French colleague, afterward told me it was very, very well done and they thought I had said some things that were very, very relevant and interesting.

*Q: Very good. Did you have occasion to use your French a great deal in Canada, in Montreal, particularly?*

DILLON: The Quebec French is not Parisian French, of course; it's quite different. That's all right. I could use my French if I wanted to. But I chose not to. I didn't want to pick up a Quebec accent, for one thing. For another thing, everyone spoke English.

*Q: Yes, that's what I thought.*

DILLON: So in my private life, I seldom used it. Formally, in council, we, of course, had simultaneous interpretation: English, French, Spanish. Later we added Russian, but not in simultaneous interpretation. But I often would switch to the French channel if we had a long, drawn-out meeting at which we were not taking a vote and there were long statements being given, so that I wasn't risking anything by working outside my own language. I would turn to the channel when the French representative was speaking. He had beautiful, beautiful French. Or the Belgian representative had marvelous French. I very much enjoyed listening to them on the French channel. It helped keep my French going and so forth.

*Q: But speaking generally, English has replaced French as the lingua franca, hasn't it?*

DILLON: I think so.

*Q: In these international meetings?*

DILLON: I think so, especially in ICAO, because early on, many, many years ago, ICAO adopted the policy that English is the language of international aviation.

*Q: Oh, of course. Yes.*

DILLON: There were a few of my colleagues who did not speak English, or spoke it so little that, as a matter of courtesy, I worked with them in French, and sometimes that was a third-language situation. For example, the Chinese representative, when he came on

council, did not speak English, and, of course, I did not speak Chinese. We worked in French, and very effectively. I enjoyed working with him so much. He passed away a year or two later with cancer, very, very sad for all of us who had known him and worked with him. I had a reception for him one evening at my house, at the residence. I had purchased locally in Montreal a couple of Chinese prints that I rather enjoyed, very typical Oriental art, and by way of making conversation, I asked him to look at them. There was some Chinese writing on them. I said, "Can you give me any idea what this says? Does it say 'Visit Beijing' or does it say . . ."

*Q: "Made in Brooklyn." (laughter)*

DILLON: "Made in Brooklyn." He studied it and studied it, and he said, "Well, I think it's very old Chinese, but it seems to say, 'When the chrysanthemums bloom, I will come again and be your guest.'"

*Q: Oh, how lovely.*

DILLON: I've never forgotten that. I wouldn't be at all surprised if that wasn't what it said at all. (laughter)

*Q: Yes, exactly! (laughter)*

DILLON: But it was a lovely thing to say, and it was very appropriate to the art piece. Very, very nice man, Mr. Liu.

*Q: You obviously enjoy very much interacting with people of different cultures.*

DILLON: Oh, yes, yes.

*Q: Very enriching.*

DILLON: I feel much more at home with people from other cultures than I do the people of my own culture.

*Q: Is that so?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: To what do you attribute that?*

DILLON: Perhaps going way back. After all, I was born and raised in the southwest, where we were right around among Indian populations, many Hispanics, in the early years many, many Hispanics and the Spanish language and customs. As I mentioned in earlier interviews, early on our household was simply very comfortable with members of the black race, although they didn't often represent another culture. Also, I suspect that I

know enough about the other cultures and like people enough that I feel comfortable with them, first off, and secondly, because I feel a little bit inadequate in my own. I have to say that very frankly.

*Q: Why in the world would you feel inadequate in your own, Betty? I can't conceive of that.*

DILLON: Perhaps it goes back to my background in the sense of my having had a very modest background, my having had to do things the hard way over the years. I'm not sure. Who knows what goes into our individual psychological makeup? But that may be a part of it and when I'm with someone from another culture, I feel two things: first of all, I know they're superior to me in the sense that they are the experts in *their* culture and I'm an outsider; On the other hand, I know that I'm from the United States, and I know that they respect me and my country for that reason, and I'm assured of a certain security in our interpersonal relationships.

I've thought a little bit about it, and that might be the answer.

*Q: That's fascinating. You certainly have absolutely no reason to feel inferior to anybody whatsoever! But I dare say something you had mentioned before, the fact that you didn't finish your degree, really did bother you a great deal, didn't it?*

DILLON: Yes, it did. And there were times when it stood in the way of my advancement.

*Q: That's probably why it loomed so large in your life, yes, because it wouldn't have otherwise. That silly piece of paper.*

DILLON: I think sometimes people used that as an excuse not to promote me or not to recognize my work, rather than saying, "It's because you're a woman." "Oh, but you don't have your degree yet."

*Q: It was an easy out, wasn't it? And you were really penalized for it.*

DILLON: But I do enjoy being with people from other cultures and they seem to enjoy being with me.

*Q: Exactly. Well, don't you think that anyone is flattered by having somebody else take an interest in them?*

DILLON: Of course.

*Q: Basic human nature.*

DILLON: Of course. Would this be a good time to mention one of my favorite anecdotes from years gone by?

*Q: Yes, by all means.*

DILLON: When I was working in African Affairs and doing the special study on policy at Department of State, we had a visit from the chairman of the board of Nigerian Airways. He's long since passed away. He was an Ibo chieftain and was here on a visit making representations to the government regarding purchase of aircraft for Nigerian Airways, and he was negotiating with Pan American regarding the blocked seat arrangement and so forth. He, of course, met with people at Department of State, and his own embassy people were taking him around.

The Department of State asked if I would have a little dinner party for him because I was so steeped in African Affairs at that point. I was delighted. The little house I had at that time was a charming little place. It didn't have a separate dining room, but the living room-dining room was some 40 feet long, so it was more than adequate, but arranged in that way. I invited about 50 guests, which was really packing them in. Many people wanted to meet this man.

Most of the guests had arrived by the time he got there. He arrived with someone from his own embassy and with someone from State Department. He was a huge man, six-feet-something and very large, and in addition was wearing the tribal robes from Nigeria, which further enhanced his appearance and made him even larger. He had on sandals and so forth, traditional dress.

*Q: Looked like a chief.*

DILLON: Yes, looked like a chief. We could barely squeeze them into the room by that time. (laughter) I was thinking to myself, as the hostess, "How in the world am I going to be able to push this man around through this crowd and see that he meets everyone?"

Well, we were making a little headway, and all of a sudden, a space opened up toward my daughter's piano. She was taking lessons and we had a lovely little cherry piano there. I had a red velvet seat on a little Hitchcock chair that she used at the piano. He got his eye on that chair, which was between the living room and the dining room, halfway down this long room. He pushed his way over to it, sat down on it, and I thought, "There will go my Hitchcock chair!" This monster of a man, his robes overflowed the chair, and he sat himself down there. The most miraculous thing happened. The crowd began circulating past him, you see.

*Q: He was holding an audience.*

DILLON: He was holding an audience. Well, I was greatly relieved, and it was a most successful evening. I had some lovely red wine of some kind and he enjoyed it, so I gave him a bottle to take home with him, and he went merrily on his way.

The next day, a vice president of Pan American called me from New York, where the chief had visited that morning on his way back to Nigeria. He said, "Betty, what in the world did you do for this man? He arrived up here ecstatic. He said, 'Betty Dillon is the only person in Washington that understands Africans, that understands the role of a chieftain. She had a chieftain's chair there for him, and instead of dragging him around through the crowd, as he had been drug through other cocktails and receptions, she sat him down and brought people up to him to present them.' And he said, 'Furthermore, we like Betty Dillon because she looks us straight in the eye. We know what she's thinking, we know that she is honest and trustworthy, that she likes us. We just had a most enjoyable visit in Washington.'"

*Q: Isn't that wonderful?*

DILLON: And I've long remembered that story about Chief Daffy and his visit there. But I learned lessons from it, and I would hope that others did.

*Q: The Hitchcock chair, I hope it didn't have to be reglued.*

DILLON: The Hitchcock chair made it.

*Q: It didn't have to be reglued?*

DILLON: It didn't have to be repaired. We still have it.

*Q: But you know, that's true. At the African Museum, they have chiefs' chairs and they're very small. They're not great big thrones. With a little red velvet cushion. Oh, I think that's a lovely story. Very nice, indeed. We must all remember that when we entertain chiefs.*

DILLON: But those little niceties are very important when we work with people from other cultures.

*Q: Oh, yes. Oh, yes.*

DILLON: And we must be sensitive to them, and we must make an effort to find out about them and not just force *our* customs and practices on other people.

*Q: Oh, exactly. Especially on nations that are still called Third World, because we are such a big country that our representatives can really intimidate people.*

DILLON: As we mentioned earlier, my relationship with the Japanese representative on council and his very generous agreement to serve as my vice chairman of the Committee on Unlawful Interference simply because we went through *his* ritual, *his* procedure for accepting that kind of thing.

I've spoken on cross-cultural communications quite often and made a presentation to some of the Peace Corps groups just last year on the different aspects of cross-cultural communication, everything from learning and understanding about other customs and mores, to body language, so important.

*Q: You mentioned that before, and that is so important, because people can say whatever they want, but if the body language doesn't express the same thing, they know. They know.*

DILLON: Oh, yes. Very, very important. One of my predecessors in Montreal looked upon the Central American and South American--the Latin American representatives--with a great deal of derision, and persisted in referring to them as the "banana republics."

*Q: That's awful.*

DILLON: And I said to him, "You cannot do that. You can't use that term in this office."

He said, "Well, I never use it in front of them. It's just here in this office."

I said, "You can't do that. You can't refer to them in those terms in your office, walk out that door and do business with them on a warm personal basis."

*Q: Of course you can't.*

DILLON: They know.

*Q: Where do people get these ideas of superiority? It's ignorance!*

DILLON: The other thing I've seen happen so often is, an individual or a group will be negotiating and saying nice things back and forth and using a lot of appropriate diplomatic language, and then the other person leaves the room and they will say something disparaging.

*Q: Oh, isn't that awful? It's despicable.*

DILLON: And I found among my colleagues from overseas that they have a cute little habit of standing outside the door just for a minute before they walk on down the hall. (laughter) So over the years, I've developed a practice of saying something nice about the person I just met with after they leave the room. It doesn't hurt anything. It doesn't cost anything.

*Q: That's right. Speaking of friends and friendships, did you have any particular group of friends among the official delegates that were particularly close to you? You mentioned the Japanese and the Chinese, but I wondered if you saw them socially, as well.*

DILLON: I saw them socially simply because there was a very heavy social schedule.

*Q: Official social schedule.*

DILLON: Official social schedule. So much so that it was almost impossible to have a private life or have a personal different set of friends from the ICAO family. That was all right, because I knew them all very closely and most of them, their families, and could enjoy that kind of social relationship apart from establishing some others on the outside. The United Kingdom, Air Vice Marshall Russell and his wife and daughter were very good friends. The Japanese representative and his wife. The Nigerian representative and his wife. The Lebanese representative and his wife, although she was not there all of the time. Consequently, he and I were often invited in order to fill out the odd number situation at social functions. Very, very fine man. I could relate one personal anecdote after another.

*Q: How did you handle things when you were doing the official entertainment? Did you have mainly receptions, or did you have dinners and if you had dinners, did you then need a host?*

DILLON: I had both, of course, depending upon the occasion. We coordinated the diplomatic social schedule within ICAO. We had to, because it was so complicated. Consequently, if I knew that there was a formal dinner at eight or nine o'clock on a certain evening, and I was having something that same evening, I would have the reception before the dinner someplace else. Often it was the other way around.

I might say right here that the social schedule in ICAO was a very important one. I've often heard people say that all diplomats do is go to cocktail parties and run around to social functions. Because we were meeting daily and were in a constant year-round state of negotiating, it was necessary, almost necessary, for us to have these informal occasions in the evening to coordinate positions, to negotiate positions, and so forth. I learned to use them and to enjoy them very much.

*Q: So they were working parties.*

DILLON: Yes. They were certainly working parties. At social functions, especially when you're in company with people from other countries of different cultural backgrounds, it's customary for the women to gather together after dinner or to sit together during the cocktail hour before dinner and so forth. The wives discuss the school situation, the markets, the things that wives talk about everywhere in the world. This became awkward, you see, because was I to stay with the women and listen to this kind of thing, which was the farthest thing from my mind at that point, or was I to inject myself into the male group, you see, on the other side of the room and go on behaving as a council member should behave, negotiating, discussing, and coordinating, and so forth?

On some occasions, I tried to do both. I tried to be with the wives enough to let them know that I understood the important role they were playing in maintaining fine

diplomatic households, working with their children and their families and supporting their husbands. I wanted them to know me and to be comfortable with me.

At the same time, I didn't feel that I was there to spend all of my time sitting with the wives, discussing the bad school situation. Consequently, I ultimately came around to putting the priority where it should be, and that was on my role as a council member, I stood with the men, I talked with the men, I met with the men, and socialized with them.

*Q: Did this take some getting used to on their part at first?*

DILLON: Not a great deal. I never felt any discomfort. There was never any incident. None of them, save one, showed in any way any prejudice against women in that role, and that was my Canadian colleague, whom I will discuss later in another context. But they all made me feel very comfortable. As a matter of fact, on one occasion the Norwegian delegate held a stag party for the male council members to celebrate something or another. I've forgotten now. His wife had gone for the year or there was some special occasion, but it was not a full diplomatic function, in that wives were not invited. It was a stag party, and they called it that, and all the male members were invited. He invited me.

*Q: And you felt no discomfort there?*

DILLON: None whatsoever. We did a lot of "skool" [toasting], we drank quite a bit, not too much. We had a lot of fun, had a marvelous evening. They were very respectful of me and so forth, but in every way considered me to be there as a council member. It was one of the most flattering things that happened to me during my tour in Montreal.

*Q: Indeed! Now, this is a very unimportant matter, but it's one that people are interested in. How did you dress for an occasion like that?*

DILLON: As I recall, I chose to wear something--certainly not pants. I never wore pants. I seldom wear pants now. But it was a high-necked, full-skirted dress, a very comfortable, leisurely kind of thing, in a set of dark colors, minimal jewelry. But I felt that comfort and relaxation were the order of the evening, and I dressed appropriately.

*Q: No attempt to vamp. (laughter)*

DILLON: No. Exactly. (laughter) Nor to dress like the men, if you will.

*Q: Quite. Quite. Were there many rivalries up there that you senses?*

DILLON: I might say regarding that one evening that at the end of the evening, I chose to go home alone. Two or three of the men, they had their cars and drivers there, and offered to take me. Two of them offered to take me together, and I thanked them profusely, but I left alone and went home alone.

*Q: In your own car?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: You didn't have a car with a chauffeur?*

DILLON: No.

*Q: Why not?*

DILLON: It's a *very* good question. (laughter) A *very* good question. Especially with the Montreal weather. I used a taxi more than I drove my own car, which can be awkward, too, because always at the end of the evening, you have to find a telephone, wait for the cab, and it can be awkward under diplomatic circumstances. But there definitely is a need for a car and driver at that mission.

*Q: Absolutely. I suppose it's budgetary reasons.*

DILLON: Sure.

*Q: I was asking you if there were many rivalries that you felt among the different members of the council.*

DILLON: Certainly not personal rivalries. There were, of course, some political rivalries, in the sense that you would hear some of the representatives from more progressive and advanced countries criticizing representatives from the developing countries for political reasons or for intergovernmental reasons, but not personal.

*Q: Did you find yourself in the role of peacemaker?*

DILLON: Yes, sometimes.

*Q: Do you think that was because you were from such a powerful country, or because it's your nature to be a peacemaker?*

DILLON: I think it was my nature to be a peacemaker. My predecessor had not been, so it had to have been my intent and my personal makeup.

*Q: Yes. Did you find that people came to you to ameliorate a situation?*

DILLON: Sure. They sometimes came to me to talk things out if they had a problem with the secretary general or with the president of the council. They would come to me, and I would listen. I served the role of the listener sometimes. The purpose of the meeting was vague, and they had no particular purpose for being there and talking with me, except that I listened, maybe made a few general comments.

*Q: How do you feel about that sort of a post as training for young officers?*

DILLON: ICAO is not a good post for training young officers, because I consider it to be unique. It is so directly involved with airline operations and manufacturing, and that's its priority. That's its *raison d'être*, if you will. It's not a good place to train. I think the other multilateral organizations are. But then we don't have the in-residence kind of situation that you have in ICAO.

*Q: Right.*

DILLON: They must go either with an annual assembly or diplomatic conference or committee meeting and return to Washington. I think assignment to an embassy post where there are multilateral organizations headquartered, is very, very good training-- Geneva, Brussels. Of course, Geneva is not an embassy, but it's close enough.

*Q: What about what you consider to have been your major successes there? You touched on some, but I'm sure there must have been others in such a long time or you wouldn't have been kept there.*

DILLON: Well, the one that State Department has remembered most clearly in its mind was getting the 25% assessment ceiling through, of course. But that was in the first year of my assignment there.

I was also able to take the chairmanship of the Committee on Unlawful Interference during the peak of the hijacking years and make it a functional body again. I was re-elected for a second term.

During that time, and as a result of that committee's work, we were able to put through the council a major annex to the Chicago Convention (which created ICAO), on security. There are technical annexes to that multilateral treaty, if you will, and adding an annex to it was a major occurrence, of course. So we were able to have ICAO adopt Annex 17 on security and put in it standards and recommended practices for beginning to try to deal with this awful problem of hijacking, blowing up aircraft, taking hostages, whatever.

*Q: In that context, ICAO deals with that sort of thing, but you don't get into the actual blowing-up of the Korean aircraft and things like that?*

DILLON: We don't, except on one occasion, which I may have mentioned to you. We were asked to become directly involved. The military aircraft of Israel shot down a Libyan airline scheduled flight in North Africa. I don't recall if this is on the tape or not. It was a terrible thing. The aircraft was lost. It was a daily scheduled flight. The military aircraft panicked and shot it down. I think a hundred or so people were killed, including men, women, and children, pregnant women, and so forth.

Because of those involved, there were political interventions in ICAO to investigate the crash and possibly adopt some resolution or take some action in ICAO that might help prevent this kind of thing from happening again. In that case, ICAO appointed a very, very professional, highly technical team of investigators to go to the site, investigate from a technical standpoint, from the standpoint of an accident investigator's viewpoint, non-political, and report back to the organization, which it did.

As a result, ICAO adopted a resolution condemning Israel for its action. I voted for the condemnation on behalf of my government. That, incidentally, was the reason for calling the diplomatic conference in New York, the one at which I got the 25% assessment ceiling through.

*Q: You were given instructions to vote to condemn?*

DILLON: Oh, yes. Oh, yes.

*Q: In situations like that, you just can't do it on your own, no matter how you feel?*

DILLON: No. No, no, no, no. Not for a serious political issue of that kind. The U.N. mission in New York worked closely with me in addition to my own delegation. I was head of delegation, of course.

But on the more positive side, what also came out of that was some ICAO activity and the later adoption of some standards and recommended practices that we hope helped for future situations of that kind.

Less than ten years later the Soviets shot down the Korean Air Lines flight under remarkably similar circumstances and many of us were reminded of the earlier incident in North Africa. Our vote to condemn Israel, I was told had established a position that was advantageous when we came to considering our position in ICAO on the KAL incident.

*Q: What about other things that had to do with the safety and manufacture of an airplane, such as the DC-10s, when the doors fell off? Did that come under you? That happened to various DC-10s all around the world all at once!*

DILLON: It didn't, really. There was a lot of talk about it, especially among the commissioners and those of us who had been close to aviation. But it isn't something that ICAO gets into directly. The manufacturers, of course, are the first to become involved. The airlines and the manufacturers work closely together to see where the fault lies, if, indeed, there was a manufacturer specification shortcoming and so forth. The only way that something like that might get into the standards and recommended practices would be in some kind of general language, maybe, in the technical annex on aircraft.

*Q: I see. It certainly has been very helpful that you've described to me what you did. I really hadn't had any idea what was done, other than it had to do with airplanes.*

*Did the problems in Vietnam bother you? Because you certainly were there early enough that the Vietnam War was still going on. Did you feel any flak from that?*

DILLON: Very little. I recall there was a general atmosphere of concern for the United States. There was a general atmosphere, as there was developing all over the world, with respect to our involvement there, an atmosphere of, "We must get out. We must find a way out. We don't belong there. We're doing terrible things." But these things were never discussed openly in diplomatic--

*Q: No atmosphere of real antagonism?*

DILLON: No. No. We just went on about our own business, which really had nothing to do with it. What did take a very direct toll--and I will mention it in another context later--was the beginning of the end in Beirut and our relationships with the Lebanese representative.

*Q: You mean when the Israelis moved in?*

DILLON: Yes, when Beirut first started disintegrating and hostilities first broke out, which was in '75, '76.

*Q: Was it that long ago?*

DILLON: Well, there were things going on before that, but that's when they began shelling Beirut and it became obviously a serious, serious problem.

*Q: Well before the Israelis came in. We were talking about your successes and so forth.*

DILLON: Well, there were some other things, in addition to the assessment ceiling and Annex 17 on security. During my tour there--and I really cannot take a whole lot of credit for it--we worked our way through the microwave landing system specifications and ICAO adopted the United States candidate as the one that R & D should proceed on.

*Q: Does this mean that the U.S. will manufacture whatever is needed for this around the world?*

DILLON: Yes, because it becomes a standardized system ultimately, and for that reason, of course, there's a great deal riding on these decisions in ICAO.

There was a highly skilled, technically skilled expert panel set up, an intergovernmental panel of six or eight or ten members--I've forgotten--who are technicians in this field. It's a very narrow one and represents the most advanced kind of technology, of course. That panel was set up and went through, I think, some six meetings in ICAO on an informal basis. A panel in the ICAO hierarchy is the lowest organizational body on the ladder. At

the same time, it is very often the most important. I say it's low, because it then submits its findings to a committee or directly, in this case, to the Air Navigation Commission, which works it over for months and then submits it to the council and so forth. But high in the sense that the panels are made up of very dedicated membership, very well-qualified membership and so forth.

And all during the time between the actual panel meetings in Montreal, the members are working with one another between countries and among countries. A U.S. person might go from Washington to Paris or London. A couple of people from Switzerland might meet them up in London. This is their business, after all. Our people were highly skilled FAA men.

So there were some six panel meetings. I think one of them had taken place before I arrived, one or two. Then we went through two or three or four of them during my tour. Each time our goal, of course, was to have the U.S. system adopted, but there was a technical problem developed. Again, I can't remember if we already put this on tape.

*Q: We very briefly touched on it, yes.*

DILLON: I think both our system and the United Kingdom's system, it boiled down to a contest between our system and theirs. It had some problem with what is called scalloping, because the microwave landing system was technically put together so that if there were hills or skyscrapers or obstacles near or in certain directions from the approach path of the aircraft coming in to land, there would be a shadowing effect on the landing system. This would cause scalloping of the airplane, which is a maneuver that the airplane would make as it approached the runway and could, of course, be very dangerous.

So they, the technicians, worked on that at great length and finally found a way to handle it with a computer chip. Once that was ironed out, I think the organization felt that there were other advantages and that the U.S. system was the one to go with. There are some microwave landing system installations already and it's in advanced experimental stages.

*Q: Did the British have the same problem with scalloping?*

DILLON: As I recall, they did, but to a lesser extent. But there were some other problems.

*Q: When this happens and the United States' system is adopted, that renders useless the British system?*

DILLON: Yes, in a way it does. In a way it does. On the other hand--and I can't speak authoritatively because I don't know what has transpired since those years--on the other hand, there's sometimes international cooperation among manufacturers, and it's possible that that took place between the U.S. and the U.K. manufacturer.

*Q: The English have had quite a lot of problems, haven't they, one way and other with their development? They've poured all that money into the Concorde, which has not caught on.*

DILLON: No, it hasn't. It's much too expensive. Its load factor is very low, of course. It's limited in the number of people and the amount of cargo it can take, the weight factor. Consequently, they have to charge so much that I think it's beyond the reach of most travelers. It's unfortunate. Hopefully, it will find its place. Maybe it's before its time.

*Q: It's a beautiful ship.*

DILLON: Oh, it is. I saw it for the first time in Montreal and was most impressed. It looks like a large goose when it's landing, a great bird. Beautiful.

*Q: It was scheduled here for a long time, and has since been discontinued. But every day at a specific time, you could see it.*

DILLON: So I was able to help the panel on the MLS, not with their technical work, certainly, but with the negotiations that had to take place as these reports came before the council. Many council members simply didn't understand it, as I didn't most of the time. (laughter) But we had to be sure that we gave them as much information as possible and that we in every way saw to it that even among those members that didn't understand the technicalities of the problem, they would want to go with the technology of the United States, which, after all, has had a superb reputation over the years in aviation.

*Q: Yes. Is the fact that our planes aren't being maintained the way they should be, at least according to the press, having an effect on the way other countries think about our system? Since deregulation, there have been a lot of accusations that the U.S. planes are not being maintained the way they should be.*

DILLON: Well, this is a whole other set of problems for us. It really hadn't come into full--

*Q: No, because you left before this. Exactly.*

DILLON: It's only in the last several years it's come about. My personal opinion is that, sure, maintenance is part of it, but first of all, I think when deregulation took place--and there are many people that adhere to this school of thought--there was not enough consideration given to technical saturation. There were studies done, all kinds of studies done on the economic implications of operating under deregulation, but there wasn't a serious, serious look given at the saturation of en route facilities, airport facilities, area radar facilities, and the saturation of major airports.

So I think that has put an operating pressure on both airlines, the operations side of airlines, and the maintenance side of airlines to keep tight schedules, to adjust schedules, to work under this kind of pressure, if, indeed, they're serving major airports.

But I think, overall, something else has happened to aviation in the last several years. It's the same kind of malaise that has unfortunately affected many of our other industrial sectors. Individuals who worked in aviation in the early days, whether they were pilots or maintenance men or even operators on the administrative and executive side, were dedicated to safe transportation, to economical transportation, to flight, to aviation itself. Aircraft engineers that repaired a plane or maintained a plane at the time it was turning around, as we call it, to go back over its route, or to go on its schedule, were absolutely dedicated to what they were doing. They felt the importance of their role in this whole picture. Pilots were absolutely dedicated to their own expertise, to keeping it up, to keeping ahead on piloting, to being the best possible pilots.

There was a pride and a fraternity in aviation that made it so wonderful, especially United States aviation. We've lost that.

*Q: You really feel that?*

DILLON: Yes, we've lost that. Generally speaking, we've lost that. I'm very much afraid that, for example, union feeling runs very high now, and many engineers, maintenance people, A and Es, pilots, are much more concerned about where their next pay check is coming from.

*Q: What are A and Es?*

DILLON: Aircraft engineers, airframe and engineering people. The mechanics. But I'm very much afraid that people now are much more concerned about their own individual status in the company, where their next pay check's coming from, whether or not they're going to strike, whether or not the airline's going to merge. There isn't that love of aviation.

*Q: They're not serving a higher cause than themselves.*

DILLON: Exactly. It's a job. Now, I don't mean to say that every aircraft mechanic is being casual about his work. Not at all.

*Q: Of course not.*

DILLON: But I think there is more and more of that indifference or impersonal kind of look at aviation, and it's just another job. It's where you happen to work. I think that takes its toll. That, combined with the pressures of current-day operations under deregulation, the two together are taking a toll.

*Q: Yes. Do you think any of this is attributable to the deregulation? Well, yes, obviously the pressures of that are. But how much effect do you think the firing of the air traffic controllers [June 1981] had on the industry as a whole?*

DILLON: PATCO, the union that struck, had been regarded as "subversive." Apart from that, it was illegal to strike against the government. But it should have been handled differently, earlier. Again, my personal opinion, because that took place after I left my assignment in Montreal and after I left government. I was appalled. The air traffic controllers, almost without exception, are the unsung heroes of the international air transport network. For me to see an air traffic controller in leg irons, which was the case on television, was the most appalling thing I can imagine.

*Q: Why was he in leg irons?*

DILLON: He had been arrested because at the time they were let go he refused to leave his job, or was striking. Had struck. I guess.

*Q: Isn't that terrible!*

DILLON: It was the most appalling thing. I never thought I would see that in the United States of America. I think the government--our government at that time--wanted to make a point, show the world I don't know what, but I was appalled by that entire set of circumstances. I feel sure that many of the controllers who were let go were not the best. Many of them perhaps were. We hope that the ones that were let go were the less efficient ones and so forth, less qualified ones. But that was not the basis on which they were let go; it was those who were striking and so on. And very good people were let go, and their lives were ruined; men who have served in one of the most difficult roles of any in the world. Being an air traffic controller is just one of the most demanding things we can put upon a human being.

*Q: And I don't understand why they don't burn out within two or three years.*

DILLON: Well, many do, of course. Many do. Or burn out and have to get away for a while and come back.

*Q: Because it's constant, constant, constant pressure, and you have to stay alert all the time.*

DILLON: Oh yes. They're on for an hour, 45 minutes, or two hours. There's a short period of time and then off for a while and then back on again.

*Q: Who sets those rules, Betty?*

DILLON: I don't know. In FAA, of course.

*Q: Within the different countries?*

DILLON: Oh, within the different countries. I'm talking about our situation. In other countries it might be quite different. But many countries, of course, have simply adopted the FAA regulations from the United States as their own, maybe with slight modifications. So we have the advantage, once again, of saying, "This is pretty standard worldwide."

*Q: We really have been the leaders.*

DILLON: Yes. Oh, yes. And in developing countries where they had no expertise or technical capability for creating their own set of FAA regulations, which, after all, are voluminous, they have decided the easy way to go for the time being would be to use the U.S. Government's FAA regulations. But there again, with respect to controllers, it depends on the country, what their own regulations are, and it may be quite different.

*Q: But shouldn't that be standardized if it is known that a man or a woman can't take more than 45 minutes at a time?*

DILLON: Sure. Sure. Of course. And I'm sure worldwide, at major airports, that generally speaking that's the standard.

*Q: Just as they all use English.*

DILLON: Yes Now, if you get to a small airport in Africa, way out in the boondocks-- well, you probably wouldn't have an air traffic controller to begin with under those circumstances, but there might be small airports where there's light traffic that someone would be on duty for longer periods at a time.

*Q: Yes. That would be possible.*

DILLON: But generally speaking, they're on and off. But these people are the unsung heroes of aviation. No question about it.

*Q: What do you think can be done to turn this situation around?*

DILLON: We know already from what's being published that we have too few air traffic controllers. There's very much a shortage. We're, I guess, trying to train more controllers. The U.S. air navigation commissioner from Montreal, my deputy, retired after his assignment up there. He was a former air traffic controller. He was asked to instruct the new controllers at the Oklahoma FAA Center and worked there for a year or so, trying to train new people. But there still is a serious shortage, and I think that whole incident devastated the ranks. That is, even those who stayed on and were kept on were somewhat demoralized about it, and it left them with a certain sense of insecurity or put-down that didn't help the sector at all. I think controllers generally, at that very point, as a matter of fact, needed to be encouraged and supported and recognized. That's what brought on the whole problem.

*Q: Yes, and also weren't they fighting for a better situation, such as hours served and that sort of thing?*

DILLON: Sure. Hours, salary, the whole thing. Benefits.

*Q: Benefits. Yes. But mainly, as I recall, they were worried about being worked for too long a period of time. Wasn't that one of their basic complaints?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Then they were certainly justified.*

DILLON: Absolutely.

*Q: What about your own situation when you left your position in Montreal? Did you feel you left behind some unresolved problems?*

DILLON: I really didn't. It's true there were some small current issues at the time, but the major problems that I had facing me when I went to Montreal, and the major issues that had come up while I was there, had been resolved more or less to our satisfaction--that is, the United States Government. I was very pleased with what we accomplished.

Of course, in ICAO there's a constant workload, revising, reviewing, studying the standards and recommended practices so they can be kept current and keep up with worldwide technology. ICAO was beginning to move more and more into consideration of economic issues--that is, rates and fares and so forth, which they had not in previous years.

*Q: If their primary goal and reason for being are such things as safety and practices that will ensure safety, why are they getting into rates and things like that?*

DILLON: The Chicago Convention of 1944, the conference itself was, as you can imagine, very controversial and there were a lot of serious intergovernmental negotiations there over and above just the creation of ICAO and consideration of policy guidelines. What came out of that conference was the convention which is the treaty which creates ICAO, and it was very carefully worded. It refers to the safe and orderly operation of international air transport. It also refers to the safe and *economic* operation of international air transport. That's about all it says. The annexes, for example, do not address--there is not an annex on economic questions, rates and fares and operating costs and so forth. There is one on facilitation, which has to do with moving passengers and freight through terminals and through airports as expeditiously as possible, and that's always been a subject treated very thoroughly and at great lengths within ICAO. But the actual setting of rates and fares, it was decided at Chicago, would not be one of the things

that ICAO would get into on a day-by-day basis. That was part of international negotiations.

It was agreed at Chicago that the airlines would establish the International Air Transport Association (non-governmental) for negotiating international rates and fares.

There were many good reasons for that. Some of them were purely political, some of them had to do with the different nature of airlines. In many countries of the world--in most countries of the world--airlines are flag carriers of the government and are either owned and operated by the government or heavily subsidized by the government, as opposed to our system, where we've had more or less competition among airlines, certainly not free competition, as is so often mentioned. It's never been that. It's been partially controlled. But our airlines had an opportunity to propose and to set rates and fares based on their operating costs and so forth.

So ICAO had stayed away from that, but there came a period in the '70s here when many of the new airlines that were burgeoning, you see, because of newly independent states and so forth, there came a time when they were saying, "Oh, we can't compete, because the big airlines, the airlines that are grandfather airlines or large profitable airlines that have access to major points and major airports and major traffic points, because they are in a position to run us out of business. We can't compete with them."

So more and more they began bringing into ICAO, in the Air Transport Committee, for example, (which was a committee of the whole of the council, which was created to consider economic questions, but had really painted with a very broad brush some of these economic questions and policies) began to delve more and more into specifics at the insistence of countries representing small airlines, new airlines, or in some cases, representing countries that wanted to increase tourism as a major source of international exchange or as a source of income, because those countries felt that the rates and fares set to and from their countries were so high that it had a dampening effect on travel to the country, you see. And that IATA had become a cartel controlled by the big airlines which excluded and jeopardized smaller airlines.

So under those circumstances, but for a differing set of reasons, representatives were beginning to raise this question of rates and fares in the Air Transport Committee and the council. Just the year before I left, ICAO decided to call a special worldwide conference on economic issues solely. That took place, I think, just a few months before I left, and I can't, frankly, at this point recall the outcome.

The United States was, of course, opposed to ICAO's getting into economic issues. They were opposed to calling the conference. On the other hand, once it was called, there were some advantages to having a worldwide audience for some of the United States' policies, and I tried to point that out to them.

*Q: Where was that held? Was that also in Montreal?*

DILLON: That was in Montreal, as I recall. We'll be discussing, in a few minutes, the reason I don't remember terribly clearly some of these things that happened in the last few months of my six-year tour there.

*Q: Yes. As we finish this area of your career and this area of the oral history, I wonder are there other specific undertakings that you had in Montreal that you would like to discuss now?*

DILLON: I would like to point out that my daughter, Mary Katherine Dillon, was there with me and was a great help to me. You've mentioned earlier the necessity for our having diplomatic functions, dinners, and receptions at the residence. She was very often my co-hostess, and apart from that, she very often served in the kitchen. Well, we both did, for that matter. I sometimes pointed out to Department of State that if I had not been a woman and if my daughter had not been available and willing, they would have had to come up with more operating monies for the residence and so forth. I think, as women, we let ourselves be taken advantage of sometimes in this regard.

*Q: Indeed.*

DILLON: And some of my thinking colleagues said to me on occasion, "Betty, we've noticed that you have to do everything we do, plus have some very heavy responsibilities at home, all of the things our wives do."

*Q: Yes, that is something that I was going to go into at length when we get onto personal items. But if you'd like to go into it now, that's fine.*

DILLON: Well, we can or not. I suppose we should look back at the six years at ICAO and finish that up first. I mentioned three of my major accomplishments, and there was another one a couple of years before I left. We, the United States, decided to review the need for, and the cost of, the joint financing agreement which administers the North Atlantic cable and some other non-directional beacons and other lesser technical en route facilities for the North Atlantic air transport routes. This had not been done for many years, and it had simply been rubber-stamped and it was felt that a thorough review and reconsideration needed to take place. Therefore, in order to bring this about, I subtly sought the chairmanship of the joint financing... (End of tape)

I was a member of the Joint Financing Committee, and served as chairman for a year. During that time, we brought up from Washington someone who could sit on the committee, because I was in the chair, and submitted a paper which was used as the basis for a thorough technical and financing review of the North Atlantic facilities involved. This went through the committee very commendably in the sense that it was studied thoroughly, and the committee members were able to make suggestions for no longer using some of the facilities and for modifying others, and for making changes in the financing arrangements. Those recommendations passed the council, and a conference

was called of all the member states of that agreement, which is not all of the member states of ICAO, just those directly involved with the North Atlantic routing and who had signed the joint financing agreement many years before. But it was a sizable conference of many states, and there were observer states there as well.

I was asked by colleagues and the secretary general to take the presidency of that conference, which was not only a great privilege for me, but it would have given the United States some added advantages. There are always advantages to being in the chair at meetings of this kind. But it also meant that as head of the United States delegation, I would have to turn the head of delegation position over to a member of my delegation. As I recall, there were nine or ten people on my delegation. Unfortunately, or fortunately, they were technical people, experts there to support me in the review and consideration of the issues before the conference. They had not served as head of delegation before, and I was very anxious about asking them to take on this heavy burden. More than one delegate asked me not to turn the delegation over to one of them.

Therefore, I asked Washington to send up someone experienced and qualified to head the delegation so I could take the presidency of the conference. Washington felt it could not do this. They didn't have monies to do it. At that late date, which was just a few days before the conference, they didn't think they could make anyone available. They left the decision up to me, and I decided not to take the presidency of the conference. I felt that I needed to speak for my government in the conference and serve as head of delegation and that I could accomplish more that way. I was, however, chosen as vice chairman of the conference.

The conference was extremely successful. It was so successful that as we moved through the agenda, item by item, our U.S. positions were adopted almost without exception. In one case, the proportion of cost as between aviation and meteorology was changed. It wasn't a serious matter, but it was not consistent with the position I had.

Everything else went so well that at the end of the conference, I went back to that issue and had it adopted as well, which pleased our aviation people. I remember that they sent me a huge bouquet to the residence that night. [Laughter] Because it did favor the charges for aviation. Because, you see, aviation carriers, airlines of the United States were more prevalent over the North Atlantic than from any other one state, so we wanted to keep the aviation proportion of costing lower, or as low as possible, compared to the meteorology portion costing. These things are terribly complicated, and I shouldn't go into this much detail, but it's hard to treat them lightly.

*Q: One reads arcane articles in the Wall Street Journal or the New York Times, and you don't know what's gone behind it. They simply say, "Such and such was adopted" at a conference or something. I suppose they do send up reporters at times like that, don't they, to report on these conferences?*

DILLON: The trade magazines do, the *Aviation Daily*, *World Aviation*, and so forth. Very often there are representatives from the press of other countries.

*Q: Did you find they always treated you properly, with respect?*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: No sexism in this at all?*

DILLON: No. Of course, if you have listened to a conference of this kind and listened to me and seen what I did on behalf of my government professionally, it would be a little difficult to do anything else.

*Q: Oh, yes.*

DILLON: Another one of our accomplishments while I was in Montreal had not to do with the substance of aviation issues, but was a very nice development on behalf of the United States and international aviation worldwide and historically. There is given by ICAO periodically a Warner Award. It's named after Edward Warner, who was the first president of the council. He was from the United States. The award is given to outstanding figures in aviation, in worldwide aviation, over the years, and is a very, very commendable presentation. The United States had never received one of these awards. We, of course, hadn't really sought them because we felt there were many outstanding individuals in world aviation from other countries, and we had so many, after all, that it was never one of our goals.

We decided, however, the time had come, and we wanted to nominate Charles Lindbergh for the Warner Award and have him receive the first award to a United States aviation figure. He had passed away not long before, as I recall. It seemed that this kind of thing would be easy, because, after all, he is one of *the* figures of aviation historically, but there were still those that felt maybe the U.S. shouldn't take an award because it was basically a United States program to begin with; that is, the Warner Award program. There were those who felt it was too obvious a thing to do, that, rather, we should give the award to someone lesser known, maybe who needed encouragement, and so forth. In other words, there were some arguments against it.

The other thing was that Anne Lindbergh, Charles Lindbergh's widow, very well known in her own right, of course, is a very, very private person and was not given to encouraging this kind of thing, nor to participating in this kind of thing. So we had to convince her that this would be a marvelous thing for the United States and for aviation everywhere, and that, indeed, she should participate. We were able to accomplish all of that, and in the fall of 1975, she came to Montreal, received the award, which is a silver medallion, which she later placed in his museum in St. Louis. Her presence there was a grand occasion. She is a most remarkable woman. She became my daughter's heroine. She was certainly my heroine to begin with. She was our house guest while she was there, and I can't tell you what an impact just her presence there had on the entire ICAO family. She accepted the award. It was presented to her by the president of the council, Walter

Benaghi of Argentina, who was Mr. ICAO many, many, many years, and the formal ceremony was very impressive.

So I like to look back on that occasion as one of my accomplishments that had an impact on ICAO. It came during the fall before I left, and many things happened that fall. One of them was the opening of Mirabelle Airport, the big international airport at Montreal. That was the occasion for inviting many, many VIPs from many different countries. It happened to coincide with the opening of the new big, huge, modern ICAO building, which ICAO had constructed in downtown Montreal. So these two happenings coming at the same time created quite a lot of activity and brought many visitors to Montreal.

I recall that the Secretary of Transportation, Robert Coleman, came to Montreal for the dedication of the airport and the building, and his visit was really exceptional. I had a very large dinner party for him, and he was very, very well received.

*Q: Did you have him as a house guest?*

DILLON: No. He and Mrs. Coleman were at one of the hotels there, but there is a personal note that I should put in here. Shortly after his arrival, he asked to see me alone, and informed me that he was considering appointing me deputy administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration. I can only say I was shocked. It was a wonderful opportunity, and I must say, in retrospect, that I made a serious mistake not having accepted it. But the situation at the time was such that I could only do what I thought was best under the circumstances for me, for my government, for ICAO, and I felt that I had to stay on in Montreal for a few months. The main reason was that my government had already suggested to me that I be a candidate for secretary general of ICAO. There had not been a woman secretary general of a multilateral organization, and they decided, after several of my colleagues approached me about it, that we might go with the candidacy. I informally and personally was receiving a great deal of support from my colleagues, many of whom were campaigning for me and making representations to their own governments to support me.

The council recesses over the Christmas holidays. Several of the council members returned to their countries to be home for the holidays, and several of them asked me to please let them know if the United States had taken a final decision regarding my candidacy before they went home, so they could do their own politicking on my behalf with their governments on the spot. Washington did not take a decision before the holidays. As a matter of fact, they didn't take a decision until February, and the election was to take place the first of April, as I recall. Again, I think Washington was used to working with the other agencies, where the delegations pop into town for a one- or two-week conference and then all go back home. They do things at the last minute. I tried to explain to them we were all in-residence, we were getting a lot of help from other individuals in Montreal, and this was evolving day by day, and we should take advantage of that situation. But for whatever reasons, they didn't get around to a decision until February.

So knowing that that was coming, or feeling sure that it was, I had to decide between going with the United States' candidacy for secretary general or accepting Secretary Coleman's appointment for me in the FAA. There had, of course, never been a woman anywhere near that level in FAA, and it would have been a great honor and a great step forward for women. It is a presidential appointment, and I took mental note of the fact that this was the fall of '75, there was an election coming up in '76, and it is a position that changes with administrations. So I felt that probably a year was all I would have in that position anyway.

The last year of my tour in Montreal was a nightmare because of a personal development. At the very time we filed formally my candidacy for secretary general of ICAO, I received a call from my sister, asking me to come home for a few days. I needed a vacation, anyway, and I thought I could use a week's rest before I started campaigning in Montreal for the secretary generalship. I went home, and to make a long story short, she was ill and had to be hospitalized the following day and became a classic case of terminal cancer. She underwent surgery a couple of days later, which was inoperable, and she was given three months to live. Because my sister and I had been so close over the years and so devoted to one another, this was a terrible emotional shock for me.

There were other complications, however. We had gone into business together in the late 1960s. We had purchased a Colonel Sanders Kentucky Fried Chicken franchise, which she ran and had operated very successfully for almost ten years. So there were all the complications of what to do with the business. My mother was there with her. She was not well, and I was, of course, concerned about her.

I called Washington and consulted with them about my candidacy for the secretary generalship. They left the decision to me, should I withdraw or carry through on it. Since we had already filed, I felt an obligation to carry through on it. I'm not sure that was a right decision. In retrospect, I probably would have been wise to withdraw the candidacy and be free to spend more time with my family, but under the circumstances, I anticipated that my sister would live only a couple of months in any case. As it turned out, she was such a strong person emotionally and physically, that she lived for eighteen months. She went back to the business and was very active at work for several months.

I returned to Montreal and pursued my candidacy there, as well as the other ongoing ICAO work, but it became necessary for me to commute almost weekly to the Midwest. I'd go down on Friday night and come back on Sunday night or early Monday morning. This, of course, took a terrible toll. I don't think at any time it minimized the effectiveness of my work in Montreal. I was continuing to be very successful in moving along with U.S. government positions, but privately, of course, it was a terrible time for me.

The election for secretary general came along in April. We were not successful, and I think for some very explainable reasons. First of all, I probably didn't campaign as I would have if I had been free personally to go and come. For example, I would have liked

to visit each of the twenty-five or thirty member states that were represented on the council, meet the ministers of transport, the ministers of foreign affairs, and other appropriate government officials, so that they could be acquainted with me and my qualifications and, thus, be more inclined to issue instructions to their representatives in Montreal to support me. Under the circumstances, I couldn't do that, of course, so all of *my* representations had to be done in Montreal, and our embassies handled representations with the other governments.

The competition came from France. Down through history, they have a reputation for being fine diplomats, and this situation was no exception. The candidate was their representative on council, a young man who was very well qualified and had been a very good council member. They were very shrewd in that they appointed one of the other council members to serve as a campaign director for him, if you will, so that he didn't have to go himself and plead his own case to other council members, whereas I had to go personally and say, "Why don't you vote for me? I'm the best available," and so forth. It was a very awkward position for me to be in.

The support I received from my own government was very disappointing. For example, Washington asked all of the embassies in the capital cities of the countries that were on council to make representations on our behalf--Rome, London, Paris, Tokyo, and so forth. The responses were very slow in coming in. In most cases, the embassies sent in second- or third-level embassy officials. In only one or two cases out of thirty did the ambassador himself make the representation. In some cases, certainly more than one or two, the official who went from our embassy to a government office on behalf of our candidacy never found the right office, and sent that back in a reporting cable. That is, "I saw and talked with someone, but I'm not sure that's the office that backstops ICAO."

In one outlandish case, in one of the capitals in South America, a top embassy official went to a group of officials there and made the pitch on behalf of our candidacy, but the officials from the other government said, in effect, "This is ridiculous. You people should have known better than to nominate a woman for this position," and *our embassy official agreed with them*. This was reported back to me by that country's representative in Montreal. He said, in effect, "Betty, what's going on with your own government? You're not getting any help in our capitals back home." I had been told that strong representations would be made in Cairo, because the very able Cairo representative on council wanted to support me, but he said, "I'll have to have some work done in Cairo by your people so that I can do what I want to do on your behalf." Second- or third-level people went in there. They, again, reported that they didn't think they'd found the right office. The ambassador himself did not go. The Egyptian representative on council again came to me and said, "Betty, I thought your government was going to make strong representations on your behalf, and that hasn't been done. I must tell you that I don't know what position that's going to leave me in."

In one case, in a major foreign capital, the representative on council was, in effect, bolting the European caucus, which was supporting the French candidate. This man said, "I am

going to support you, and I don't care about the rest of them." This position was transmitted back to his government by someone informally. The French, in effect, hauled in that government and told them what they would have to do, and he had to, of course, then obey very explicit governmental instructions, and as a matter of fact, he was told he had to be the campaign director for the French candidate, which left him very, very unhappy, indeed. In that particular capital, our economic counselor was a man I had worked with in Sri Lanka. I had no idea he was there. He was a very fine young career Foreign Service officer. He knew me, he knew my background, my qualifications, and my record of effectiveness. He repeatedly called on that government and repeatedly said in his cables, "I know what this woman can do. I've worked with her before. She's a fine candidate, and I want you to know I'm doing everything I possibly can to get the government to back us." However, as I said, that was the very country which was hauled into line by the French on behalf of the French candidate.

Another major factor had to do with the Canadian representative on council. He was a Québécois; that is, a French Canadian. He personally was anti-U.S. Many people in Quebec, are, for some interesting reasons which we needn't go into here. I suspect that he was something of a chauvinist. He is the only member of council that I ever felt might have some reservations about working with a woman and certainly would have some about having a woman secretary general. His position was particularly effective because he represented the host government, and the secretary general of ICAO has to negotiate with the host government about the headquarters building, about diplomatic privileges, and many, many other things. His personal thinking was so well-known that officials in his own government, Canada, came to me in Montreal and said, "We want you to know this is going on. There is nothing we can do about it. He's doing it personally. He knows he has instructions to vote for you, and he will, but anything you or your government can do to counter what he's doing will be extremely helpful."

We sent an official from Washington back to Ottawa and talked top level there, and, of course, all they could do was give us the same assurances that they would vote for me and do whatever little bit they could to bring him into line personally. He went so far as to entertain the African-Middle East caucus at his country home (his wife was quite well-to-do) and lobby for the French candidate. He approached the African delegates as a group, two of which were from French-speaking countries, and lobbied them very strongly. We know that some last-minute calls went from Montreal out to African capitals that were informal and personal, telling officials in those countries that their representatives on council were considering voting for me, and they should see to it that this not happen. So that African delegates who sometimes didn't have instructions from their governments and therefore could use their own good judgment, were, in this case, given specific instructions. "Whatever you do, don't vote for the United States."

So we had this awful informal campaigning going on. Eight of the thirty council representatives had come to me personally and encouraged me to file and assured me that they would be campaigning for me and voting for me. But as the time grew closer, it became very apparent that pressures were being put on them from back in their capital

cities, but it also became apparent that they would probably be released from their instructions after the first ballot, so that if we could have made any kind of a reasonable showing on the first ballot, we could have gone in on the second or third ballot. This didn't happen. The only delegate who voted for us was the Canadian. It was the most ironic situation you can imagine. The one person that had really done the campaigning against our candidacy was the one who voted for us, and all of those who had initiated the candidacy, had supported me and campaigned for me, on the first ballot had to vote against me. And then because we had no showing at all on the first ballot, it slowly moved through a second, third, and it was the third or fourth ballot that the French candidate was elected.

The Department of State was, of course, very unhappy about the situation. I tried to explain to them that I felt a lot of our formal diplomatic representations had fallen far short of what was expected and what should have taken place, and I pulled out the reporting cables from each of those posts and gave them to the assistant secretary, and he promised to look into all of it, as though that mattered at that late date. Also I pointed out that I certainly hadn't been at my best, although I don't know what else I could have done there in Montreal because of my personal situation. So we were very unsuccessful, and I think, again, that it's a bit of irony that the only position, the only vote I lost in my six years in ICAO, Montreal, was my own candidacy.

*Q: When the second ballot came up, there was more than one person being voted, more than two people. I suppose it went between the others and the French delegate, was that it?*

DILLON: Yes. In addition to the French candidate, the representative from Indonesia was a candidate, technically a very well-qualified man. Then there was, I think, a brief candidacy of one of the Latin American representatives, but that just faded into nothing. So, basically, it was between myself, the French, and the Indonesian, who was considered to be kind of the Third World developing-nation candidate.

The only truly intelligent effort on our behalf came from the U.K. The director of Technical Services in the secretariat was from the United Kingdom, and much respected. The UK filed his candidacy and voted for him, as a "stalking horse," as it were. My colleague Air Vice Marshall Russell told me afterward that they had done this so that they would not be bound by the European group's French candidate, but would be free to support me on the second ballot. As it turned out it was a futile effort.

But the French had done such a good job out in the capitals, which, after all, is where the instruction came from, especially in French-speaking countries, which included a large number of those on council, whether they were in Africa, the Middle East, or wherever, that once we moved into the second and third ballots, you began to see the developing nations, as well, going in that direction rather than toward Indonesia, which, after all, didn't have a caucus of its own, so to speak, and didn't have a constituency, so to speak.

*Q: What happened after the first ballot? Did you withdraw your candidacy?*

DILLON: Washington had sent up one or two officials to be there for the voting, and the air navigation commissioner sat with me, all of which was, I thought, a little bit of overkill, given the situation.

*Q: And too late.*

DILLON: And too late. We talked briefly about it. They were shocked. I was shocked. I was surprised and terribly shocked. I knew what had been going on with the Canadian, but I had rather hoped it was going in one ear and out the other with some of these people.

*Q: Yes, but apparently they had instructions.*

DILLON: From back home. As I said, there had been efforts made, we know, long distance phone calls placed as late as the night before from Montreal to capitals, saying, "Get your delegate under control," that sort of thing. So given that situation, we decided just to hang in there for the second ballot, in the hope that we might pick up another one or two or that even more might feel that they were released from the second ballot. But that didn't happen, and they still had the one on the second ballot. We didn't withdraw at all, so the election came in the third or fourth ballots.

*Q: How much of it do you think was anti-U.S. feeling, and how much do you think was because you're a woman?*

DILLON: A large part of it was anti-U.S. feeling back home in the capitals. The French council member who was elected took me to lunch the next day. We were very good friends, and he's a very able young man. He said, "Betty, all of us on council hope that you understand this was not a vote against you. You happen to be (and these were his words) from the wrong country." It was an anti-U.S. vote. I suppose that is perhaps the one and only time in my entire international career where I had it brought home to me very clearly that there is that tremendous resentment of the United States around the world, for various reasons.

As a matter of fact, the French representative presented me with a beautiful leather bound book, which I have to this day, of Baudelaire's poetry, in French, of course, which includes "L'Albatros", and he said, "I give you this for this specific reason. Your country is an albatross around your neck."

*Q: My word! The Rime of the Ancient Mariner.*

DILLON: *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*.

*Q: You couldn't take a thing like that personally, because it isn't meant personally. But still, in all, it must be a shock to know your country is that disliked when we had tried so hard, but not always in the right way.*

DILLON: There were other factors. For example, one of the delegates who had gone home for the Christmas holidays and wanted instructions before he went was the Lebanon representative. He said, "My government is already so dispersed and so disrupted that it's going to be hard for me to find the officials I need to find and get my instructions." He was one of those that we didn't give the information to before he left, but when he came back, he was furious. It had nothing to do with this issue or my candidacy, but the destruction of Beirut had started. They were shelling Beirut. He said, "*You* are destroying my country." Now, this is a man that for a year or two I had been on a first-name basis with, a very fine young diplomat. He had often supported me on crucial votes in the council. But he said, "Betty, doesn't your country understand what is going on over there? They talk about Christians and this and that and the other thing in the most simplistic clichés. And he said, "The fact is, there are more refugees in my country than there are Lebanese at the moment. The factions are so divided that it's going to get a lot worse before it gets better. You're destroying Beirut. You're destroying Lebanon. It's because of your support of Israel, of course, and what Israel is doing to the Palestinians."

*Q: So our support of Israel has cost the U.S. a tremendous amount around the world.*

DILLON: So he was one of those that I had counted on. I had learned to count on him in crucial situations because, again, he seldom had instructions from his disorganized government at that point. But he went against us. Being French-oriented, as it were, which Lebanon has been during certain periods in the past, he went with France.

*Q: Your point is well taken about Canada, because this is still the time of René Levesque.*

DILLON: Exactly. There is a lot of anti-U.S. feeling throughout Canada, but in French-speaking Canada, in Quebec province, there is a lot of anti-U.S. feeling. And a lot of chauvinism.

*Q: You're not the first one who has said the Department and embassies abroad don't do the backing up that other countries do. The smaller countries recognize the importance of these things and go all out, where we are spread so thin that we just don't. It seems to happen all the time.*

DILLON: As I said, I blame myself in part, because my personal situation was such that I couldn't do what I would have done under other circumstances. If Washington hadn't been able to finance a trip to some of these capitals, I would even have taken leave and gone myself, because I think that needed to be done, especially with a woman candidate. I think I needed to have gone to their ministers and gone with my embassy people to make the representations. That isn't done, to my knowledge. It isn't done at all as a matter of practice in other organizations, but I think it would have been effective in this case. I

didn't have the physical nor emotional stamina, nor the time under those circumstances to do that.

*Q: It may be just as well, because if you had invested all of that emotion into it, I don't think you could have defeated the organization of the French.*

DILLON: It would have taken a superhuman effort, really, to have overcome their effort.

*Q: And there is enough national chauvinism, too. You had a couple of strikes against you.*

DILLON: Oh, yes. Oh, yes, definitely. But we had thought from the start, because there was so much outspoken clear support from council members, that it might be a good time to try.

*Q: But the political situations change between the time you start these things and the time you finish.*

DILLON: The other thing that happened had to do with Japan, which was another vote we learned to count on in the council. They had a new representative by then, a young lawyer. He was not an aviation person, and, as fate would have it, just at that time, in January, February, March of that year, an issue arose in Japan between their civil aeronautics authority and our airlines. It was a question of paying landing fees, as I recall, or a noise levy. Maybe that was it. But it was a money situation, and our airlines were refusing to pay it or refusing to pay as much as was being asked. Just at that time, our airlines entered into litigation in Japan, as fate would have it. And as fate would have it, their representative on council was a lawyer. That was what he knew more than anything else, so he jumped into the midst of this legal case in Japan. I'm sure that gave him an excuse to vote against us. So there were a number of things. The house of cards just collapsed altogether within ninety days.

*Q: How did this affect you?*

DILLON: It, of course, was a terrible disappointment. It was a hurt. But under the circumstances, that is, that my sister was dying and I was faced with this personal situation, it was less of a hurt than what I was going through personally.

*Q: You could keep it in perspective.*

DILLON: Sure. But I often look back, you see, again to Secretary Coleman's offer to me, which was almost prophetic. If I had accepted that in late November or December and come to Washington in lieu of doing the candidacy, I would have been back in the United States, closer to my sister. Of course, at that time I had no idea what we were facing from the standpoint of her situation. But as I look back, I think I should have done that and avoided all of this candidacy and been in the States and been closer to her. But that's retrospect. We only make the decisions we feel we have to make.

*Q: That's right.*

DILLON: We continued on in ICAO, of course, all of the work that had to be undertaken. A couple of years before, I had been invited by the Soviet delegation to make a semi-official visit to the Soviet Union, which I did. Washington very kindly made it semi-official and funded my trip. My daughter and I visited Kiev, where we visited the Aviation Training School, and were entertained by aviation officials there.

We stopped in Prague first, at the invitation of the director of civil aviation there and the Czechoslovakian representative on the council, and had an excellent three-day visit there, then went on to Kiev, and from Kiev to Leningrad. We flew on the local airlines. I wanted to do that. We flew with CSA, the Czechoslovakian line, from Prague to Kiev. It was a marvelous experience.

*Q: Aeroflot was?*

DILLON: Yes! Well, marvelous in the sense of exciting. [Laughter] First of all, we were put on the plane by our hosts in Kiev with armloads of flowers. They love flowers in the Soviet Union and seem to have them year 'round, from goodness knows what sources. But the Ukraine, of course, was more prolific in that regard than the northern cold climate. The plane was very, very, very crowded, and I think there was one stewardess, but no effort made to give service of any kind. There was baggage and everything but a coop of chickens on the plane. It was really loaded. But it was a good flight and left fairly on time and got there fairly on time.

*Q: What does the stewardess do?*

DILLON: Not much. [Laughter]

*Q: Just there in case somebody faints?*

DILLON: I suppose so. Not much. It was a small plane. It was one of the smaller Ilyushins, as I recall. But it was interesting to see how they handled the flight.

In Leningrad, we met with one of the officials of the Aviation Institute there and some friends who had been designated to host us, had a very nice three-or four-day visit there, and then went down to Moscow on the train, which was interesting as well. The trains were crowded, but they were fast and efficient, the tracks were well maintained, and I thought the train itself was.

*Q: Were they diesels or electric?*

DILLON: Good question. They must be diesel for that length of travel. I didn't notice.

In Moscow, we received the treatment that many visitors receive, especially at that time. We had to cool our heels for a few days, but we had been given a guide if we wanted to use her, and that had been arranged by the Intourist Aeroflot people in Montreal. So we did some sightseeing. We were at the Metropole on the second floor, a marvelous big stone building, and on the second floor, there's a stone ledge all the way around. My daughter and I were relaxing, talking. The window was behind me, and all of a sudden my daughter got a strange look on her face, and she said, "Mother, there's a man there on the ledge!" [Laughter] So I turned quickly and looked just enough to see him pass beyond the window. It was obviously some kind of surveillance. To this day I don't know if it was KGB or CIA. [Laughter] But it obviously was someone eavesdropping at our window on that second-story ledge on a huge hotel.

It was a very good visit. The second or third day I said I'd like to go out on our own. At that point my daughter had no Russian; she has manageable Russian now. That's the handicap, of course. When people say they won't let you go out on your own, you can't go out on your own if you don't speak Russian or have some little bit of a semblance of it. So I said, "Let's give it a try."

So we left the hotel. The first mistake we made was trying to hail a cab on the street. There are taxi stands, and you have to go there and queue up and wait your turn until the next taxi comes along. Well, we soon caught on to that and walked a couple of blocks to the line and got a taxi, and we went to the basketball tournament between the U.S. team and the Soviet team. I'm not up on basketball, but that was a very famous, exciting game in which we beat the Soviets, but it had been publicized at great length. So we went there in a taxi, sat, enjoyed the game, chatted. There were some other Americans there from, I guess, in the embassy or somewhere. We said hello. We caught a cab afterward, then came back to the hotel. We had a very, very nice evening.

By the third or fourth day, the officials that I had been referred to contacted us at the hotel, and I was calling their offices, too, in the meantime. I went out with two of them for a dinner meeting, had a marvelous time, a great deal of vodka and many courses of dinner and so forth.

*Q: Caviar?*

DILLON: Oh, yes. We arranged a visit at Sheremetiyev, the airport, and I was taken through most of the facilities there. There had just been a crash there of a Japan Airlines plane, went off the end of the runway or something. I've forgotten the details now. They were saying something about their computer system. I asked about the crash and how it was investigated or what could have caused it. Anyhow, a computer became involved in the conversation, so I asked where the computer was and could I see it. They said, "Well, yes, but all computers look alike." So, in fact, we did go to the printer's and went down to the basement, to the computer banks. But even in that visit, which was in '73 or '74, I found them to be very open and very interested and interesting.

I've worked with Soviet delegations since 1960. When I was at Civil Aeronautics Board, I was involved in the negotiation of the bilateral air transport agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union, pursuant to which Pan Am started flying to Moscow and Aeroflot started flying to New York. So off and on over the years, I have worked with Soviets and dealt with them, and I've called at the embassy, trying to get charter rights when I was working with Overseas National Airways and so forth. Then to be in residence with them in Montreal, then to visit the Soviet Union. Two things: first of all, I think they're very much like us, very, very much like the Americans, or at least like Americans used to be, in the sense they're down to earth, they're practical, no nonsense, unsophisticated.

On the other hand, they come from a different culture, they have some different mental processes, different ways of communicating and so forth, and I think we need to understand that more. Even the language is a serious barrier with the Russians. I've been in meetings with them, in the council, and other places, when serious issues were not handled properly simply because of translation. It's so important that we recognize the difficulties of translating and interpreting from one language to another, or in the case of ICAO, we had to have a swing interpreter, in the sense that the English was translated into a third language and then translated to the Russian.

*Q: Yes, it can get quite far off the track.*

DILLON: Very far off the track. My second Soviet rep on the council was Vladi Morosov, a younger man, less qualified in technical aviation, but a good internationalist. I've seen him interrupt the council debates because he would be listening to the interpretation in another language and say, "Oh, no, that's not what I said," or, "That is not what was said." He had enough sense of English and perhaps a little French that he was following closely the interpretation.

I very much enjoyed working with the Soviets, and I found them very supportive. I could count on them on many key votes. They would vote with the United States. They helped us on the MLS decision very, very much.

In 1976, in the winter, the year before I left ICAO and not long after the secretary general vote, I was asked to go to Montevideo, Uruguay as the United States' observer to the annual or biannual conference of the Latin American Civil Aviation Commission. It was a new organization which was intergovernmental and, of course, interline, that is, with airline representation. The United States had not been invited to its previous conferences. There had been two or three of them. Although ICAO was not directly involved and I was not directly involved, I had been able, in Montreal, to get an invitation for us by working with the Latin American representatives on the council and the president of the council, who was from Argentina, and to convince them that the United States really should be a part of these meetings. We were all in the Western Hemisphere and we had many mutual interests in aviation.

Since I had been instrumental in bringing this about, I was asked to go as the United States' observer. The sessions were all in Spanish, so this meant I had to brush up on my Spanish, which I did late nights. I think I got a Berlitz set of records or something and studied very hard for a few weeks before I went. I got the working papers in Spanish ahead of time and went through those, so I was able to follow quite well. I don't speak Spanish well, but I certainly got through the conference and, I think, was an able representative. That was an interesting trip. It was the first time I had been south of Mexico in Latin America, and enjoyed it very much. I think we established a good rapport with the Latin American governments that were represented there.

I might say up to that point, the Department of State had taken the position that LACAC, as it was called, had deliberately excluded us from these meetings, that they didn't want us to know what was going on, etc. I found this not to be the case. This attitude had prevailed in Washington for two, three, four years or longer, and we had built on this thinking. Once I started talking with people about our wanting to be there and why we should be there, I found no resentments against the invitation at all. It was issued rather automatically, and I understand we were invited to the next one.

*Q: Very good.*

DILLON: We had a visit from the inspector general of the Foreign Service. I can't recall exactly when, but we received a cable saying that he was coming through Montreal, I believe from meetings in Europe, and was on his way back to Washington. The cable implied that he would like to spend some time with me and be briefed on the mission activities there. At first I thought I'd have a reception for him, but then I learned he would be there only overnight, and I felt perhaps the time would be better utilized if we had dinner. Indeed, that's what he suggested.

I asked him to the residence first for cocktails, and had the maid prepare a very lovely tea cart full of hors d'oeuvres and so forth. This is an anecdote. [Laughter] My tea cart has two leaves that come up and have a brace under them. The residence in Montreal was very, very large, and the living room was alongside the dining room; but in front of both of them was a floor-to-ceiling plate glass window, so that when you sat in the living room, you could see the dining room reflected in the window and vice versa. The inspector general and I were sitting in the living room, having a drink and talking, and the tea cart was at the end of the dining room. We had gotten a plate of hors d'oeuvres and gone back to the living room. As we were talking, I heard this strange noise from the dining room area, kind of a combination "swwwish" and little rattling, and I'd never heard anything like it in my life. I couldn't imagine what it was. In the plate glass window I saw that one of the leaves on the tea cart had collapsed, and the entire content of the tea cart had slid down the tablecloth onto the floor. [Laughter] So, needless to say, I was very upset. But I never told him, and he doesn't know to this day.

So we went on with our drink, but instead of suggesting that he go back to the cart, we hastily departed for dinner. [Laughter] That incident marked my remembrances of the inspector general's visit. He was a former ambassador, of course, and a very, very fine

man. I think he has since retired. He seemed to be very pleased with the way the mission was running and with what was going on there.

The consul general had met him at the airport. She had cars and drivers, of course. It was a woman, B.J. Harper, a most competent person. I can't say enough for her service to the United States and to the Department of State. She was most cooperative where I was concerned, and when she knew a VIP was coming, she would often suggest that her car be used. I could go in the car and meet my visitor, or we would both go, or she would go. On this occasion, she went, and that gave her an opportunity to chat with the inspector general as well.

The consulate was a large one. It's a consulate general. I found everyone there to be cooperative, although we didn't have to use them very much.

After I took the telex out of my mission, we used cable traffic, formal State Department cable traffic, to transmit our reports and to receive instructions from Washington. I found this to be a much more effective way of disseminating information about ICAO in Washington. The consul general and I had an understanding with respect to diplomatic functions, social functions. She knew that I was extremely busy running my mission, a highly technical one, and I knew she was extremely busy with passports and visas and trade developments and what have you, for the tremendous amount of work they have, being in Canada so close to the United States. She would invite me when the guest list included someone that she thought I should know or should have an opportunity to talk with, and similarly, I included her when it was appropriate. We had an understanding that on those many occasions when it wasn't appropriate, we would not impose upon one another. She was a wonderful buddy and a great help.

*Q: I suppose you didn't really have much time to be together, did you?*

DILLON: Not a great deal.

*Q: But nice that you two could work so well and effectively together. You mentioned Secretary [William P.] Rogers. Did he come to Montreal?*

DILLON: No, unfortunately not, but I did meet with him in Washington while I was chairman of the Committee on Unlawful Interference. He called a meeting in Washington of a handful of people who were directly involved with the hijacking problem. It had become especially serious, because the Airline Pilots Association, ALPA, was considering calling a strike if the U.S. government and/or ICAO didn't do something about the hijacking and unlawful interference problem. The pilots felt they were endangered, which they certainly were, and that they were being called upon to do things that were far beyond what a commercial pilot should be involved in.

Secretary Rogers called a meeting, and I was called down from Montreal in consultation, and half a dozen of us met with him for a discussion of the problem and the issues. I

recall he asked for my reading on how serious the pilots were about going on strike. I reminded him and the group that they had threatened a strike a year or two before, but it was a matter of growing concern to them, and that the time had come, in my judgment, even if it were nothing more than a gesture, an attempt, if something meaningful weren't done, they would go out. I believe it was shortly after that, that I was able to get Security Annex 17 through the ICAO council, which pleased Department of State very much. It probably was a factor in avoiding the strike by the pilots.

In the meantime, you see, we had a Department of Transportation (DoT) now, and there was an assistant secretary or deputy assistant secretary, a retired general, General Benjamin Davis, a black man, one of the first top blacks in Department of Transportation, who was in charge of security for DoT. He came up for the hearings on the security annex, and I recall he sat through the entire morning session. While he was there, the council members were very, very active. Each one of them, it seemed, wanted to intervene, and they gave long speeches. Again, I think there's this attitude, especially on the part of developing countries, that here is an opportunity to impress a top official from Washington, D.C. So the material moved very slowly. The annex was many pages long. We went on through the ordinary lunchtime adjournment hour until about 1:00, 1:30, and this gentleman had to catch a plane back to Washington. He whispered to me that he was very discouraged and pessimistic, but he said, "Hang in there and do the best you can." He went on to the airport.

As soon as he left, things speeded up very fast. [Laughter] Also it was getting to be lunchtime, you see. So about 1:30, there was a motion to adjourn for lunch, and I said, "No, no, no. We're going very fast now. We spent the entire morning on this. This is the third reading of this annex. We're going to finish it." We did, including some of the most difficult issues that had been raised previously. A hungry council is a fast council. So I was able to call General Davis at the airport before his plane departed, and say, "Congratulations. You can go back to Washington with a new annex." [Laughter] He couldn't believe it. He was very, very pleased.

*Q: You could hardly tell him he was holding up the works! [Laughter]*

DILLON: Very fine gentleman.

*Q: Each anecdote reinforces the importance of person-to-person diplomacy, the importance of personalities in conflicts or agreements, how crucial these things can be.*

DILLON: Yes. There is that human element. We overlook that so often in our international relations at all levels. After all, a minister of foreign affairs or a secretary of state is a human being, and even at that level, these are human beings. They have good days, they have bad days, they have personal interests, they have governmental interests. Those things should be taken into consideration, underlying everything else.

*Q: And the biases you bring to a job.*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: I was thinking particularly of John Foster Dulles and the biases he brought, which precluded getting along with the Russians.*

DILLON: Yes. I have been in conferences later in my career, as you will see, where that was precisely the case, that our representatives were so constituted personally that one was working in an atmosphere of confrontation, and the goal of the negotiations was *not* to reach agreement.

*Q: Not only a waste of time, but dangerous.*

DILLON: Very dangerous.

*Q: It's interesting, too, the way a success in one area can bring about a success in another area. A perfect example, of course, is your 25 percent.*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: But even if a team does well or people on differing teams get along well at the Olympics, it creates that little special something that goes a long way. And it's so obvious, I don't know why more use isn't made of these things.*

DILLON: I think that even when you have an atmosphere of cooperation and coordination, you get that among individuals who may not be of like mind regarding the issues. They may have governmental instructions or national instructions that are different from yours, political positions that are different, but if you have that personal rapport, "I understand you and you understand me. I understand your problems, you understand my problems," you get that same kind of teamwork feeling, although you can't come out at a place where everyone is happy about the result. But you come out at a place where everyone can accept it and they know how you got there and they understand it. Understanding is very, very important.

*Q: It certainly is.*

DILLON: I think that was the case in New York, in connection with the assessment ceiling vote. I think those people from ICAO, those that I knew and who knew me, who knew the United States through me, we were a team. Some of their positions were not the 25 percent ceiling. Some of their positions were against any ceiling, or they had some other figure in mind. But we were all there on behalf of aviation and the welfare of the organization, and you get that same kind of feeling. Somehow you work it out together, and you can live with the result. Once again, I've been in other conferences later on where that was not the case and the entire conference exploded.

I enjoyed all of this very, very much. I see that you have the possibility of loneliness down here [in the questionnaire]. I have never been lonely. I enjoy being alone a great deal. I'm an avid gardener. That's one of my hobbies.

*Q: Did you have time to do that in Canada?*

DILLON: Not a great deal of time, and I didn't have a garden, because the residence was in a large apartment in the Port Royal. But I chose the apartment because it had a twenty-five-foot loggia with a huge plate glass window and a marble shelf inside the window, and it was perfect for plants and for inside gardening. I had it crowded with plants, large and small. My guests enjoyed my little garden very much. I had a collection of African violets that was beyond imagining. They bloomed year 'round. The light was just right for them, and the temperature.

I had one incident that was not pleasant. My daughter gave me a miniature rose for Mother's Day one year. After, I think, the second year, I'd had it a while and some aphids came out on my rose. I got a little spray can of pesticide and sprayed it a couple of times, but it wasn't getting the job done. One evening I came home, I suppose I'd had a very frustrating day at the council, but it was a Friday evening, and I mixed a drink and got a little plate of hors d'oeuvres, and went out to do my gardening. I found the aphids had really taken off, so I became upset. I got my pesticide and I fogged that loggia. Well, of course, it went in my drink, it went on my cheese and crackers, I breathed it, and I didn't realize how intense it was until my daughter came out of her room, which was on the other side of the apartment, quite a distance away, and said, "Mother, what are you doing? I can smell that stuff in my shower!" So I know I overdid it.

Well, about three o'clock in the morning that night, I awoke and my first thought was, "I'm dying. I don't know what it is, but it's going to kill me." I've never in my life had that feeling, and I didn't know what it was, of course. I hadn't suspected at that point. I was extremely ill. I, of course, didn't go into work, and the next day I couldn't. I was out for two or three days. I kept getting worse, you see, rather than better. Finally, Kath and I were talking about it, and she said, "Mother, don't you remember what you did with that pesticide spray?"

Well, it turns out that it was, just a few months after that, banned. It was one of the most dangerous of the insecticides, and I had simply breathed it and eaten it and whatever, and poisoned myself. I was out for a good ten days. I had to cancel some speaking engagements and so forth.

*Q: Was this an intestinal upset, or your breathing, or both?*

DILLON: It was everything. I was nauseated. It was a neurological thing as well. I didn't have convulsions, nothing that serious, but I couldn't think and I was shaking. It was a very serious reaction.

A few months later, I had occasion to have a physical, for some reason or another, and I'd forgotten all about this incident. My doctor said my blood count, even at that late date, was one of the worst he had ever seen. So, you see, it partially destroyed my blood, is what it did.

*Q: The red cells, you mean?*

DILLON: Yes. As well as doing some temporary nerve damage.

*Q: This was several months later that you had the test?*

DILLON: Yes. So at the time it must have been really quite serious.

*Q: Indeed. Are you aware of the very similar thing that happened to Clare Boothe Luce in Italy?*

DILLON: I did hear at the time that she had lead poisoning from the paint in the building.

*Q: We really don't know. That's what was said at the time, and certainly it's what she believed, but there is some doubt about whether or not it was that. It seemed to have been some substance, and she had the same thing, neurological giddiness, inability to concentrate, and that sort of thing. It might have been that or it could have been something else that she was exposed to.*

DILLON: Sure. This taught me a lesson about insecticides and pesticides, especially indoors, you see, where there was no circulation.

*Q: Did it make you feel an inability to concentrate?*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: I'm interested in that aspect of it.*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: You were just in a fog?*

DILLON: Yes, exactly. It was like a very, very serious case of flu, but I mean a serious one, not a bad cold. A far-away kind of thing--

*Q: You hurt all over.*

DILLON: Yes, and some lack of physical coordination, in the sense that--

*Q: You'd stumble when you walked?*

DILLON: Yes, and I was slow about everything.

*Q: But it all regenerated, your nerves?*

DILLON: Oh, yes.

*Q: But it can be--isn't that what Agent Orange does, it causes permanent damage?*

DILLON: I think so, and I think they said that the ingredient, pyrethrin, I believe is what it was, and it was banned a few months afterward for that very reason.

*Q: Terrible. I'm very glad that you didn't have a lasting thing, because it must have been very frightening.*

DILLON: At the time, of course, we had no idea, and I think by the time I was recuperating from it, we guessed what it was. Of course, one can always surmise that somebody has put a pill in your drink or something. If you're an ambassador, that pops into your mind. [Laughter]

*Q: There's always that problem.*

DILLON: But we didn't have security problems in Montreal to any great extent, but there was a period of concern during the hijacking period when I was, after all, chairman of the United Nations Committee on Unlawful Interference. Especially at the time of the Israeli shoot-down of the Libyan jet and some of the other international incidents involving aviation, it was a very delicate political situation, but I was never concerned. I was never paranoid about it. One can't be. I was careful, and I was careful for my daughter. We had some orientation sessions at the consulate that were very helpful.

*Q: About when was this pesticide incident? Did it coincide with either the Israeli shoot-down or the chairmanship of the anti-terrorism committee?*

DILLON: The Israeli incident and the diplomatic conference in New York would have been in 1972. This other thing must have happened in '73, perhaps. They really were not close to one another in time that I recall.

But the only little incident I can remember that even smacked of security just shows one should not allow oneself to become paranoid. I had been to an orientation session at the consulate, and I vowed to myself that I would try to be more careful about some of these things. Just a day or two later, there was delivered to my office a package, to me personally. My secretary brought it in. I said, "Do you know what this is?" "No, I don't know what it is." It was a strange-size box and it was kind of heavy, and I said, "I think we ought to get this out of the office."

So we moved it out into the hall very quickly and called the security officer from the ICAO secretariat. He was a very bright young man, happened to be an American, but a careerist in the multinational system. He came very quickly and very efficiently did something or other. They wouldn't let us go out to the hall. He opened it up and it was flowers from the mother of one of my daughter's girlfriends. [Laughter] For some special occasion; I've forgotten what. She worked in the secretariat, as a matter of fact, and she had been gracious enough to send flowers. So we were all very chagrined and very embarrassed, but the security officer wasn't. And in retrospect, it was the thing to have done.

*Q: Oh, yes, especially with so many crazies running around those international organizations.*

DILLON: Yes. We occasionally had calls at the residence, sometimes at odd hours. There was a period when I would receive anonymous calls very early in the morning, about daylight.

*Q: Never found out what they were?*

DILLON: No.

*Q: Just referring briefly to this illness that you had from the pesticide, were you aware right away what it was?*

DILLON: No. I couldn't imagine what it was. Even that night, I kept thinking it was flu. I didn't know what to think. I had never, and have not since, had anything like that.

*Q: It came on so quickly and was so serious?*

DILLON: So quickly, and it was different. I suppose the way it affects your neurological makeup, your mind; it was different.

*Q: Did you ever suspect other administered poison at that time?*

DILLON: No, no, I don't think that ever occurred to me, frankly. Just now, as a matter of fact, when we were talking about it. Nor did anyone suggest it. I can't remember what I did that particular day. It would have had to be something at lunch. I hadn't had dinner yet. It would have had to have been, I should think, in my drink, which I had just mixed myself, or in my cheese and crackers. I don't think so, really. When they came out with the ban on this very thing a couple of months later, I was convinced.

*Q: It certainly sounds like it. Even though you were on this committee about terrorism, you yourself didn't feel threatened, except that one incident with the flowers?*

DILLON: No, no, it didn't concern me.

*Q: Nor were you a target, apparently.*

DILLON: No, not that I'm aware of at all.

*Q: That's good. Did you have to do any entertaining on July Fourth, that sort of thing? That was all done at the consulate?*

DILLON: That was done by the consulate. Several of my colleagues would send a little personal note of congratulations or an expression. Also, the council and the committees adjourned on June 30, so, of course, that was only four days later. It might have been a nice time to do something, but, frankly, we had so many diplomatic functions, when June 30 rolled around, we were all ready to forget about ICAO and rearrange our summer schedules.

*Q: Did your officers have wives?*

DILLON: On my staff or within the council?

*Q: On your staff; the junior officers.*

DILLON: The junior FSO was married. The secretary was not, my administrative assistant, and the receptionist were not.

*Q: Then your commissioner was married?*

DILLON: Yes, he was married.

*Q: Did you have much to do with the wives, or did you include them in things?*

DILLON: George Wolf, my commissioner and deputy, and his wife Betty, we were together constantly. We were almost always at the same social functions. Sometimes the commission had their own and the council had their own, but very often we were together there. Of course, George and I were working together day in and day out.

*Q: Did he ever take your seat when you couldn't be available?*

DILLON: First of all, you just have to always be available as council member, but the answer is yes, on rare occasions. Not so much if I wasn't there, but when there was a highly technical issue or something the commission had spent a lot of time on, I would ask him to sit with me and either get support from him or ask him to take the microphone, I think, on occasion. But to sit in for me, no, because he had his own *full* plate, you see.

*Q: You mentioned that. But I wondered when you were ill that time, whether or not he had to cover for you.*

DILLON: Frankly, I just don't remember. I know that I had plans to give a lecture at Cambridge, at Harvard, one of those days, (which had to be canceled) which leaves me thinking there must have been a day or two that we weren't meeting. Council meets Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, and the committees in between. If the committees finish early in their session, sometimes you didn't have meetings on Tuesday and Thursday, so that might have accounted for part of it.

*Q: Of course, Canada isn't a foreign country, anyway, and therefore, you don't have the problem of wives that are at loose ends, I wouldn't think.*

DILLON: Not so much among our wives. Certainly Betty Wolf was extremely active. She worked with the wives of other delegates, many of whom did have adjustment problems, especially of a cross-cultural nature, some of them serious problems. She organized some of the other wives who had been in Montreal for a few years, and they saw to it that new wives were oriented and were helped with respect to schools for their children and where to shop and that kind of thing, and helped them with the social schedule and so forth. She rendered, I think, a tremendous service in that regard, a most unusual woman. Unfortunately, Mr. Wolf is seriously ill now, and the last time I talked with Betty, she was having a very difficult time, but is bearing up quite well under it.

The junior Foreign Service officer was married to a nice, interesting young woman, and we included them whenever it was appropriate in the social functions. They both seemed to adjust well and liked Montreal.

*Q: And your entire staff you would include when appropriate?*

DILLON: When appropriate, absolutely. From time to time, we entertained in the offices, especially after we moved into the new building in '75. I think that was the spring of '74 or '75. We had a nice conference room, as well as a kitchenette, and we hadn't had those niceties in the old building. So we would invite people in for a coffee hour for some reason.

*Q: At those times when you entertained in the office, did you ever have to rely on the wives of your officers to help you?*

DILLON: I don't recall that they helped in the office. Betty Wolf certainly helped with the overall social schedule. For example, I would suggest to her and to George sometime that I thought it might be more appropriate if they entertained if there were, for example, a technical panel coming; that I would be happy to attend if they wanted, but it might be a good time for them to give a little cocktail party or reception. On occasion, they acted as co-host and hostess when I entertained, if it were a very large occasion.

I remember once when I was detained in the office, which I often was in the evening, and I was hosting a very large group at eight o'clock for dinner. It was buffet, fortunately, not sit-down formal, and I was on the phone with Washington and I was waiting for cables to

come over from the consulate, and I saw that I was going to be late for my own dinner party, so I asked Betty and George to go on ahead and coordinate with Kathy and see that everything moved along, and for them to act as host and hostess when the guests started arriving. I think, that was the same evening that I found myself going up on the elevator with my guests, which left them terribly concerned. [Laughter] I tried to cover my head and cower in the back of the elevator, but it didn't work. One of my colleagues said, "Betty, is that you?" I sheepishly said, "Yes," and they said, "Well, we are coming on the right evening, aren't we? This is your party?" I said, "Yes, we're all in it together."

*Q: You had a little help in the home, I believe you said. You had a woman come in?*

DILLON: Yes, I had a maid come in, I think twice a week, as I recall, and did the cleaning and helped a little bit in the kitchen, and, of course, whenever I entertained, she came for the evening. In addition, I had cooks and maids and bartender come in.

*Q: You and your daughter did the cooking? You didn't have it catered.*

DILLON: Yes. I only recall catering once. That was the last year I was there. I had a wine and cheese kind of thing done by caterers. It was very nice. But Kathy and I have always felt that our home is our home, whether it's an ambassadorial residence or otherwise, and we enjoy cooking. She's a wonderful cook. Because she had been involved in some cooking over the years, I think she didn't mind helping out with it.

My sister and I had bought a Colonel Sanders Kentucky Fried Chicken franchise in the late 1960s, which I mentioned earlier. My sister was operating it. When she became ill, my daughter went down to our business and helped, went through a management training program and helped in the franchise and set up a small catering service in connection with the franchise. Then, of course, she's been exposed to cuisines from other countries over the years and enjoys making couscous and tadjine and hot curries, as well as some very sophisticated French things. She's a gourmet cook.

*Q: At what age was she when you moved to Montreal?*

DILLON: She was born in 1956, and we went to Montreal in the winter of 1971-72, so she was in high school.

*Q: Fifteen. She was just a young girl. She went to a Canadian school?*

DILLON: To Trafalgar Girls' School, a private girls' school, which, once again, we didn't enjoy very much. She transferred for her last year to West Mount High School, which was a public high school, and graduated there. She went a year longer than would have been necessary. She had the choice of finishing a year earlier because of the difference in school systems, or doing an extra year. She chose to go with the extra year. I was still up there. That was her home, anyway, and I think she had the time. She said, "I'd rather do it that way than to be pressed to finish all of my high school work in three years."

*Q: Then what did she do after that? Did she go on to university?*

DILLON: That was the year that my sister was ill, so she came down to Indiana and ran the business. She went through a management training course and became manager of the business, under my sister's supervision, until my sister died. Then she stayed on for a brief transition period until we sold it. Then she very soon after that started university at George Washington University.

*Q: Then you didn't have her help with entertaining.*

DILLON: That was the last year I was up there, and I missed her very much. I always knew she would be there and could fill in.

*Q: I thought maybe she might have gone to McGill.*

DILLON: She could have, I suppose. We didn't anticipate being in Montreal for much more than another year or two, and McGill specializes in things other than what she's interested in, which is philosophy and the humanities. I had considered going to McGill, because they have one of the finest aviation schools in the world, one of the few graduate schools in aviation. It's known all over the world.

*Q: Did you have a chance to travel much around Canada?*

DILLON: Not a great deal. I just didn't have the time, and, of course, I was traveling internationally. In 1975, I guess it was that very important year, the government of Canada arranged for the council members to make a couple of trips, those who wanted to. One was to go down to Ottawa and visit Parliament House and meet with some of the officials there, and generally get an overall Canadian orientation. The other trip was to an air show in Vancouver. I believe that's where it was, in Western Canada, and see a bit of the western part of Canada. We were guests of the Canadian government. I don't recall how many council members went, but it was a goodly number.

*Q: You went to the Ottawa trip too?*

DILLON: Yes, I went on both of them. They were wonderful opportunities to get to know my colleagues better, and their families. Most of their wives went, some of their children.

*Q: Did you have much opportunity, and were you asked to give many speeches?*

DILLON: Yes and no. Not many of the kind I would like. Toward the end of my tour up there, I was asked to address the National Aviation Club in Washington, and they tell me they had a record turnout because they assumed I was going to be the first woman member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which did not come about. That was a memorable occasion. I enjoyed it very much.

I was asked to come down and address one of the other aviation groups, a worldwide group with a chapter in Washington. I spoke to them on an occasion and had several requests for copies of that speech. I recall referring to the "royal purple" as being significant down through history as designating aristocracy and leadership, what have you, and I recall saying that in ICAO, the United States "wears the purple," which is, of course, quite true. We are looked to as the aviation leaders of the world.

I had many speaking engagements in the Midwest, because I'm rather well known there because of our family roots in Indiana. I often address Rotary Club, Lion Club. I'm a member of the Daughters of the American Revolution in that area, and I often was asked to speak to them when I was home.

*Q: About aviation matters?*

DILLON: About my work, my career, and about ICAO and international relations in general. I am a member of Altrusa International, which is a women's charitable organization of executive women, and my chapter is in Southern Indiana. So I often address them. My press is from that area, for the most part, the *Indianapolis Star*, the *Louisville Courier Journal*, as well as the local papers. Of course, the *Washington Post* does things, too, when you have a big appointment.

*Q: What did you do for recreation in Montreal, Betty, besides gardening?*

DILLON: Besides gardening, not much.

*Q: How about keeping yourself fit?*

DILLON: I exercise. I did then and I still do. That's very important. I am an outdoor person, and I had hoped to ride up there. As a matter of fact, I made some arrangements early on. But frankly, there just was not the time. Of course, speaking of physical fitness, I walked to and from work about half a mile every day. I worked in Montreal for six years, and that included the wintertime when the snow was shoulder high sometimes on each side of the sidewalk.

I also acquired a little dog while I was up there, a little shihtzu, a fine apartment dog. I loved Li-po very much, and I took him walking, you see, morning and evenings.

*Q: What kind of a dog is he?*

DILLON: A shihtzu. They're Chinese and Southeast Asian. It's an old breed, and I understand that down through history they've been hunting dogs in the Orient.

*Q: They're little?*

DILLON: Yes, small. They're very much like a Pekinese, but they do not have that flat a nose. Their noses have a little bit more shape to them. White, long hair.

*Q: Do you still have Li-po?*

DILLON: No, I had him for five or six years. When I came back to Washington, I was traveling internationally and had so many responsibilities that I placed him with friends and had to give him up.

*Q: I wanted to ask you about this very nebulous feeling which results from having a great deal of power and being in the position of authority in a group, as you were; the chairman of this and head of that and so forth. What effect do you think that had on your own self-image and on your personal feelings of yourself?*

DILLON: One never knows what one's going to do when suddenly you find yourself with power, and we never know what others are going to do when they're suddenly given a lot of power. I have been in positions of authority before, when, in retrospect, and even at the time, I felt I wasn't handling it well. I drive myself and I'm inclined to drive others, and under that pressure, I become authoritarian. I'm aware of that, and I try very hard not to get carried away along that line. I'm fine until I get under extreme pressure, which I certainly was in this position day in and day out.

However, a strange thing happened with respect to the Montreal position. I didn't look upon it as a position of authority and power. I walked into it as though it were something I had been waiting to do all of my life. I was comfortable with it from the first five minutes. I knew where to go, what to say, how to handle it. Not that I didn't make a lot of mistakes, but from the standpoint of being able to cope and being in command of the situation, I was. For that very reason, I felt that I handled what little power and authority I had very well.

I felt humble in the position. I felt very modest and humble in the presence of my colleagues and in the presence of what was a very important international deliberative body, and that in and of itself, I think, tends to make you a little more reasonable about things.

*Q: Also a little, perhaps, in awe of the importance of the work that would come out of this deliberative body, I would think.*

DILLON: Yes. My working methods are such that I enjoy giving responsibility to other people, and I sometimes turn loose of too much responsibility. I want other people to know what's going on. I used to give my secretary a letter and then say, "I'm writing this because this has happened and that's happening, and I'm hoping the response will be this, that, and the other." Linda would say to me, "Mrs. Dillon, I really don't care about any of that. I don't want to hear it. Just give me the letter." [Laughter] But I felt that she, as a

Foreign Service careerist and a very bright career-oriented young woman, should have a little broader exposure to the overall picture.

*Q: Also you remembered how much you profited when you were a young woman.*

DILLON: Sure.

*Q: But not all young women are thinking that far ahead or are that ambitious.*

DILLON: Yes. On the other hand, I am very mindful of detail, and that's sometimes a deterrent. I think that stems from the fact that I worked so many years as a secretary when my responsibilities were detailed down to the last period and comma and piece of paper. If you have that emblazoned on your mind year after year, it's hard to get away from. So in my positions in later years, when I was at a higher level and had some power and authority, I found myself often concerned with details that I shouldn't have been concerned with. I find that doesn't happen if I'm working with a reliable staff and people that I can trust in the sense of knowing that they will do the job well and can turn things over to. But if I'm the least bit concerned or if I feel they're not capable of handling something properly, then I am inclined to revert very quickly to concern about detail.

*Q: Would you describe a typical day?*

DILLON: It's very difficult to arrange a typical day, because I think, in retrospect, there were no typical days in ICAO. They were all very difficult days, for one reason or another. I always walked to work and walked home in the evening. It was about a quarter of a mile. I tried to get there between 8:00 and 8:30. On arriving about 8:30, I would make up my work schedule or review my work schedule for the day, or make up my work schedule for the week. I would check the executive council agendas for the meetings that week (they met on Monday and Wednesday afternoons and Friday mornings), the committee agendas, if any of the committees were meeting on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

At 9:00 o'clock, I might have a staff meeting. I tried to have one either Monday morning, early, or the last thing on Friday so we could review the week and get set for the following week. About 10:00, we would receive cables from the consulate and have our mail and correspondence in. I would go through that and perhaps write a couple of letters or send instructions to staff.

At 10:30, I might very likely have an appointment with one of the other delegations, perhaps the United Kingdom, who was very often a "friend in court," and I liked to coordinate and cooperate with him, Air Vice Marshal Russell. That might be followed by a visit with the president of the executive council, because I liked to keep him apprised of where we were on major issues. He didn't like surprises in the council meetings, so I kept him in touch with what we were doing.

I might rush back to the office in time to brief a visiting technical delegation or to be briefed by them if they'd been in meetings in Montreal. This might be followed by a brief meeting with the United States air navigation commissioner, my deputy, regarding some technical issue that was coming before council from the commission or something having to do with a technical panel that might be visiting in Montreal.

Around noon, I would check to see if any of our Washington positions were in for the afternoon council meeting. They came in by cable, as a rule, through the consulate, although occasionally we'd get something in writing. Very often I tried to catch some delegates before they left for lunch, because I found that many of them didn't return from late lunches until just before the council convened at 2:00. I might *run* among African delegations and Latin American delegations in order to find out what they were going to do on a certain issue or let them know what we were going to do.

At 12:30, I might jot down some remarks that I was going to make before the council on a certain agenda item. I might call the secretariat and ask the status of a certain panel meeting or check on a certain committee agenda or ask some administrative question about the pending ICAO budget or something of that kind.

At 1:00 o'clock, I might well go to a luncheon of some kind given either by an ICAO delegation or someone in the aviation community, IATA, which is also headquartered in Montreal, or it might be an occasion in which we were saying farewell to a colleague or that kind of thing. Those were important, because they were part of ongoing relationships in the ICAO family.

At 2:00 o'clock, council meeting in the council chambers. At 3:00 or 3:30, we'd have a break. I would *run* back to the office, check incoming cables, phone calls, correspondence, and perhaps touch base with the air navigation commissioner.

The council usually adjourned around 5:00 or sometimes it would go until 6:00, or on one or two occasions, later than that. Around 5:15, I might call Washington Department of State, if I thought it was necessary, if there had been some significant development in the afternoon council meeting or if I hadn't received a position that I very much needed.

At 5:30, I might write a reporting cable on what had transpired during the afternoon, during the council meeting, agenda item by agenda item. Around 6:00, because things were beginning to get quiet by then, I might review the files for the committee meeting the next morning, which I would have asked my secretary to put on my desk. Maybe by 6:30 this technical delegation that was visiting there will have broken up, and they will all pour into the office, the U.S. delegation, and they and the air navigation commissioner might sit down with me and say, "Betty, let us tell you what happened this afternoon. What do you think?"

By 7:00 o'clock, I might do some paperwork, draft out some notes, draft a reporting cable to Washington, write out some correspondence for my secretary, and leave at maybe 7:30

for the residence. I very likely would have a social function in the evening. It might be a formal dinner at 8:00 or 9:00 o'clock, or it might be a 7:30 or 8:00 o'clock reception, followed by a formal dinner elsewhere around 9:00 o'clock. It might be given by a large delegation, it might be in honor of a visiting group, and those were extremely important and I dared not miss one. A lot of negotiating was done there, and a lot of contacts were made, as well as just building good working relationships *et cetera* with your colleagues. Then, of course, often you negotiated a position that evening, which you then met on at 10:00 o'clock the next morning in committee or council.

So it was always a twelve-hour day, and very often a fifteen-hour day. I recall leaving the office one night at midnight after writing myself, the working paper on ICAO in which we proposed anew committee on aviation and the environment. The night air was cold and crisp. We tried to save our weekends. Sometimes I did paperwork on Saturdays, but there was an informal understanding among council members and within ICAO that weekends were sacred. You did not schedule diplomatic functions over the weekend, barring some emergency. We did not work over the weekend and that really saved us.

*Q: I wonder if at this time, Betty, you could remember some of the honors and awards that you have been given over the years.*

DILLON: I've been very pleased to have been recognized a few times by my government, particularly. When I was named the first woman country director in Peace Corps early in my career, I was selected by Peace Corps as their Federal Career Woman's nominee, and was very honored. Interestingly enough, in ICAO years later, I was selected by the Department of State as its nominee for the Federal Career Woman's Award. In neither case were we selected government wide as one of the recipients of the award, but it was a great honor for me to be the nominee in both of those cases. At CAB I had received a certificate for "Sustained Meritorious Performance and Devotion to the Public Service in African Affairs." In 1975 the Business and Professional Women designated me a "Woman of Achievement."

On the occasion of my speaking before the National Aviation Club toward the end of my tour in Montreal, I was given an honorary membership in the National Aviation Club, which I appreciated especially because it is made up primarily of aviation personnel, airline representation, and many of the men and women that I had worked with in the aviation industry over the years. So that was an especially nice thing to come my way.

*Q: And well-known pilots, that sort of person?*

DILLON: Not pilots as much as airline presidents, vice presidents, Washington representatives, and so forth. But including many of the government people. FAA, CAB, and so forth, belong or attend regularly. It represents the aviation community, generally.

*Q: How did you feel about leaving Montreal?*

DILLON: I didn't mind leaving. I had been there six years. While I had enjoyed every moment of it and had been very, very successful, I felt that I had been there long enough. Just the last year that I was there, I began to feel a little bit bored, a little bit stale. I don't think I neglected any of my work, but the whole thing was growing tiresome. I knew the game, I knew the players, I knew the issues. Many of them hadn't changed over the years. I felt it would be a welcome relief to move on.

What did shock me was the way that my transfer out was handled. I had held on in Montreal through my sister's terminal illness, when I really should have been with my family. I had turned down the deputy administrator position at FAA. Just a month or two before she passed away, I was informed by my desk officer in the Department of State that the assistant secretary had asked *him* to tell me that I was being replaced after six years, and all I had done in Montreal. I felt it could have been handled a little bit more graciously.

*Q: Am I to understand this is under a new administration?*

DILLON: Yes and no. It was under the Carter administration, but they had been in for a year. I had been told informally that it was most likely they would leave me in Montreal because I had done very well, and they were pleased with the situation. I later learned that I was pulled out because a political appointment was waiting in the wings, and that was the particular position he wanted. It wasn't as though he could have been placed elsewhere. He had been told by his sponsoring senator that he could have any position he wanted, and that was the job that he knew and wanted.

*Q: How did your colleagues feel about that? Did they know in what a preemptory way you were given your congé?*

DILLON: No. Sometimes I discussed with them, if it were appropriate, the internal workings of things, but I didn't think it was appropriate to discuss that with them. I wanted also to give my successor every advantage as he came in. He had been a pilot in the Second World War and, I think, wanted to perhaps reminisce a bit about his early aviation days and pick up on his aviation interests. He was an attorney from the Midwest. I must say they were very lenient about scheduling his coming in and my going out. My sister was by then in the last stages of her illness and, as a matter of fact, passed away in September, so I asked Washington if I could please remain in the position for a couple of months through the summer when nothing was going on, anyway, and that my replacement come in in the early fall when he could begin with the new council sessions and get oriented very quickly. They were agreeable to that.

My sister passed away in the middle of September, and I came back to Washington the first of October. I had assumed, because I was a careerist, that another appointment would be available to me, either in the department or, since I was Civil Service, after all, not Foreign Service, somewhere in government, perhaps FAA, where, after all, I had been offered the deputy administrator's position, or the Department of Transportation.

I was given a consultancy in the Department of State for two reasons. First, I was asked to do two papers for the new deputy assistant secretary of state who backstopped ICAO. One was on issues and problems in international aviation, a substantive paper, and the other was on procedures for formulating United States government policy and positions for ICAO. I prepared these papers over a period of two months. They were very well done. Nothing like this had been done before; it was the first effort to provide a point of reference for all of the people involved in international aviation. (Just a few years ago I asked about it. The IO desk officer said that he always kept a copy at his desk--it was their "Bible".)

*Q: This was for the assistant secretary of IO [Bureau of International Organizations]?*

DILLON: Yes. The consultation had been provided for me for a second reason. I had been selected the year before to head the United States delegation to the twenty-year World Administrative Radio Conference in Geneva, the conference which sets aeronautical radio channels, frequencies, and policy for ten or twenty years at a time. It's a worldwide conference and a highly technical one. That was to start in February. It was a six-week conference, and there was a twenty or twenty-five-man delegation, highly technical. I considered myself very, very privileged to have headed such a delegation, to have been selected for that kind of a conference. So because I was coming up to that assignment, the department worked out the two-month consultancy between Montreal and the Geneva conference.

When I finished the two papers in IO, I was set up in an office to begin preparation for the WARC, World Administrative Radio Conference, and began meeting with the very large preparatory committee here in Washington that had been working on our positions for a year or two. This, again, was a very, very heavy work schedule, and I had to work very hard to be brought up to date on all of the technical papers that had been prepared and the issues that were coming before the Geneva conference. It made it very difficult for me to follow up with my own network in Washington. I had been out of the country for seven years, after all, and really more than that, because I had gone to Montreal after having served in Peace Corps overseas, as well. So I'd been away and I needed to reestablish my contacts and begin seeking out a new assignment.

In late February, we went on to Geneva for one of the most hard-working and difficult conferences I've ever been involved in. It was day and night, long hours, highly technical. I had a superb delegation. There were men on that delegation who were *the* experts worldwide on some of this technology and these issues, but they were, at the same time, very practical and realistic, and just a superb group to work with.

Here again, on arrival in Geneva I found a situation quite different from what I had been told, in Washington, to expect. I'd been told that the secretary general of the International Telecommunications Union, the sponsoring UN agency, was anti-US and uncooperative, and that I could expect no cooperation from ITU. When I asked our attaché responsible

for liaison with ITU to take me to the secretary general for a courtesy call, the attaché didn't know where the office was--he had never been there. Secondly, fate was with me. The SecGen was Tunisian. The greeting was cordial (in Arabic) and this gentlemen and his secretariat was with us from beginning to end.

We were so successful in our positions throughout the conference and in having the conference reach agreement in and of itself, that that agreement went on before the worldwide all modes radio conference a year later and was adopted without change, I'm told.

Toward the end of the conference, everyone was becoming weary, we were all worn out, and conference officials were tired, and I recall that in the very last few days it seemed that we weren't going to be able to complete our work and to reach the final agreement on all of these positions. Time began to run out. The secretariat became concerned because they were running out of money. They had budgeted a certain amount of time for the conference. You began to hear talk about, "Perhaps we should go ahead and adjourn and reconvene in a few months," that kind of thing.

Well, we would have no part of that. I wanted no part of it. So we stepped up the work hours and cut short our recess times and moved ahead as rapidly as we could. The last night of the conference, many delegates had already left to go back home. Some of my own people had had to return to their positions. Some of them were industry advisors and that kind of thing, and they had had to return to Washington. So we had a skeletal conference, but, mind you, there were 100 or so people there. It was a full-blown worldwide conference.

It looked like we weren't going to be able to finish. We adjourned briefly for dinner and resumed in the evening after some committees met informally to do some work that we hoped would expedite things. Nine, ten, eleven o'clock came, we were working away on channels and some very last-minute, very small detailed kinds of things that had to be put into papers. There came a small, but really insignificant, confrontation between some of the developing countries who wanted more channels for aeronautical radio, and they began accusing the progressive advanced countries that they were hogging it all. When people become tired and restless, issues loom large.

By midnight, there was a suggestion that we should adjourn, but we moved on ahead. By one or two o'clock in the morning, it looked like we weren't going to be able to get a final draft together enough that the secretariat could then take it, editorialize, and put it out as our final document. There was a move to adjourn. I took the floor. I think there was only one of my delegates left in place at that point, members of my delegation. I took the floor and said, "No way. We came here for this agreement. We're going to leave with an agreement. We're right down to the wire. We have very little left to do. Let's adjourn for an hour and let the secretariat do what it needs to do. What we have so far, we can work on our positions during that time, come back together, and approve the final paper."

Well, I suppose that might have been one of the times in my career when I had an advantage being a woman. I was, of course, the only woman head of delegation there, and for a woman to say to all of these men delegates, at three o'clock in the morning, "I'm not budging. We're going to see this through," might have had some impact. I hope it did.

Well, that's the direction we went, and we did approve it, and it turned out to be a good paper. It was a good paper. As I recall, my remaining two or three or four delegates left the hall with me, walked back to the hotel as dawn was breaking over Geneva.

*Q: You must have felt rather exhilarated.*

DILLON: A couple of months later, I was giving an address in the Midwest and did the best I could to explain what it was I had been doing. It isn't easy to explain. You can't gloss over it. You can't generalize. Still, if you try to go into detail, people don't understand. So I gave a talk about the Geneva conference, and the first question in the question-and-answer period was from a lovely lady who said, "How did you like Switzerland, Betty?" [Laughter]

*Q: From the inside of that committee room. [Laughter]*

DILLON: I thought, "Well, in spite of the effort, I haven't gotten the message through." But in fairness to her, I was in Switzerland, I was in Geneva. But I might as well have been in Timbuktu. I saw the inside of the hotel, walked passed the embassy every day to the conference hall, lived in the conference hall until after dark, for six weeks.

*Q: Any free time was spent catching up, I suppose.*

DILLON: Sure.

*Q: Grueling.*

DILLON: It was grueling, but, again, very, very gratifying, because we did do what we went there to do, and, I think, had an enjoyable time doing it.

*Q: When you got back, did you receive credit for all this effort?*

DILLON: I surely did among the technical people. For example, the FAA men, the industry men, they're involved with aeronautical radio, ARINC, the airlines, and so forth. I recall receiving a standing ovation at a big RTCA [Radio Technical Commission of Aviation] meeting. It's the technical body that does most of our preparation on radio.

*Q: You came back and gave them a speech?*

DILLON: Yes, at the debriefing, but later I was an honored guest at one of their annual meetings, and received a long standing ovation, which once again made it all worthwhile.

*Q: Were you again the only woman at the lunch?*

DILLON: No, no, not at the lunch. There were 250 people there--men and women. There were others there, but the only woman in Geneva, yes. I hope State Department appreciated what we did. I think so. It was so technical, it was almost beyond them, but they did know that we came out with an agreement, it was a good agreement, and we got all our positions through. So that pleased them very much.

*Q: Did the head of IO tell you?*

DILLON: No, I don't recall that he did, frankly. I recall finishing up my final report, which was exhaustive, of course, and I had to finish with that draft the last day I was on the rolls. I remember finishing that night after dark. I think it was eight or nine o'clock, and I was alone. Everyone else had left. The lights were out, for the most part, in the building, except in my office, and I remember turning around and looking at the office and looking at my papers and walking out. Twenty-two years of government; a 35-year career--gone.

*Q: Not the way it should end, is it?*

DILLON: But, you know, the satisfying thing about all of this, all of my international work, is not the specific accomplishments. You ask me about those, and I've had the good fortune to be successful in much of this, but the satisfying part of it is this person-to-person, government-to-government, cross-cultural experience, the friends I made, the understanding I gained, hopefully the understanding I gave to others about my government and my country, sometimes the look in someone's eye, sometimes the tone of a voice. Those are the things that matter, and those are the things that made it all worthwhile for me, definitely. That's what's important.

*Q: Indeed, it is. When you got back from Geneva and your consultation ended, around the middle of March 1978, at that time you did not have an onward assignment because you had not been able to take the time to look for one.*

DILLON: That's right. I went to Marc Ginsberg, the political liaison at the Department of State. He praised my record but said, "Anyone who's been in should be out", and "You've had the good life long enough." I was appalled.

*Q: What happened then?*

DILLON: Well, a week later, I had emergency surgery. I had had a gall bladder problem, gallstones, but I'd been living with it. So all of a sudden, I couldn't live with it anymore, and I had to have emergency surgery. It went extremely well, and I was in excellent shape. Within a couple of weeks, I was back at my exercises and so on, but once again, it served to just knock me out of the picture right when I needed to be circulating and making contacts and so forth. It was at least six weeks, as after any major surgery, before

you can get around, look your best, feel your best, and feel like you want to be seen by other people and make your contacts. I started doing that, of course, as soon as I could.

I went to FAA, because the then administrator of FAA was a protégé of Alan Boyd, who had been my chairman of the CAB [Civil Aeronautics Board] in the sixties. He was a man who had been to Montreal on an occasion. We knew one another. He knew well of my work up there. I had heard that he had appointed an assistant administrator for policy and planning, a woman, and that she had left after six or seven months. I don't know what the circumstances were. Either she didn't like it or they didn't like her; it was a misfit, and she left. So I thought that would be an ideal opening for me. I could be of great service there. It was a vacancy and I could have stepped into it.

I met with the gentleman. He said that anybody he considered for that position would have to be taken off a list at the White House. I said, "I am a careerist. I'm non-political. If you want assurances, I can get them from senators or congressmen or whatever."

"Well, I know, but that isn't the issue. We have long lists of people waiting to be appointed under this administration. My nominees are being sent over from the White House, political appointees." He said, "Betty, frankly, I just don't feel that I can put up that much of a fight for you. I would have to confront the White House and refuse to take their nominees." At one point we tacitly agreed that he might make that effort, but I could see that his heart wasn't in it, and I didn't pursue it, frankly.

I sent my papers to the Department of Transportation. One of the positions that they were filling went to a black man. I think he was a university professor, I understand, from one of the Ivy League colleges, and I was very pleased that a black person was named at that level in DoT.

I talked with the Civil Aeronautics Board again. In the meantime, they had appointed women to the board, which was a big disappointment. I had long hoped I might be the first woman. There was not a changeover coming on the board. They serve by term. I didn't quite feel that I could go back on the staff of the board. Already, in any case, they were in the throes of beginning to abolish the CAB. And of course it was abolished a year or two later, and the residual functions were transferred to DoT.

So there I was. My sister's passing away had left me with the corporation and the business in the Midwest. I really didn't feel I could go there and run a restaurant, with my background. I felt that would be a loss of human resource. So my mother and I decided to sell the business, and I disbanded the corporation. I was executor of my sister's estate, which required much more time than I ever thought that kind of thing could. It really took full time for over a year. I also did away with the corporation, and that involved a lot of tidying up. So I worked with attorneys and accountants and spent a great deal of time and effort on that.

My mother was ill. She was totally emotionally and physically debilitated as a result of my sister's long illness and death and the loss of my career which we'd all sacrificed so much for. My daughter was starting university, but she was suffering a bit of the trauma we'd all been through from the standpoint of her aunt's death and taking the responsibility to run the business. I felt I needed to support her as much as possible.

*Q: Just a terrible time for all of you. A long illness like that has a terrible effect on the people who are left behind. It drains everybody.*

DILLON: I does. I knew that, but I never fully appreciated it until I became involved in it. It drains you emotionally, it drains you financially. She had very good insurance, fortunately, but it doesn't begin to cover it. My transportation bill from Montreal to the Midwest that last year was \$10,000. It ruined my mother's health, it had a serious effect on my career in indirect ways.

We all have private lives, and I think that we need to remember that we must carry on in our careers and cope with these personal problems as we go along.

*Q: Indeed. The year you spent selling your business and helping your mother, that was in Indiana?*

DILLON: Yes. That was in the Midwest. I worked with attorneys and accountants there, dissolving the corporation, selling the business, and getting my daughter started in university over here, trying to support my mother. My mother passed away in 1980.

In the meantime, representations had been made on behalf of my career from the Hill and to the White House and to the Department of State, so that eventually I was given early retirement because of involuntary separation from the Department of State. This, of course, was not what I preferred. I was at my peak and I wanted to go on with my career and found myself really lost. I was quite busy with all these personal affairs, but for the first time since I was sixteen years old, I was not involved in my career or in a career position.

I might say about my retirement that after many of us had worked very hard to try to get a decision on a new assignment or on retirement, I gave up and was going on about my business. A few months later, I received a check in the mail, which was my first retirement check, and I don't know where it came from or who sent it or what the arrangements were, and I've never asked any questions about it. A month later I received papers to sign.

*Q: It does continue to come, I hope.*

DILLON: Oh, yes. Yes, I'm retired.

*Q: I believe you had just a very little while to serve. Wasn't it a question of six months that you needed to reach mandatory retirement?*

DILLON: Yes. I was fifty-two, I think, and had twenty-two years of service. In any case, I lacked just a few months of having the required age-and-time combination to be able to take early retirement.

*Q: Couldn't they have found work for you for six months, in view of all your expertise?*

DILLON: Of course.

*Q: Do you think this is just a question of incompetence in the personnel department? Because look at the expertise they've lost.*

DILLON: Not so much that that the State Department as the White House and Mr. Ginsberg. There are very few people anywhere that have the combination of experience I have at the level I have in both international aviation and in international diplomacy, and I was very sorry to see that kind of put on the back burner. After all, the government had a great investment in me, and it would have been nice to have utilized that for a number of years yet. I still hope, you see, that there will be an opportunity to serve again.

*Q: It seems to me this is another reason why our government reacts and lurches from catastrophe to catastrophe.*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Constantly changing people and not taking advantage of the expertise that is out there, that is often right in their own department.*

DILLON: Most definitely. In the address I gave to the National Aviation Club, which was the last year of my service in Montreal, I made it a point to talk a bit about a lack of continuity and what I saw as an alarming thing happening, especially among the technical ranks of international aviation. The highly skilled experts were coming up to retirement age, and I saw very few people coming on to fill their shoes in government and quasi-government circles, or the industry, for that matter. Men who were revered around the world in their fields as being the most advanced in their knowledge of technology and expertise. They were the World War II, many having come out of military aviation. I proposed a training orientation program.

*Q: What do you think was the reason for no one recognizing what was about to go out the door if they didn't do something?*

DILLON: The new people who came in didn't know what goes on in government, and I've been in Washington through six or seven or eight administrations now, in one capacity or another, in or out of government, and I fear that the Carter administration ranks high with respect to ignorance of government operations. I have to say that. I had great expectations for them, and I had hoped to serve them in an appropriate capacity, but

those people with whom I had contact took a pork barrel view of government, they took a patronage view of government, and were totally lacking in understanding of what is needed to operate government competently and efficiently.

We all know that patronage exists. I've been involved in it on both sides. We all know that government is a political machine. I'm the first to agree that at the policy level, any administration has to be sure that its top people are attune with respect to policy directions and are loyal to those policy leanings and so forth. But that's quite a different thing from saying to someone of my competence or others to whom similar things have been done, "We don't need you," because I'm precisely what the government needs.

*Q: After this long period of great personal difficulties in your life, what did you do then? What were you able to do? You've been overseas since then.*

DILLON: I received a very timely and wonderful call from a longtime friend, no less than Chief Justice Warren Burger, who had been kind enough to call me while I was in the hospital and learned of my brief illness and learned of my plight. He asked if, as an interim step to get me back into circulation in the Washington area, I could be interested in becoming the executive director of the Supreme Court Historical Society.

My first reaction was negative, because although I've had contacts with the judicial branch, that certainly isn't my field of expertise. I've worked with aviation attorneys and lawyers and, to a certain extent, the courts, but that wasn't where I had been all of these years, and I felt that perhaps it wasn't the right fit, either for the Historical Society or for myself. But then he mentioned that the Society was constituted of very outstanding people, very well-connected people, intellectuals, historians, a very fine group that he knew I would enjoy working with and, once again, it would help me to make some new contacts and so forth. After all, it was an administrative-type position. It was executive director in a small society. It was new. It was just a year or two old. It was one of the fine things that he initiated while he was at the court.

So, in fact, I did that on a one-year contract and, I think, served very well. We were able to conduct a very successful fund drive and tidy up some administrative problems that they had, establish new administrative procedures and so forth. It was a very successful year. They, of course, wanted me to stay on, but I felt that that was enough time doing that kind of thing, unless I wanted to decide that that was going to be my career for the rest of my career time.

*Q: This was not civil service. This was private?*

DILLON: Private, non-profit corporation. Very enjoyable. I did meet some very lovely people and interesting people.

*Q: In other words, when you left government service, you left the night that you wrapped up your report from the conference, and left the building all by yourself?*

DILLON: No going away party, no "Thanks a lot," no "It was nice knowing you." That's right. And even riding home that night, I remembered back over the years. I remembered Africa, the Peace Corps, the foreign aid program and so forth. But, of course, I fully intended to continue my government career at that point.

*Q: Of course you did. But even so, each time we leave, we like those little ceremonies to see you on your way. It sort of puts a nice period to a thing and rounds it out.*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: Did you have something to go to when you left the Supreme Court Historical Society?*

DILLON: These years are very difficult for me to keep in sequence, but I think that was about the time that my mother passed away in 1980. I had to settle her estate. I suddenly had the responsibility of all that was left of our properties in the Midwest, the family farm, my sister's house, my mother's estate and personal effects. So, in effect, I had to spend most of my time over there, once again with lawyers and accountants and so forth.

At this juncture, I felt that if I were going to resume my career in a meaningful way in government or out of government, it would be extremely helpful to have my university degree. For the first time, really, I had both the time and the money at the same time to get my degree. So in 1982 or '83, I received my B.A. in economics.

*Q: Good for you!*

DILLON: I didn't go to graduation. I felt after all those years, at my age, it was not the thing to do.

*Q: Oh, certainly it is. That was at George Washington?*

DILLON: Yes, George Washington University.

*Q: You've maintained a home here, have you?*

DILLON: Whenever we weren't residing overseas, I've had a house here in Arlington.

*Q: You own a house?*

DILLON: Not now. I sold my house before I went to Tunisia the last time.

*Q: Where does Tunisia come into the picture?*

DILLON: Well, there's something else in between. I was over in the Midwest working on the estate, trying to get the properties back in shape, the old family place and so forth,

when I received a call from a man who had become the executive director of IO, the Bureau of International Organizations, Department of State. He had been on my delegation at the famous New York diplomatic conference, where we got the 25 percent ceiling adopted. He and I had developed a mutual respect over the years. He was a very fine Foreign Service officer.

He informed me that the Nairobi Conference on Women was coming up, and the United States was looking for a U.S. coordinator to pull all of the preparation together. They wanted a woman, of course, a professional woman, someone who knew multilateral conferencing, who knew the international scene, as it were, and would I be interested? I told him of course I was interested.

By the way, at the time of the Mexico conference during the U.N. Decade for Women, I had been called to Washington from Montreal and offered the head of delegation appointment to that conference. I hope, graciously, declined it. I think IO expected me to, in the sense that the man who offered it to me said, "Betty, don't get mixed up with it," or words to that effect. [Laughter] As it turned out, he was right, because it was a very, very controversial conference.

*Q: That's a good one to stay away from.*

DILLON: Yes, it was very controversial. I'm glad I wasn't involved.

So now we're coming up to the next one five years later or so, and I'm asked to be the U.S. coordinator. I asked about head of delegation, and he told me that it was anticipated that that would be a political appointment. He said, "It's possible you could be head of delegation, as well as coordinator, but more likely there will be a top woman political appointment to head the delegation."

I thought about it for a day or two and then called him and told him, yes, I'd be willing to undertake it. There was to be a preparatory conference in Vienna in the spring, leading up to the Nairobi conference in July. His call to me was in October, November. He said, "We want to move very quickly on it. We have office space reserved, very fine space on the first floor. This is a prestigious thing. You will have a hand-picked staff, two secretaries. We're transferring some other officers in to assist you. There's an interdepartmental, interagency committee already functioning, and you will chair that."

It sounded familiar and very interesting, so I told him I would do it. He said, "We want to move very quickly on this appointment, and I'll get back to you in a week or two." I didn't hear from him, and a month went by. I called. He said, "It's going slowly, but we need this person on board. We want you here as soon as we can get you here." They brought me over on consultation, incidentally, and we talked a little bit about it. I went back home. But he kept saying things like, "I'll call you Wednesday. You call me Monday morning," and so forth.

I had planned to go to Paris for Christmas. My daughter was there in school. There was a time squeeze coming up here. I didn't mind canceling that, but I didn't want to cancel it and then not be on board in Washington. I explained that to him, and he said, "Well, I'm sure it will be before December. We want to get going on this thing." So I canceled my Paris plans. Thanksgiving came and went. Christmas came and went. It got up into January, and I told him it had been a few months now, and I really had to know if this thing were going. It wasn't a question of security clearance. They could bring that up to date very quickly. He said, "No, there's no problem like that." Apparently it was an interagency budget problem. They were fighting over funds or something.

Finally, in January, I think toward the end of January, he said, "All right. Pack up your things and come." I came on board to find that there was no office space. The office space that they had earmarked for this project had been taken over by the SALT arms negotiator delegation, John Tower and his group. So we scurried around looking for some offices, and we found some up on the third floor somewhere that needed to be cleaned up. There was no secretary. One secretary came in part time two or three days a week, and she was very jealous of her time, understandably. She was a part-time secretary. One of the women who had been working in women's affairs was assigned to the office, but it seemed she had wanted to be the coordinator and considered herself to be the authority on all of this, which, in fact, she was, and was a little bit perturbed that this function was being taken over by someone from outside. Gradually we became good friends.

*Q: Was she from the State Department?*

DILLON: Yes. We became friends and finally developed quite a good working relationship. Two other women were assigned to me, and I later found out that was because one of them had been fired from another office, and the second one was a mole for the assistant secretary, a young girl, political appointment, no previous work experience, but I learned that her sole purpose for being assigned to the office was to report back to the assistant secretary everything that was said and done within the staff. She was supposed to be a congressional liaison, but I found it very difficult to find out what she was doing. I said, "I need to know which senators and congressmen, which staffs you're contacting, just where you're going. Just give me a list at the beginning of the week so we avoid any overlapping, any embarrassment," and she couldn't provide me with that. She said, "Look at the *Congressional Directory*. That's my field."

So this was sort of a Coxe's Army, you see, that was put together, and here we were within weeks of the Vienna preparatory conference, which was a full-blown diplomatic conference, of course.

In the meantime, I had read in *Newsweek* that Maureen Reagan, the president's daughter, had been named to head the U.S. delegation to Nairobi.

I tried very hard, working long hours, to pull together position papers. There was no memory on this thing. There were papers available from the Mexico conference. There

was a file cabinet full of them, but they had never been sorted or filed, sorted out, some thrown away, and so forth. So they were almost useless, unless you wanted to assign one person to them, to read every piece of paper and refile them. I did call a meeting of the interagency committee, which turned out to be about fifty people, women from all over government, a couple of men who were directly or indirectly concerned with the agenda of the two conferences.

That was a very successful meeting, and at the close of the meeting, one of the women present from the Department of Labor, Bureau of Women's Affairs, raised her hand and she said, "We want you to know that many of us have been very discouraged about preparations for the Nairobi conference, and we've been very depressed about what has gone on so far, but for the first time today we feel that we have people with us who know what's going on, who have us on the right track, and this has been a good meeting."

*Q: How nice!*

DILLON: So once again, I felt, "Well, I'm doing my best, and maybe it's going to be good enough."

We held a delegation meeting just a couple of weeks before Vienna. In the meantime, I had received a call from Maureen Reagan, congratulating me. I assumed she was congratulating me as the U.S. coordinator to assist her in the delegation. It turns out she was congratulating me because she had just named me as a member of her delegation. I didn't tie that together because the Nairobi delegation had not been named. Department of State, as you well know, has a special Office of Conferences that takes care of formalizing delegations, takes care of security clearances, any political implications that might embarrass the administration, takes care of any special arrangements that need to be made. It's there for that purpose. Then once the delegation is approved all the way up by the appropriate office and the secretary's office, and the White House, if necessary, then the wheels begin to turn. Delegates begin to hear about how to get a passport, whether you need visas, what your plane reservations are.

So here we were with a delegation being named by a person outside the government, albeit the president's daughter, mind you, but Department of State didn't know who these people were. They didn't even have a list of names, much less started work on them.

This might be a good place to take a break.

*February 12, 1988*

DILLON: We might say a word, again, about the one delegation meeting we had before we went to Vienna. I had been told that my preparation and my work with the head of delegation and the delegation members should be very simple, because they had no previous experience in international conferences. Consequently, I was expecting to take that approach. However, as soon as the head of delegation and some of the delegates

arrived, I began to sense an attitude, an atmosphere of negativism. That's the only way I can describe it. There was talk of "we" and "they," and I was never sure who "they" were. Sometimes I thought it was the government, that is, State Department. Sometimes I thought it was the developing nation contingent at the conference. Sometimes I got the impression it would be the Soviet delegation. But in any case, there was an adversarial kind of an attitude on the part of the delegates, a confrontational attitude. It concerned me terribly. I've been in hundreds of delegation meetings over the years, many of them I've conducted, many of them I have sat in as a delegate myself, others have been briefings or debriefings. But I think I can say this meeting was one of the strangest I've ever been in.

Fortunately, we had arranged for a presentation by a young woman who had been at the previous women's conference. She made a very simple presentation to the delegates on what they should expect from the time they got off the plane. That is, there would be cars there to take them in town. If there weren't, they should take taxis. The hotel reservations had been made. When they arrived at the conference hall, they would find a chairman at the podium and committees would be in place. The meetings would start in the morning and there would probably be an afternoon session, and so forth. In other words, the mechanics of the conference. The delegates seemed to respond very well to this.

My staff and I had prepared, under great pressure over a period of only the week or ten days we had available, a delegation book, which is customary for each of the delegates, containing general information, position papers and issues papers, in some cases papers on specific agenda items for the conference. I had rather thought to go through that book at the delegation meeting, but we had a much shorter period of time available than had been anticipated, and the head of delegation said, in any case, she did not want to read "that flowery language." She simply wanted to know what was going to be going on over there. So we put the books aside, although we ultimately took them to Vienna, of course.

I want to pick up now on the appointment of the members of the delegation. I was to go to Vienna on a Friday evening flight in order to get our preparations under way there for the Monday morning conference. Friday morning, I received a call from general counsel at the White House, John Powers. He said that they were going to announce the delegation to the Nairobi conference in July that afternoon. I expressed some surprise and indicated that that list had not yet come to the Department of State, that it is the department that has vested in it by the president the authority to appoint delegates, that there were certain procedures that had to be adhered to before announcements could be made, and so forth. He seemed quite perturbed, understandably, and concerned. He asked me to give him the legal authority under which the department appoints conference delegates. We quickly dug that out, and it was a one-page document signed by Harry S. Truman, President, and has been in effect since that time. He had no problem, of course, accepting this as the legal authority, and said that in order to be halfway in compliance with that legal mandate, he would send the list of the delegates over to me immediately so that we would at least have the names before the noon press conference on this subject.

I held my breath. Noon came and went, and there was no press announcement. I received another call from him saying there would be a 3:00 p.m. press conference announcing the delegation.

*Q: Had the names come to you by that time?*

DILLON: By that time I had received a very crude list, photocopied. There was no announcement at three o'clock, but I received another call saying they weren't going to announce it that day, but that I was to proceed to Vienna, talk with Maureen Reagan, the head of delegation, and get her approval to release the list. I told him I understood that she, in fact, had made up the list, and I was sure there would be no problem with it, but he wanted to follow that procedure. I caught a late afternoon plane and went to Vienna with a copy of the list in my pocket.

The next day, most of the delegates arrived in Vienna, including the head of delegation, and that evening, Saturday or Sunday, there was a U.S. delegation meeting, that is, the delegation to the Vienna preparatory conference. As we went into the meeting room, I stopped Maureen and mentioned to her that we had this urgent matter pending, that the White House had called me and asked to get her approval to announce the Nairobi conference delegation. She exploded. That's the only word I can use. She started speaking in a very high-pitched voice, which resounded through the marble floors of the hotel where we were meeting. She yelled at me, "Hasn't this been done yet? Why hasn't this been done yet?" I explained that the White House had called; they had planned to do it Friday, that Department of State had sent to them its legal authority, it explained the procedure, and she yelled at me, "Why should I believe you? I can't believe you. Why hasn't this announcement been made?"

One of the delegates, Nancy Reynolds, her close friend, was with her and began shaking her head. I tried to calm Maureen and said, "Maureen, I'm the person assigned by the department to work with you, to support you, to help you. Please trust me in this matter. This is where we are on the Nairobi delegation. It can be announced first thing Monday morning. All we have to do is send your okay in by cable, and the White House will proceed." I pointed out that it was John Powers, general counsel, who had called me on this matter, whereupon she spoke very disdainfully about Mr. Powers and she walked on down the hall. There was no decision, no instruction given to me.

After the delegation meeting that evening, we met in her suite of rooms for an informal discussion of the situation, again with Nancy Reynolds present. We went through the list of delegates that Maureen had selected and had already called, inviting them to be delegates. She described why she had asked each one and gave a little bit of information about their backgrounds. Most of them were prominent women. It was a list of outstanding women who were well-known professionals and careerists, each in her own field. I mentioned one or two other names that my office had been considering, but she said she would have no one on the delegation that wasn't devoted to her father, and she would not have anyone who might speak disparagingly of him or this administration.

I might say at this point that one of the responsibilities of my office, that of United States coordinator, was doing the staff work for the Nairobi delegation appointments. In other words, during these past few weeks, I had been receiving nominations from the Hill, from large organizations, from various sources giving me names of women who, for very good reason, should be considered for appointment to the July Nairobi conference delegation. That's another reason I was shocked when I learned that the delegation had been made up outside of State Department and, in fact, appointed privately while we were still telling congressional offices that we would be happy to consider their candidates when the time came.

Over the weekend in Vienna, I sent a cable to the Department of State, asking them to let the White House know that Maureen Reagan had approved release of the Nairobi conference delegates, and I understand the announcement was made on Monday or Tuesday.

The Vienna conference got under way. The United States delegation met each morning early before the conference, which was a very good procedure, but it soon became apparent to me and to others on the delegation that our goals were not necessarily to negotiate and to reach agreement, but to, once again, follow a negotiating path of confrontation with frequent mention of walking out of the conference. Ordinarily, delegation meetings are given over to the agenda items for the day, what our position is on them, and how we can achieve our position.

The United States delegation gave a very nice reception for the African delegations. I was greatly relieved to see that, and it went very, very well. Shortly afterward, however, in a delegation meeting, I suggested that we meet with the African caucus with a view to clearing the air, discussing our positions and why we had formulated those positions, and seeking their assistance on some of the votes. In our delegation meeting, in front of other delegates, the head of delegation said that it was not her intention to meet with the Africans, that they were "savages," and she "wasn't sure why we were even in the conference meeting with them."

*Q: How had she allowed the party to take place?*

DILLON: I think the party was at her suggestion, and I think it was something that she seemed to enjoy very much, and the African women did. I couldn't see that we used it for any diplomatic function. That is, as far as I know, it was purely a social function. There was no discussion of issues or positions and so forth. At one point I was beginning to have a useful discussion with an important African women when Ms. Reagan appeared and said curtly, "You go someplace else. I'll take over her."

After a few days, the situation within the conference and outside became worse. For various reasons which were never entirely clear to me, there seemed to be constantly an atmosphere of confrontation, paranoia, and always just beneath the surface the possibility

of our leaving the conference. I never knew where the head of delegation was spending her time.

At about this point, it was announced that Ambassador Alan Keyes was going to be in Vienna for a couple of days and was going to be a part of our delegation during that time. I had not met Alan Keyes, but apparently all of the other women knew him or knew of him and were extremely enthusiastic about what assistance he would be able to give us. I later learned that Ambassador Keyes was a protégé of Jeane Kirkpatrick in New York and was pulled out of the FSO ranks and made an ambassador under her sponsorship. It was clear from our first meeting that he is very conservative in his policy orientation, and rather than help with the confrontational aspect of our involvement, he seemed to contribute to it and be a part of it. As a matter of fact, Maureen delayed some things, or seemed to want to hold back until his arrival, which she described as the "marines landing." She said she felt like the marines would be landing when he arrived, "to save us." It wasn't clear to me what we needed to be saved from!

From that point on, Maureen and Alan Keyes pretty much handled the situation themselves. There were still delegation meetings, but the rest of us were not fully aware of what was going on in informal meetings and what was going on behind the scenes. By talking with other U.S. delegates and many delegates from other countries, I was able to find out that the situation was one with which I had become very familiar over the years. The African caucus was the swing vote. I talked with some of our other delegates and told them that, in my opinion, it was very important that we meet with them and endeavor to gain their support or find some compromise or we, indeed, would end up without an agreement.

On urging from these other U.S. delegates in a delegation meeting, I made that suggestion. I said, "I think we should take our legal pads and sharp pencils, ask to meet with the African caucus, and see if we couldn't bring about some meeting of the minds." Alan Keyes snapped at me, "It's too late for that," and they changed the subject.

Jumping to the end of the conference, which brought the most pressure, of course, and in which everything culminated, the last day, during the day, there was great pressure on the head of our delegation and she became increasingly paranoid. At one point the plenary session broke into committees, and she became fearful that the Soviets and the Eastern Bloc delegates would "take all the seats around the table" in our committee meeting, one of the most important of the committees. She asked some of us to rush to that room and reserve the seats. At first she asked that we accompany her on the elevator with her security man up to the next floor. After we got on the elevator with all of our papers and stacks of things which most of us had by then, she decided that that was not the thing to do, so she had the elevator doors opened again, and we all clambered off, stepping on the toes of the security man, dropping papers. The doors closed, then they immediately opened again, and she said, "No, no, you come with me." We got back on the elevator, two or three of us in that particular group. But then we were asked not to come on the

elevator again, so finally we simply took an elevator across the hall or walked up; I've forgotten. But obviously there was a great deal of pressure.

When we got to the committee room, there was plenty of space around the table. The Soviets, of course, were represented, and I think one of the Eastern Bloc countries, some of them sitting were in the back. It was a crowded room and I couldn't see that there was any great problem about who sat at the table or didn't sit at the table.

That evening was the final session of the conference, and as near as I could tell, the crucial issues had to do with the inclusion in the final agreement of political language having to do with women refugees and the PLO. Our position was, of course, that it was inappropriate for a women's conference, although the language itself was worded so that it expressed concern for women refugees, women and children forced into camps and, as usual, carrying the brunt of that kind of an awful political and military situation. But indeed it was political in nature, and we felt it did not belong in the final agreement. I believe that that's what the last big confrontation was over. I was not in the meetings and I was not privy to any of the discussions, so I'm not sure.

*Q: Is it customary for the coordinator to be at meetings like that?*

DILLON: Not only as the coordinator, but I was a member of the delegation.

*Q: So you should have been there.*

DILLON: Oh yes. We all should have been. I had the feeling that none of the other delegates were included. Once in a while she would ask one of them to work with a certain delegation or assigned a rather general task. In my case, for example, she asked me to handle relations with the Soviet Union, which I was pleased to do. I had worked with them for many, many years, but I soon found out that once I had introduced myself to the Soviet delegate and to a couple of the Eastern Bloc delegates whom I found very friendly and open and approachable, I had nothing to say. I didn't know what she wanted me to do with them after I met them and set up a rapport. I had the feeling that the same approach had been used with our other delegates, that she might want them to serve as liaison to a certain country or group of countries, but having said that, that was the end of it. You set up the liaison, but what do you do next? Because we didn't know what negotiations were going on inside closed rooms, so to speak, and under those circumstances, it's very dangerous, indeed, to work with another delegation. You might be undermining what's happening with your head of delegation and other heads of delegations.

*Q: Were you specifically told not to come to the meetings, or did she just take off and you didn't know where she was?*

DILLON: Usually she and Alan would just take off immediately after the U.S. delegation meeting or during recess or what have you, and the rest of us would be sitting in the back

of the room. We simply were no longer a part of what was going on. If anyone was, I would suspect that Nancy Reynolds was involved and the "mole" from IO, but I think not to the extent that Alan Keyes was.

A day or two before the conference ended, Maureen asked me, after the U.S. delegation morning meeting, to ride with her in her car to the conference hall. I had noticed that she had been taking a different delegate with her each morning, and I thought this was rather a nice gesture, and it was my turn. However, I no sooner got in the car than I got a terrible reading-out, because one of my staff members who had remained back in Washington had reportedly been extremely rude to her assistant who remained back in Washington, that Maureen's assistant had called my office for some rather general information and apparently my staff person had said, "We wouldn't have that here, but here's the office and the phone number that does have it." At least that's what my person reported to me. But Maureen seemed to feel that my person should have gotten the information and called her assistant back. In any case, the ride from the hotel to the conference hall was one in which I was berated because of my poor staff and so forth.

So we're back to the last evening of the conference. We were nowhere near agreement, that is, reaching final agreement on the final piece of paper, which was a long and complicated document. We became hung up on the political language issue, as I recall. It appeared in two or three or four different places in the documentation.

*Q: What was hanging it up?*

DILLON: The political language in the final agreement, which was a very long and complicated document. When you're talking about the role of women worldwide, it covers a multitude of things, but the political language, most of it regarding the PLO, appeared in three or four different places. I believe that was the issue. I was never clear.

We went on until 10:00 or 11:00 p.m. We had a break and came back, and made a little progress. You know, I hesitate to talk about these things in detail, because it's been so long and I've been so many places and done so many other things since then, that I certainly wouldn't want anyone to say I didn't know what was going on. If I'm erroneous in some of this, it's simply because I haven't thought about these things for many years. I don't have my notes and files available; they're stored. So I'm just relying on my memory at this point.

We went on till midnight or one o'clock, and tempers were flaring and everyone was under pressure and tired by then. There was another recess, and apparently Maureen Reagan and Alan Keyes met with the Kenya delegate. You must remember that Kenya was a key country because they were hosting the Nairobi conference a few months later, after all, so they had taken what I considered to be a very wise position at this conference. They tried to remain impartial and stay out of the controversial issues and play the role of host country for Nairobi. But at the same time, because they were going to host Nairobi, they obviously didn't want to see the Vienna preparatory conference end up without an

agreement and in a state of chaos. So apparently, in the final hours, if not days, the Kenya delegation was taking more of a role in the African caucus and in the conference generally. [President] Jomo Kenyatta's daughter was the delegate, and their ambassador in Vienna was a member of the delegation, but played more and more of a role in the goings-on. So during this early morning hours' break, apparently Maureen and Alan met with them or with the African caucus *in toto*, and I gather at that meeting Kenya came up with a basically procedural proposal for handling these differences, which would enable us to reach agreement in Vienna and leave some of the problems for later on, some of the problem paragraphs and language, for later on.

As I said, I wasn't privy to the meeting, and I can only assume some of this based on what then went on in the plenary session. I also gather that the United States did not go along with this proposal and had told the African caucus and the Kenyans that they could not accept this proposal. When the plenary came back in session at two or three o'clock in the morning, the Kenyan delegate made the proposal on the floor as a way of reaching an agreement of some sort in the final hours of the preparatory conference. At this point, Alan Keyes was either in the U.S. chair or at the U.S. position. He grabbed the microphone and in a very brief, angry statement, called the Kenyan representative "foolish" for having made this proposal. In East Africa and throughout Africa, the word "foolish" has very serious connotations, far more than in our English language and in other countries. It carries a connotation of being stupid, if not retarded, being Mongoloidal, if that's a word. It even carries some superstitious kinds of connotations. It's a very heavy word in that part of the world.

The use of this word on the part of the U.S. delegation had a very serious impact personally on the Kenyan ambassador. He took the microphone in what I thought was a very diplomatic way, explained why they had made the proposal, that we obviously weren't going to be able to reach agreement on some of these issues, and he thought it was the way to go, but he obviously was shaken, so much so that the meeting had to be adjourned again, and one of his colleagues took him into an outside lounge and sat with him for quite a while and talked with him in order to calm him. When the gavel went down on adjournment, on a recess at this juncture, Alan Keyes and Maureen Reagan jumped up from our position and ran toward the Kenyan position in such a way that people told me afterward they thought there was going to be a physical confrontation. The whole approach, their language on the microphone, and then their whole approach toward the Kenyan delegation was threatening and unfortunate.

Alan Keyes sat with Margaret Kenyatta for a while and, hopefully, explained. I might say that in addition to our delegates running down that way, many other delegates ran to the position. From where I was sitting in the back of the great conference hall, I can only liken it to things I've seen years ago when there was a street fight and everyone for blocks around ran as though there was a magnet drawing them to the site of the fight, and they all ran toward the Kenyan position and stood in a crowd around the Kenyan position to see what was happening.

I hope that whatever Alan Keyes said to Margaret Kenyatta helped ease the situation. I hope that the ambassador's friend was able to calm him. Apparently that was the case, because when we reconvened, there was some kind of an agreement reached. As I recall, it wasn't purely the Kenyan proposal, but it was one that enabled us to adopt the piece of paper with reservations and with ongoing procedural considerations.

*Q: Not entirely the Kenyan position, but partially.*

DILLON: Partially. After the conference adjourned then and was completed, it was the wee hours of the morning. Maureen very generously invited the U.S. delegation to her suite, where she had some champagne or something, and thought she had sandwiches. She had asked the security people to bring in some refreshments, but apparently they hadn't gotten around to that. It didn't matter. In any case, it was a very nice thing to do, and ordinarily we would have had a very nice short chat and said our goodbyes and broken up and gone on to finish up and leave town the following day.

In the first place, Maureen wanted to call her father in the White House and tell him that the conference had closed and that apparently we at least got a piece of paper, if not everything they wanted to go along with an agreement. She couldn't get through. She tried a couple of times and couldn't get through, and was nearly in tears and became very difficult with the operators on the phone. She then began to relax a bit, and we talked a little bit about the happenings at the conference and the delegations and so forth. She wanted to blame the Kenyan ambassador for much of what had happened. She insisted that at a reception the evening before, he had been drunk. I expressed some surprise, because I had talked with him at length at that reception, and found that he was quite lucid. He is a typical African. I've known and worked with many Africans with that particular personality and makeup. He speaks very slowly and has almost a euphoric kind of attitude. It's typical. I've seen it before. Trying to ease the situation in this little informal gathering of our delegation, I said I didn't think that he'd been drinking, that he might have been "chewing a little betel." The Africans use something similar to betel that has maybe some slight effect on their personality, but, of course, I was just making light talk. She said, "Oh, you mean they eat bugs, too?" We dropped the subject at that point and went on to the next. She repeated her belief that Africans were "savages," and that we shouldn't be meeting with them.

*Q: She was aware that something had happened that shouldn't have happened? She at least was that aware that things hadn't quite gone right, when the African was so upset?*

DILLON: Yes, that's true, but I think she viewed it as negative from the standpoint that it stood in the way of our getting what we intended to get, which was what would be best for the entire conference. There was never any consideration of negotiating or giving a little something to get a little something.

*Q: It was what the U.S. wanted that mattered.*

DILLON: Yes, that was all that mattered.

*Q: Never mind the rest of the delegates from around the world.*

DILLON: Exactly.

*Q: The U.S. point is the right point.*

DILLON: That was it, and if we couldn't get that, once again, there was always this idea of walking out. A day or two before the end of the conference, there turned up, just floating around the conference hall, photocopies of a Heritage Foundation paper that had been prepared a few weeks before, regarding the Nairobi conference. It was, of course, ultra-conservative. It, in effect, said that we should not be a party to something that would be less than what we had in mind, and we shouldn't hesitate to walk out. I was concerned about where that piece of paper came from, because I had seen it in Washington and I knew where it rested in Washington. Although I found it hard to believe, I'm very fearful it was purposefully circulated to the conference by way of an indirect threat, that because delegations from the developing countries, for example, would very seldom know what the Heritage Foundation was, it sounds grand, and they might assume it was part of the United States government or a quasi-government arm, and that, in fact, was the government position; that if things didn't go right, we'd walk out.

*Q: Certainly that was the attitude of the chief delegate.*

DILLON: That was the attitude of the delegation generally. So it was in keeping. Very frankly, I've been in international work for as long as I can remember, at all levels, with all kinds of people, in all kinds of situations, and I've always loved it and enjoyed it. I hated to see the conference over with, but in this case, I was very relieved to be able to leave Vienna and get away from the conference situation there.

*Q: Did you have any other feelings at the time vis-à-vis the other delegates from other countries?*

DILLON: I circulated with a number of them, of course, talked to the African countries because I had worked so closely with Africa. I met with several Latin American delegates because I had, after all, worked closely with them at the conference in Geneva a few years before. I like the peoples of the developing countries, and I think we could have accomplished a great deal with them there. I did chat with the Soviet delegates and an Eastern Bloc delegate, a Czechoslovakian, and I found them friendly and interested, but there was not, as I said earlier, an opportunity to do any work with them in that setting. Had I done that, I would have run the risk of going out in left field or undermining our own U.S. delegation and U.S. position. I had to keep it on an informal and person-to-person basis. I did take the Tunisian delegates [2] to lunch because of my interest in that country. They voted with us on the next vote.

*Q: Obviously you felt chagrined. Did you feel any embarrassment?*

DILLON: Of course I was embarrassed. I was embarrassed for my government. I found some people saying things like, "Oh, the daughter of the president is very nice," because that was the thing to say. I found other people expressing concern that the U.S. was not entering into the conference in a spirit of cooperation and coordination and negotiation. Of course, they were quite right. That was never the intention. That was stated at delegation meetings. "We do not compromise or negotiate on anything." But I almost had the impression that a walkout wasn't beyond the realm of possibility.

To what extent her [Maureen's] statements on those subjects reflected experience in organizations or with the women's rights movements, I don't know. I do recall that before we left Washington, perhaps on the day of the U.S. delegation meeting in State Department, there was some reference to the women's organizations, that is, the women's libbers, NOW [National Organization for Women] and so forth, and she said that she wanted nothing to do with them, that "You can smell most of them all the way across the room." This shocked me a bit, because I had envisioned her up to that point as being someone at least sympathetic to the women's organizations and the women's movement, just based on what public statements I had heard from her in the press.

*Q: You came back immediately, did you?*

DILLON: Yes. I came back over the weekend. I flew back one day and came in the next morning. I can't recall the days of the week; it doesn't matter. But it does to the extent that Maureen had arrived twenty-four hours before I did and had talked with the Assistant Secretary for International Organizations, Greg Newell, at his home the night before. Mr. Newell, now Ambassador Newell, called me in for a debriefing, and his deputy assistant secretary was with him, Roger Kirk, now an ambassador in Europe.

I no sooner entered the room than I could tell things were not on the same track they were on when we went to Vienna. Mr. Newell had a list written on a small piece of paper, obviously notes from his conversation with Maureen, in which there were six points which he was to transmit to me. First of all, I was not any more to be involved in any substantive preparation for the conference, that this was going to be handled by Maureen and her secretary at the Republican National Committee, and that the U.S. coordinator's office in the Department of State would be responsible only for the institutional--and that's the word that was used--preparation.

I was not at all clear what was meant by that, except that obviously it excluded substance, and that, to my way of thinking, was why I had been brought in. After all, I am a former minister, I am an international negotiator, and so forth. That was number one.

Then number two, I was to make changes in my staff and, in so many words, get rid of the woman (the only competent woman I had) who had been rude to her assistant.

Thirdly, our positions leading up to Nairobi were to be based on the Heritage Foundation paper, and so forth and so on. There were six points. Those were the major points.

There ensued a discussion, of course, of where we were on the whole thing. Regarding staff, I once again reiterated my disappointment in my staff. I didn't have at all what I was told I would have when I came there, not to mention the office space. I did say that the woman who reportedly had been rude to Maureen's assistant was a very competent woman who had worked in women's affairs all over the world. This was a junior Foreign Service officer, although a woman thirty-five years old, and I must say a credit to the Foreign Service. She was the one who had been fired from another office for reasons which, in my opinion, did not reflect on her nor her competence, but reasons we needn't go into here. They weren't relevant. She was competent, she knew what was going on worldwide with the women's movement. She had followed the development of U.N. Decade for Women, and I had come to rely on her very heavily. She was the one that was to go.

During that meeting, while we were discussing staff, I found the occasion to mention the presence of the young woman congressional liaison on my staff, and said, in effect, to the assistant secretary that I was very uncomfortable with her there, that I never knew where she was day in and day out, she didn't come to staff meetings, I didn't know what she was doing or what she was saying, if, in fact, she was contacting the Hill, and that I needed some clarification with respect to her role and her supervision. That is, did she, in fact, work for him, the assistant secretary, and was, in fact, answering to him on a daily basis, or was she working for me and should I continue to try to find some way to work with her in the hope that we could be effective on the Hill with respect to some of the pending legislation up there? This seemed to annoy him very, very much. He didn't want to discuss it. He said that she was working for him, but, of course, she was assigned to my staff, and that he would talk with her.

In any case, I told him forthrightly that I understood she was reporting back to him on most everything that was happening in my office. I felt I had to be frank about that. I said that I didn't appreciate that kind of situation. I'm a longtime careerist in government. For many, many years I have had all of my security clearances, I'm a respected person who, on two occasions, has been Federal Women's Award nominee, including one from Department of State, etc., and I took the position that either I would do what he wanted done very effectively and to his liking, or there were other alternatives. At that point, he was obviously becoming very annoyed and said, "Well, we'll discuss that later."

I came out of that meeting really at my wits' end. I had taken this position because Mr. Richard Hennis had thought, and had told me that he thought, it would be a marvelous opportunity for me to come back into government, that I would have White House "exposure", that it would be a prestigious position with first floor offices and adequate staffing, and a marvelous opportunity to once again serve my government in a meaningful role. But I came out of this meeting feeling that none of that was taking place--none of it. Even if I had been able to work effectively on the negotiations in Vienna or to work

through the head of delegation and be effective, in other words, using my years and years of experience in multilateral conferences, I would have said the other things don't matter at all. But obviously I had been shut out and was now being shut out, as we moved on toward Nairobi, from all substantive work and negotiations and substantive positions, and had none of these other things *either*, certainly not the White House exposure, except through the president's daughter, who at that point had informed all of us that she intended to work out of her office at the National Committee and out of the U.N. mission in New York, thus, in effect, taking most of the work away from my office.

So given those developments, I was quite at my wits' end about what to do. I discussed it with my daughter that night at great length, the pros and cons of staying in the position. I couldn't think of any pros, frankly, except for a salary check, and I have never in my life worked only for money. So everything was against my staying on, and my daughter, in fact, said, "Mother, you should not be involved in this. It's degrading. You don't need this after all of your years of distinguished service. It's going to get worse before it gets better, and I think you should quit."

*Q: You felt you were being pushed out, in any event?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: But they didn't want to take the onus, and therefore they were forcing you to quit.*

DILLON: Yes. I feel sure if I had insisted on staying on and had been willing to meet these six conditions that Maureen had given to the assistant secretary of state, I undoubtedly could have stayed on through Nairobi and floundered through, just done less, done very little of the things I do best, and kept a low profile.

*Q: What I don't understand is why did she not say anything to you? Why was all this dumped on Greg Newell?*

DILLON: I suppose, first of all, because he was my immediate supervisor. In a sense, it was the assistant secretary for IO in whose offices I was working. Secondly, apart from the severe criticism of my staff member, which she had given me in her car in Vienna, apart from that, these other things, I suppose, she felt had to do with the basic makeup of my office and its position in his IO section. I don't know. Of course, I'm sure another factor was the same one that would influence any of us. We don't like to tell people we're not getting along well with them.

*Q: But quite often you can clear the air.*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: There was never any consideration that there could be compromise here? You had to do things totally her way?*

DILLON: Oh, yes. The assistant secretary gave me these six points and said, "This is how we will proceed from here on." What little staff I had was being totally depleted by the loss of the one woman whom they were asking me to fire or transfer or something. It would have been very difficult for me to continue on, and perhaps they realized that. On the other hand, I was told that Maureen never for a moment thought I would resign, but that was hearsay.

So women's conferences being what they are, this brought on a great onslaught from the press. I was called repeatedly at the office and at home about what had happened between me and Maureen, what had brought on my resignation, that the other two conferences in '75 and '80 had been plagued by controversy and poor preparation and everyone had thought we were on the right track this time, but now it had happened again, and they wanted the full story.

*Q: You went back the next day and resigned?*

DILLON: Yes. I gave some notice. I think it was the equivalent of thirty days, but it coincided with pay periods, for convenience. They promptly made some office changes, without consulting me, and I came in one morning and my entire staff and office and most of the furniture had disappeared. When I called the assistant secretary's office, I was told that I could go back and sit in the back of somebody else's office, which was where I was sitting when I first arrived in the position, and I did for the remainder of the time, and finished up reports and paperwork and did some menial chores.

There was a great deal of concern within the department about what had happened to me and about the fact that I had resigned. The deputy assistant secretary of IO, for example, was appalled by what had happened. I met with him quite often when the assistant secretary wasn't available. He was working closely with me, and he had been concerned from the beginning, as I had. He was appalled when he heard about Vienna, and was very upset when I resigned, but he felt that I was "well out of it." I believe that's how he put it. Based on what he had heard, meaning in other meetings, he thought I was very well out of it.

Incidentally, he informed the assistant secretary of state that he no longer wanted any of the backstopping responsibilities for the Nairobi conference, that they should be handled directly by the assistant secretary, that he, as the deputy assistant secretary, was a career Foreign Service officer, that this thing obviously was steeped in politics, not international politics, necessarily, but domestic politics of one kind or another, with much of the work being done over at the Republican National Committee and so forth, and he felt it was not appropriate for a careerist in the Foreign Service to be involved in a project like that. He was not terribly long afterward appointed in Europe, where I believe he's an ambassador, a very fine and competent man.

When I announced to my staff that I had resigned, there was much clapping and yelling. There was a feeling that I had stood up in the face of a bad situation, that I was resigning based on principle, that I could not be a part of a United States government effort that was so badly handled. I talked very frankly with the staff member who I knew was going to have to leave, and she said, "That being the case, since you're leaving, I don't want to go on with it anyway, and I will ask immediately to be transferred out pending my appointment overseas." She was under consideration for appointment as assistant consul in one of the European capitals, which ultimately came through.

*Q: Was there any fallout, any personal problems for you after you left the State Department?*

DILLON: There were some. For example, in that summer, three or four months after I had left the department and all of the final paperwork had been taken care of, the separation papers and so forth, I received a very nasty letter from the Office of the General Counsel of Department of State, saying that I had not filed all of the necessary papers for being employed by State, one of which had to do with my personal finances. I had filled out a JF-1, which we're all familiar with. It's the form that's designed to show up any conflict of interests that might exist as a result of financial or vested interests in companies and so forth. I had been used to filling that out over the years, and it was part of my personnel package when I came back into State, and I had filled it out accurately.

So I called counsel's office and said there must be some mistake. In the first place, the assignment was over with, I was no longer in State, I had come and gone and had been back out of the department for three or four months. They said that didn't matter; I would have to file it and file it immediately or legal action would be taken. The form they wanted was a very detailed, much longer and more complicated form than anything I had ever seen before. Perhaps it was something new, that is, within the last couple of years since I had left government previously. It was very inquiring and very detailed, and I couldn't help but resent having to fill it out, especially since it served absolutely no purpose.

*Q: It seems strange you hadn't been given that form when you took the job.*

DILLON: Precisely. I pointed that out, and they said, "Well, personnel goofs sometimes, and they apparently just overlooked it." I filled it out and sent it in. I had to consult my accountant, of course, although it wasn't terribly complicated. From my side it wasn't, but it was a computerized form and not easy to understand. I sent it in. They then called me and had some questions, some very pointed questions. I could see what they were trying to get at, and we talked on the phone. I submitted some additional information or another letter and told them in writing that if they needed anything further, I would be happy to get it. That was the end of it. But it was, I thought, a very unnecessary kind of follow-up long after the fact. It gave government information about me that I didn't feel was relevant or necessary. What I gave them under JF-1 was quite sufficient to make the legal

determination they needed to make to bring me back on the rolls, and there was nothing new or different in this other form. I will always wonder why it was asked of me.

Also, a few months after I left, I received a very brusque letter saying that I owed the government approximately \$360 for annual leave and half-a-day of sick leave the last pay period I worked. Since I'd been sitting in an empty office, no staff, no work, and no one to report to it seemed strange that someone thought I'd taken half-a-day's sick leave. The letter stated that my entire payroll record had been "audited." By then I was frustrated by the whole thing and simply sent them a check.

Almost a year later when the Peace Corps was putting me on the rolls they received a note from State saying that I owed the department \$360 and "she may owe the government more money." I was outraged, immediately produced my canceled check, and demanded to know what else I might "owe the government." There was nothing else, of course.

All of this seemed to be considerably more than a set of unusual coincidences.

I received many, many calls from the press after I resigned as United States coordinator for the Nairobi conference. I was pressured by the press, both at the office and at my residence. Some press women felt that I had "an obligation to the women of the world" to discuss the details surrounding my resignation. Others felt that it was something that should be brought out into the open, and others wondered what it was all about. In any case, they tried in many different ways to get me to talk with them. I had promised the deputy assistant secretary at Department of State that I would not discuss these circumstances with anyone, especially the press, and I didn't. I finally had to leave town for two or three months until the whole thing quieted down and people had forgotten about it. I am a professional woman and a careerist, and I saw nothing at all to be gained by discussing this kind of thing in the press, creating more controversy and more disruption. I feel sure it would have jeopardized our preparations for, and our participation in, the Nairobi conference itself. So I didn't discuss it with anyone, and officials in Department of State thanked me for that a few months afterward and said they were very pleased and very proud that I had not engaged in bickering and controversy and criticism.

*Q: That's very commendable. You see so much of the opposite kind of behavior now.*

DILLON: In the fall a few months later, I received a very nice call from a woman official at USIA, with whom I had worked briefly in Montreal several years before. She knew that I had resigned as U.S. coordinator for the conference, and, therefore, she assumed I was available. She suggested I do a lecture tour in Africa as part of their AMPART program, American Participants. They had had requests for someone to come and speak in three or four countries on the role of women in development, because, you see, by now the July Nairobi conference had taken place and it was a subject fresh in the minds of many governments, especially in the developing world. I pointed out that I really was not an expert in the field of women's affairs. I keep trying to tell people that, that I'm an aviation

expert and an international negotiator. But she felt it was something I could do nicely, having had some exposure to it that spring in connection with the Vienna conference and the Nairobi preparations.

We agreed that she would line up some lectures on the role of aviation and development, as well, which she did, so once again my attention turned to Sub-Saharan Africa, where I traveled for about a month, speaking on those two subjects. I went first to Nairobi, as I recall, and spoke, had an excellent meeting there on the role of aviation and development. It was a fine turnout, including the president of East African Airways and many others involved in or interested in aviation, and we had an excellent session. I lectured and then we had a good question-and-answer period and discussion. I was somewhat relieved when the embassy official accompanying me said "That was the best use of AMPART funds I've ever seen."

I went from there down to Mombasa, and I spoke on the role of women. Our consul there was a very fine young career officer, and we had a very, very good relationship. She had arranged a meeting of women, invited not only the women leaders, but it was open to the public. Many of them brought their friends. We had an evening session which was very successful.

I was really shocked to learn, the following year, that our consul there had died of cerebral malaria. I was shocked and really grief-stricken, because she was outstanding in every way and a fine young woman.

From East Africa, I flew across to Kinshasa, and in doing so, I remembered that years earlier I almost single-handedly had inaugurated the East-West services across Africa, so it was a great pleasure for me to fly a similar route. In Kinshasa, I spoke on the role of women to a large group. It was the twentieth anniversary of the present government in Zaire, and there were a lot of celebrations going on and unusual activities. (I believe, as a matter of fact, Maureen Reagan was in the country representing the president for that occasion. Our paths didn't cross.)

I was scheduled to speak in Southern Zaire. As a matter of fact, scheduled for a two- or three-day visit down there for interviews and so forth, but because of the festivities in Kinshasa, air services were disrupted and I couldn't get down there and get back in time to continue on with my itinerary. So we filled in with additional speaking engagements in Kinshasa, including a speech to a girls' school and so forth. It was a very interesting visit, and I think it was worthwhile.

From Kinshasa, I flew up to Libreville in Gabon, and in these French-speaking countries, of course again I spoke in French and handled the discussion in French. Libreville, I think, was an outstanding visit because the representative there, who was the USIS representative responsible for my visit, had arranged a good gathering. We had a very large auditorium at one of the ministries, and many of the women government officials and women from the judiciary turned out, as well as others who were just guests for the

day. But it was a long afternoon session, we had an extended question and answer period, and it was one of those things that simply went well. It was very successful.

From Libreville, I was to go to Lagos and catch a flight to Freetown. After we took off, we were a little bit delayed, and about the time we were supposed to land in Lagos, things began to cloud over outside and we all thought there was going to be a little weather. Time went by, we didn't land, and finally we saw that we were putting down, and we rolled up to a little Quonset hut-type metal hangar on a very remote airport, and I said to myself, "This is not Lagos International Airport," which is a tremendous traffic hub. It turned out it was a harmattan, and for the second time in its history, Lagos airport had to be closed, and we had overflowed and gone to Cotonou in Dahomey. We were on the ground there about an hour. It was steaming hot, of course.

*Q: Why had Lagos to be closed?*

DILLON: Harmattan. It's the sand from the Sahara Desert blown high by wind; it's a sirocco. They call it harmattan down there. We sat on the ground for an hour, steaming, then were allowed to return to Lagos, but by then all the other traffic in the region was returning as well, so we had to hold for a while. I was very much afraid that I had missed my connection on Sierra Leone Airways, but because other flights had been delayed, the flight had held and we ran from one dock to the other, and made the connection. However, I was a day late, for one reason or another, getting to Sierra Leone, and we had to readjust the schedule there.

Some very nice things happened there. I spoke to the old college there, which is the oldest in West Africa. That was an academic group in a large auditorium. I spoke on the role of women. A session was arranged by SLAUW, Sierra Leone Association of University Women. They had arranged a speech in the USIS building in the evening, which was very well attended. In the meantime, I had met with their executive board and was so impressed with the competence and the sincerity of these women and their Association of University Women program, that I asked our consul there if I couldn't give them a donation for their scholarship program. So during my visit, we chose an appropriate occasion and I presented them with \$100. It seems a small amount to us, but in Sierra Leone, that gives one girl one full year of schooling in their scholarship program. So to them it was a big thing, and it seemed to please them very much. They were extremely well-qualified career women, very well educated, and a most impressive group of professional women.

The African women are outstanding. They're moving ahead in many ways faster and more effectively, I think, than we are. They're not being extremists about the movement, but they are producing the movement by performing and by assuming responsibility, educating themselves, performing well in their positions. In Gabon, for example, several of the women I met were involved in the Association of Women Judges in Gabon, a very powerful group of people.

*Q: They do a lot of research, too. I've read quite a bit of the literature coming out of Morocco, particularly.*

DILLON: Yes. From Sierra Leone, I went back through Paris, where I was able to say hello to my daughter, and then back to the United States. It was wonderful to be in Africa again. I loved it.

*Q: And that time of year is usually nice, isn't it?*

DILLON: Yes.

*Q: That was a lovely experience for you. And well arranged by the State Department people?*

DILLON: Yes, the embassies. But the USIA people were those that I worked directly with, and they seemed to be competent, involved, and had arranged my schedule very well.

*Q: They have a very dedicated group. Women seem to be very effective in USIA, I have been told. So you were back, then, around October?*

DILLON: It was later in the fall. I was there on Thanksgiving. I recall I was in Kinshasa for Thanksgiving.

*Q: Did you go back to Indiana after that trip?*

DILLON: Yes. I had been in Indiana to get away from the press in Washington, and, of course, I do have to go there frequently to take care of the farm and manage things there, and I enjoy being over there. For the most part, when I'm not overseas, I'm either with my daughter here in Arlington [Virginia] or over there at the home place.

*Q: What sort of farm is it? Is it a working farm?*

DILLON: It's a working farm, but it's a small one. It's about eighty-five acres, what we used to call a subsistence farm. My grandparents certainly were able to subsist there, although that was about all. It's been in the family 100 years, so I enjoy it and hate to part with it.

*Q: How wonderful that you've managed to keep it going all these years.*

DILLON: I lease out the cropland, about fifty acres. Over the last few years I had a large pond dug in cooperation with the ASCS Department of Agriculture program. They were a great help in engineering it and supervising the digging. I've started fifteen acres of permanent pasture, alfalfa, clover, some lespedeza and a little timothy for the horses. That's coming along very well. I'm selling hay off of it now, and if I had fencing, I could

pasture it. A lot of clearing had to be done, and whenever I'm there, I participate with the men doing the clearing--axes, chain saws, whatever. We cut the wood for the wood stoves and burn the brush.

*Q: Any animals?*

DILLON: No, because I'm away so much. What few out buildings were left there, we had to take down. I was able to save one of them, which was built out of the huge, big old barn that was there many years ago. I use it as a garden shed. I did build a large, very efficient workshop a few years ago, so we have that for tractors and the equipment.

*Q: If you ever settle down long enough, you could really have plenty of scope for your gardening. [Laughter]*

DILLON: [Laughter] Oh, yes. I started a young orchard, about thirty-five trees, and it's beginning to produce now. I became a beekeeper a few years ago. An elderly friend of the family presented me with my first swarm of bees, and I thought it was a marvelous time to get going, so as that first hive swarmed each spring, I would catch the swarm and put them in an empty hive. When I went overseas again last year, I had three or four hives, and all of the honey we could possibly use. I like it and Katherine does, but there's just so much you can cope with. Of course, I would not want to get involved in a commercial operation, but it was beautiful honey and, of course, the second great benefit that a lot of people don't realize coming from bees is cross-pollinization. I had their hives situated near the orchard, and they work the orchard blossoms every spring, and my vegetable garden. I found it made a difference in production.

*Q: Very interesting. You enjoy this physical work?*

DILLON: Very much. Very, very much. It's therapeutic.

*Q: Getting back to the sequence of events, you did return. Did you then take on some other work?*

DILLON: Yes. I was contacted by the Peace Corps once more about a year later. It seems that they had lost their director in Tunisia, the same country I had served in in the mid-sixties, and very much needed a new director there, someone who knew the Peace Corps, preferably, someone who knew Tunisia, someone who had French. And here I was. [Laughter] I was reluctant to take it. But I was on board in a month and back in Tunisia in two months. A great deal needed to be done with respect to the programming and over-all government relations. There were about 100 volunteers in special education, beekeeping, agriculture extension.

We talked with all of their supervisors and their directors so that there was a clear understanding of what Peace Corps was and why it was there.

*Q: You mentioned counterparts.*

DILLON: Yes. Tunisian counterparts for the volunteers. In other words, a one-on-one situation so that they could work together, cooperate, coordinate, and to the extent the volunteer could impart special knowledge regarding handling teaching the retarded.

We opened a center, that had been kind of bogged down, for teaching of teachers. It was staffed by volunteers. We added a couple of Tunisians to the staff, opened the center, and selected a group of about twenty or twenty-five children to come into the model center, and they, then, would be the objects of these teaching programs.

*Q: A practice teaching situation.*

DILLON: Exactly. This is your field, isn't it? You know more than I. The system would gather up, then, a number of Tunisian teachers, and too often they really weren't teachers. They were those working in these centers, with very little qualification. But a group of them would be selected and would, as a matter of fact, volunteer or ask to come and constitute a seminar at the center for a couple of weeks, then return to their centers. Then another group would come. This would take place three or four times a year. I was very pleased about that. It was going so well that we had agreed with the Tunisian government that a second one was needed very shortly. This one was in Djerba, far in the south of Tunisia, on the island of Djerba, and we felt we needed another one up in Central Tunisia and one in the north. So I'm hoping those programs will move ahead over the next few years.

*Q: You kept the same children all year?*

DILLON: Yes, they were the children that were assigned to this center. That was their center and they were being taught and worked with.

*Q: Very good. Had the Tunisians passed any laws prohibiting intermarriage between people [related] to a close degree?*

DILLON: To my knowledge, there's no law, and even now there might be a little problem with putting it into law, because many families follow this custom and tradition. But they are speaking out about it now. They are being educated. I've asked many young unmarried people were they going to marry, whom were they going to marry, if they were engaged, are you marrying a cousin, and there seems to be less and less of this. They will speak right out about it. The fact that the minister of social affairs, when he dedicated the Djerba center, said in his speech, "We have to get at the root of this problem, intermarriage," was to me very, very encouraging.

*Q: Yes, of course you're tearing at the whole fabric of a society when you try to change custom.*

DILLON: The other thing we did was set up a small committee headed by one of our well-qualified senior volunteers, a psychologist, and he, together with a couple of top Tunisian psychologists and psychiatrists, were beginning to meet, to formulate a procedure and a testing facility that would enable some evaluation and assessment in these centers. Very often we saw severely retarded in with children with minor behavioral problems. We saw quadriplegics, young men in their thirties, maybe, in with four-year-olds who are retarded. Just a terrible hodgepodge in some of these centers. Consequently, our volunteers and the Tunisians couldn't give the proper attention to each individual, the kind of special education they needed, and orientation.

In one center I was visiting, I noted a very bright little girl, a very beautiful child, six, seven years old, running around amongst severely retarded and handicapped. I had visited the center before. I knew she was new. I thought she was the daughter of the director of the center. I asked about her, and he said, "No, she's an inhabitant here now. She belongs in the center." I said, "What in the world is the matter with her?" "Well, we're not sure. Her parents brought her here because she failed the second grade." I watched her quite a while. It turned out she's a gifted child. She's a genius, but here she was, a "behavioral problem," failing in school, and they thought she was retarded and sent her to a retarded center.

*Q: Like Albert Einstein. A good thing you spotted her, Betty. Her life could have been destroyed.*

DILLON: Sure. This very well-qualified committee now will begin to work up some kind of an assessment procedure so that at least some gross kinds of sorting can be done, and Mongoloids and Down's Syndrome can be sorted out, little children with behavioral problems, quadriplegics can be sorted out, and so forth, and have *physical* therapy. Those who need some psychological attention can get it. Those who have serious psychiatric problems can get help. So I think that's going to be a marvelous development for Tunisia.

*Q: Indeed. Also make it possible for the teachers to work with the children. Imagine having a mixed bag like that and trying to get anywhere.*

DILLON: Some of our volunteers came over very well qualified. They'd worked years with retarded and with our special education programs here, they became discouraged, understandably so. They were trying to cope with this myriad of problems in one place at one time. But by the time we got some of these other things going, they were *encouraged* again and doing a marvelous job. The volunteers were superb.

*Q: Wonderful!*

DILLON: My favorite program was agriculture, however, and I was able to expand that very markedly.

*Q: How did you go about that?*

DILLON: We brought about some new programming initiatives, especially in the very fertile northwest region, which used to be the breadbasket of the Roman empire, and only in recent years has begun to come back into its own again, the valley of the Majerda River. We'll be putting more volunteers in there. We did this year, and we'll be putting more next year, I hope. We had the invitation of the regional director to send over a technical team to do the program feasibility study, which will lead to the assignment of volunteers. I think that this program is very much in keeping with Tunisia's five-year plan, which emphasizes agriculture production and development of the outlying regions so that urban migration can be brought to a halt. It's a serious problem in Tunisia.

*Q: The young men, I suppose, want to come to the cities in order to earn a proper living because the land has been so leached out?*

DILLON: Yes. As population increases in Tunisia--and it is increasing everywhere, of course--more and more pressure is put on them to produce, and technology has not kept up with the needs for agriculture production. Of course, Tunisia has a serious foreign exchange problem and has serious limitations on all imports. This has, to a certain extent, dampened the import of agriculture machinery, for example, and fertilizers and so forth, many of the things they might need. Although it's my impression an effort has been made to get those things into the country and exclude other things. But young men feel that if they come to the city, they can find work there of some kind. Very high unemployment rate and unemployed educated young men are more and more of a problem.

*Q: So I suppose they drift into--*

DILLON: Yes. It's surprising that there hasn't been more crime in Tunisia. The crime rate is quite low. Drugs are just nonexistent, really. It certainly isn't an outward problem. Because it's a Muslim country, alcohol, tobacco, and so forth are not often seen.

*Q: Tobacco is not a problem?*

DILLON: Of course, tobacco's a problem if there's one cigarette. But you don't see as much smoking as you do in other countries. There's a lot of cigarette smoking because of the French influence, but alcoholism, drug use is not an outward problem.

I brought a young man over from Morocco who had been a Peace Corps volunteer there for three years, and put him on contract to do some programming on national wildlife preservation and parks conservation and that kind of thing, simply because it very much ties into many of the soil erosion problems, many of the grazing problems, many of the agriculture-related problems that Tunisia has. I understand there's been some programming done in that area now to go alongside the agriculture development.

*Q: How long were you there this time, Betty? In Tunisia?*

DILLON: I was director for well over a year. I was on a one-year contract.

*Q: But you stayed longer than a year?*

DILLON: I really love Tunisia. Katherine and I are seriously considering spending more time there. I've been asked to make a proposal to the Tunisian government to do some representation for them on behalf of their airline, which ties into my background, of course, and tourism. It isn't clear yet if I would be doing some of that in the United States or if it would be done primarily in and around Tunisia.

*Q: Would you enjoy that?*

DILLON: Very, very much.

*Q: Are you going to work up this proposal?*

DILLON: Yes, I am working it up, and it will be submitted through their ambassador here in Washington.

*Q: It certainly is a wonderful place for tourists to go.*

DILLON: It is. It's a delightful country. The people are outstanding. They're very sophisticated. I often say to my Tunisian friends that they've been invaded and overrun by one civilization after another down through history, and I think they got the best from each one. [Laughter] Because they're very open, very friendly, very bright, very sophisticated, and they have a very small and difficult country to try to cope with and exist.

*Q: What is the population currently?*

DILLON: It must be about 5 or 6 million. Maybe 7 million now. Tunis is not quite a million yet. Sfax is the second largest, and I think it's half a million. So, yes, it's a very small country, but it's strategically located, of course. The southern part of it is Sahara Desert.

*Q: Are there many Bedouins in the Sahara?*

DILLON: I noticed there weren't as many this time as there were in the sixties. At that time we could see Bedouin tents across the desert when we were driving in the South. We could see their camel herds and their sheep and goats. But I saw much less of that now.

*Q: Tunisia has no oil, unlike Algeria, does it?*

DILLON: They had a little oil years ago. I think that ran out or has nearly run out. Every now and then one hears rumors of a big find, but I haven't heard any of them confirmed yet. It is not an oil-producing country significantly.

*Q: That would bring us up, then, to 1987, when you came back.*

DILLON: Yes, it was in the fall of '87, four or five months ago.

*Q: What have you been doing since then?*

DILLON: I had a number of personal affairs to take care of because I had been out of the country for a year. I've had a lot of business at the farm, getting things caught up over there. I am working on a couple of books, one on international aviation policy and one on international policy in general, which comes along a little slower. For some years my daughter and I have been putting together my biography, which we started in French many, many years ago. It was to be called *Ma Mère, La Ministre*. [Laughter]

*Q: That's a lovely title.*

DILLON: We find that's difficult, because so many of the marvelous things we want to write down and the people that we want to mention, the anecdotes we want to tell, are somewhat personal and, in some cases, confidential, and we find it difficult to break confidences or to say things that might be misinterpreted. Then we find, if we try to fictionalize them, that it doesn't come through quite as nicely as we'd like for it to.

*Q: What do you think you'll do with this? Finish writing it and then put it aside for a number of years?*

DILLON: Probably.

*Q: That must be fun. When you write with your daughter, do you find you have differences of opinion on the way things happened?*

DILLON: No, we don't, but I find she remembers a great deal more than I do. Perhaps that's because she wasn't under some of the pressures I was under at these various points in time. Perhaps it is because she was an interested bystander, as it were, not directly involved, and, therefore, she could store away details in her mind or put a slightly different interpretation on something.

*Q: Fascinating. I wanted to ask you--In reading about the Queen of England, I learned that before she sends out any ambassador, who is, of course, selected not by the Queen, but by her government, she always invites that person to the Palace and has her photograph taken with the person. In other words, she sets the official seal on her ambassador going out. This is extremely helpful to the person when he arrives at the post, because he is Her Majesty's representative. I wondered, some presidents have done*

*that. Ronald Reagan has been very good about doing that, but others have not. Did you have a call to the White House and an audience with your president, and your photograph taken?*

DILLON: No. I was called to the White House for a brief meeting with a presidential advisor, which I'm sure was to reassure *them* about my competency. But I did not have a meeting with the president. I did meet with President Ford, not individually, but in groups during the time I was the United States minister to ICAO, because Anne Armstrong had a very fine women's program going during her tour in the White House, and on at least two occasions, groups of us came in to meet with the president and Mrs. Ford for a discussion of not only women's programming, but some of the substantive issues we were involved in.

*Q: Do you think that is something that should be done, to meet with the president?*

DILLON: Yes, I think so. Of course, there's such a large number of ambassadors now, what with the multilateral system, as well as the bilateral ambassadorial appointments. It has the advantage, as you say, of giving a stamp of approval. There's no question then that you are representative, not only of your country, but of the particular administration that is in and its policies. On the other hand, it politicizes your position, very much so, and for those of us who were careerists and endeavored in every way we could to serve effectively under whatever administration was in, it might lend a political tone that could be misinterpreted, or in some cases even be a handicap in carrying out one's work.

*Q: That's a good point. Do you have any second thoughts about your career, Betty? Things you wish you had done differently?*

DILLON: As I mentioned, as we moved along through this series of interviews, I have made a couple of mistakes. A couple of them, I think, were serious mistakes. But then that's in retrospect. It's easy enough to look back and say, "Well, now that I know what I know now, I should have done this then." But if you put yourself back into the same circumstances you were in *at that time*, you would probably make the same decisions. As I said earlier, I loved the work that I was in. The international work was challenging, and I loved it. I loved the people I worked with, both within my own government and the individuals I met from other countries and governments.

I think we should probably talk about two or three major things I would like to suggest that career women do.

*Q: Excellent. Please do.*

DILLON: I feel it's important that everyone should do this, but I think women especially should at some appropriate time--and it might be when they graduate from high school or from college--but in some young year, they should sit down quietly with themselves and think things through and establish priorities. By that I don't mean options or alternatives

or career directions; I mean personal priorities. Think them through. Think about what is important. Think about principles. Think about the cost of doing, the personal cost, the professional cost of doing some of the things you may want to do. How important is honesty to you? How important are some of the basic principles that we live by and that we like to think are a part of our cultural heritage? I think they should think through womanhood and what it means. What are the handicaps? And there are some. What are the advantages and disadvantages of being a woman in the workplace? So, first off, it's personal priorities, because those have to be applied when you come to making your career choices sometimes.

Secondly, very early on, set some goals. One can work very hard, very effectively, get university degrees, but if you don't know where you're going, what good is it, really? I think, as I mentioned earlier, that since I was a little girl, for whatever reasons, I knew that I would be involved at a high level in international work. While I never really discussed that, probably not with my family or anyone, while it wasn't an outward thing that I thought about very often, that was my goal, and there was never question in my mind or heart that that was the direction I was going in.

Then if you're going to move toward that goal, how are you going to get there? Two things. I've always found it very advisable and very rewarding to seize opportunities. We hear a lot of women say, "There just aren't any opportunities for women. We don't have equal opportunity. We need more opportunity." That's a big word these days. There are opportunities all around us, and I think we should seize them. We never know which one is going to lead to another one, and when one door opens, what you're going to see when you get through it, what is the next door that's going to open, and so forth.

When I was a youngster, my grandmother said, "Whenever you have an opportunity to learn something, it doesn't matter what it is, learn it. You never know when you will need it or when it will come in handy or what it will lead to. If you have a chance to learn, learn."

Then I think women careerists need to really study and learn about and talk about this question of rights and privileges. So many women that anticipate a career or are involved in the women's movement talk about the privileges they want; the same privileges as men, and you don't hear a whole lot about the responsibilities that go with those privileges. I've known women who have been able to move into career positions and been fairly successful and were surprised and perhaps disappointed because they had very heavy responsibilities. They had to pay, as well as receive, for moving into the man's world and working and holding their own there.

At the same time, women have to remember that they have a double role. As women careerists, they have these work responsibilities, job responsibilities, career directions, but they are and they must always be women. I've been known to say over the years that if ever there was an occasion where I had to compromise my womanhood in the interest of my career, I would go in the direction of womanhood, because that simply is what we are.

We are women. Never mind the advantages and disadvantages, this, that, and the other thing. We're women first.

I recall when my daughter was very small, she and I had an understanding very early on that whenever there was a conflict between my responsibilities to her as her mother and my job or my career, if we couldn't resolve that conflict, it would be her way. I recall, I think only once when it couldn't be resolved. That is, I had a very important conference that couldn't be postponed or changed, and she had a very important Girl Scout meeting or graduation or something, and I reneged on the conference and went to that very important occasion with her. But other than that, we've always been able to compromise, negotiate. She changes her needs or I change mine, and we worked it out together. But I wanted her always to understand that when all was said and done, she came first.

*Q: At what age did you discuss this with her first so that she was aware?*

DILLON: Certainly she was still in elementary school, and I think even earlier than that. Maybe about the time she started school.

Too many women, in moving into the so-called man's world and into a career, are inclined to feel that they must become a man or become like men, and I've always maintained that you can enter the same career world as a woman and be just as successful without compromising your womanhood. It isn't easy, and very often you have the double role to play. As we mentioned earlier, when I was a United States minister, the highest ranking woman in the career civil service of the United States government, I often had to make it home in time to cook dinner for my guests, whereas my male colleagues had maids and wives and so forth.

*Q: You had an even triple handicap, because you were a single mother. What are your feelings on a two-parent family if both work? How heavily do you think the father should share the responsibility? Would you alter your statements to say that one must be present, one of them has to give up something, and it wouldn't always have to be the mother who gave up the conference to go to the Scout meeting?*

DILLON: Sure. Sure. In that respect, I think very definitely they should share. If there had been a father in our home at that time, I most surely would have said, "I have this very important conference today. What do you have?" And if he said, "Well, it isn't a very heavy day for me. I'll be glad to go," that would have been the way to handle it, of course. I'm sure it does help tremendously to have a life partner that can share in that kind of responsibility. On the other hand, I guess a little bit of my old-fashioned background comes out, because I see a lot of men doing things that, in my judgment, I would not particularly ask the man of the household to do. I think in some cases we've gone a little too far in the other direction. I can't think of an example at the moment, but I know a lot of very hard-working young men, particularly, who are having to rush home and do the washing and do the dishes, because the woman is the careerist. I think we have to be careful to keep the balance. That's what I'm saying. Just the fact that a woman moves into

a very successful career doesn't mean that everything she's been doing now falls to the husband or the father. They need to share in their careers and share at home.

*Q: Good point. This is a very fine list, Betty. Do you have any other suggestions to make?*

DILLON: Those were the ones I had jotted down.

*Q: You've done a lot of thinking on this.*

DILLON: Yes, I have, and it's been very interesting for me. It's allowed some introspection at this point in my life. As you well know, my career is not over by far, and this will enable me to make some decisions that maybe will indicate where I should go next.

*Q: You mentioned the advantages to being a woman, but then, as you pointed out, there are disadvantages, too. Could we explore that just a little bit? What are the advantages to being a woman? You've already mentioned the fact that you can speak up and perhaps get away with saying--*

DILLON: Precisely. There are different kinds of advantages. Psychologically, there are some in which a woman can shame the men into doing something. This is the best way to put it. If you were a man, you couldn't do that. I'm thinking of the 3:00 a.m. conference in Geneva, where, as a woman, I was sitting there, dying a thousand deaths, but I was sitting there at 3:00 a.m., appearing to be strong and determined and dug in, and all of these men, hundreds of them, sitting around me, who were beginning to get sleepy and irritable and so forth, really had to sit there because a woman said, "I can do it, so you can do it." That's the kind of thing I'm talking about.

There are other kinds of situations where a woman can maybe--I hesitate to mention this, because I know it's going to be misinterpreted--a woman can be a little bit more feminine than she is at other times and thereby gain a point. By that I mean a little more compassionate, a little more understanding, a little more--

*Q: Womanly.*

DILLON: Womanly. And make a point that the men in the room can't seem to get to.

*Q: Don't you think Eleanor Roosevelt used to do that?*

DILLON: Yes, I think perhaps she did. Yes, I would say that's a good example. I don't mean that a woman should plead and cry and mention dying and starving children. Not that at all. But simply bring that element of compassion and warmth and understanding to certain kinds of situations that could very often lead to getting something through or making a point.

*Q: Also, couldn't it be that women, by doing that, keep the perspective on an issue so that it doesn't go all the economic way? There are other things that have to be considered when you're dealing with reforms or laws or whatever, but it just can't be what's going to make money or be effective or be efficient. You have to think of the human cost, and women are particularly good at remembering that. Is that what you mean?*

DILLON: That's exactly what I mean. Also, I daresay that very often women are more psychologically attuned to what's going on around them. Women are thinkers. A lot of times women have time to themselves for thinking. Women are inclined to see the overall view rather than the very narrow perspective that men move toward. Therefore, in the international situation, they can perhaps be more analytical and more effective through psychological maneuvering, which is a very important part of international negotiations, whether they be bilateral or multilateral, and thereby be more effective.

The disadvantages are well known, of course. If you're a woman, you're often regarded as being inept, unqualified, mentally backward. [Laughter] Weak, emotional.

*Q: Whereas, in fact, do you find women have more endurance than men?*

DILLON: They can have more endurance. Again, I think it depends on the situation and the woman. Women can be very, very strong and determined. The Arab women, for example, impressed me so favorably because they are strong, and very often they are the rulers of the household, notwithstanding everything else that you hear about the Arab and Muslim communities.

*Q: They do much of that physical work.*

DILLON: Yes, physically, certainly. But I'm thinking even psychologically, psychological confrontations and so on, they're very strong, very determined. Career women can be those things. I think we have to be very careful not to become emotional, not to become emotionally involved. I've worked with women and watched women who were inclined to be that way, and there have been times in *my* life when I was a bit more emotionally oriented than other times. After a few years, I analyzed myself to the point where I could anticipate situations of that kind, subjects that might come up or situations that might develop. I could anticipate whether or not I was going to be overly tired on that occasion or maybe emotionally involved in a family problem on that occasion, and I have been known to cancel appointments, I've been known to postpone conferences, and that kind of thing, because I simply felt it was not the time for me to be as effective as possible and do what I had to do.

*Q: All these ideas you are bringing out come, I'm sure, through experience, and perhaps as more women get as much experience as you have, there will be less of this emotional behavior, we hope.*

DILLON: By the way, a few years ago, shortly after I left Montreal, I decided to take an opportunity at my church to become a lay speaker, and I became a certificated lay speaker in the United Methodist Church, and conducted services on several occasions, both on assignment by the church and in churches by invitation. I very, very much enjoy that. I mention that at this point only to say that throughout my career, I've relied heavily on my religion, and I realize that for many women, that's probably not the answer, but I think some kind of a religious foundation or backup or whatever you want to call it can be extremely helpful if you're really involved in a stressful and demanding position, one in which sometimes your very words commit the entire United States government, or your very words set the tone for a multilateral meeting in which life and death kinds of decisions are being made.

*Q: Yes. All of these years you had your daughter's company and many, many friends. Did you never think of remarriage? Isn't that a gap that you had in your life, that you didn't have a male companion?*

DILLON: Very much so, and I've often said to close friends who have obviously very successful marriages that I envy them, because they have found a life partner, another person to share life with, and I've often thought of what a marvelous experience it would be to share this wonderful adventure that is life with a compatible person.

*Q: But you were never tempted to remarry?*

DILLON: There was one man that I was--we were quite interested for a while. The circumstances were such that, again, one of us would have had to give up our career. I did have my daughter to raise, and I think he would have been a very fine person to have in the household with her. I wasn't ready to simply walk out on my career, which I would have had to have done.

*Q: So that's paying the price you just spoke of.*

DILLON: That's paying a price. Sure. I don't really regret it, as I look back over the years. I'm not sure at that stage of my life I could have made that kind of an adjustment.

*Q: Betty, do you have any reflections on growing older, as a woman who has had a very successful career?*

DILLON: Growing older is a part of life, and we must all anticipate it and expect it. I, however, don't see myself as becoming inactive, nor changing my career directions at this point. I'm hoping to be very active for the next several years in one capacity or another. As we grow older, we simply become more and more what we have been. As an old Irish poet says, "Such a price the gods exact for singing that the singer becomes the song." One of my favorite quotations. I would like to think that what I am now reflects what I have been for all these many years.

With respect to growing older generally in the United States, I've been alarmed to see that we're putting our so-called senior citizens, our older people, out of the mainstream of our society. Too often we're building senior citizen communities, where we encourage them to live with other senior citizens, their peers, and enjoy their later years and so forth. But you see, by doing that, we part ways from what has been the tradition down through history, where our older people remained a part of the family unit and the community. In my thinking, this is important. Older people are experienced, they're wiser because of their experiences whether they were good or bad or they made mistakes or they didn't or they were this, that, or the other thing. They are our memory, our recent memory. They are our sages, if you will. I've often felt that those people need to be more in communication with our society through appropriate channels.

I'm sorry they're not a part of our households anymore. It was customary, even in our country until not so long ago, for the grandmothers, grandfathers, great-grandmothers and great-grandfathers to remain a part of the household. While that has many disadvantages, in that often they're bedridden or require special care or special food or whatever, it has the advantage of making them a part of our lives. That softens us a bit and makes us more caring and tolerant and understanding. It also puts them into direct communication with our children and our young people who need to have a respect for old age, who need to learn from our oldsters, who need to acquire a little bit of the knowledge that comes from having that much history available to them directly.

*Q: Very, very wise comments. How do you feel about the women's movement now?*

DILLON: I think it's undergoing some setbacks. I'm appalled by the role being given to women on television at the present time. It is womanizing, it is feminizing, it is really very subtly, but very clearly once again painting woman as the sex object, woman as the weaker, woman as the emotional type. You see it in audiovisual material, you see it as a major part of sexism. Kassim, one of the women journalists from the Middle East, I think from Egypt, very wise and well informed, recently said on television that "America is obsessed by sex," and she's right, of course. You see it, it's everywhere: it's in our ads, our commercials, our TV, our records, our cassettes, our clothing styles, and so forth. Women, of course, are the object of all of this, and very much a part of all of it, and it's being done somewhat subtly. It's being done without confrontation or without issue. It's simply appearing everywhere and our young people, particularly, are having women thrown at them in that role repeatedly, constantly, hour after hour, day after day.

So when people say the women's movement has made great strides and the women's movement has taken care of a lot of these problems, I think, "Why are they saying that?" The very ground that we've gained over the last many years is being taken away from us, trivialized right out from under our feet. I was appalled by what little bit I saw of the movie this week called "Windmills of the Gods," presumably the fictionalized story of a woman ambassador, but what little I saw of it painted that woman as most certainly a sex object, as an emotional, mentally insufficient person who, in my judgment, if, in fact, she was an ambassador, should not have been one. But that kind of thing then leaves an

impression in our society that that's what a woman's going to be like if she is appointed an ambassador. It's very unfortunate.

*Q: It's particularly unfortunate when you think that thirty-five years ago, when Clare Boothe Luce was made ambassador to Italy, these are the very same things that were said about her. Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose.*

DILLON: *Oui, c'est la même chose.* We've made progress in many directions. I think there are a few more job opportunities. I think we have not made as much progress in equal pay for equal work as we should have. I'm not so concerned about equal opportunity. I think there are opportunities there. They may not always be the ones that you think you want at the moment, but if you can't go through the door over *here*, go through the door over *there*, and you'll get there eventually.

*Q: Do you think part of this business on television and in the newspapers and magazines and so forth is a backlash from the fact that women did seem to be going ahead and moving into what were formerly men's spheres?*

DILLON: I suppose it could be a reaction to the improvements that have been made over the last fifteen, twenty years, but it's so insidious because it's all around us. It's going on all of the time, and there's no way to get at it, and I'm not sure that men or women are mindful that it's going on. I don't think many women are mindful that while they may be working hard over here in the women's lib movement, twelve hours a day the TV is showing women in another role.

*Q: To sum up this very excellent oral history, could you reflect a bit now on the most significant achievement in your life, what you consider to be the most significant?*

DILLON: Well, uppermost in my mind is my daughter. I think having my little girl was my greatest achievement. For me, it's been a great privilege to share life with her.

Apart from that, in my career, as I look back over the years, I notice that in every one of my positions, even back through the secretarial years, I was always involved in something that was far above and beyond my immediate duties and responsibilities. That was true even as a secretary. In each job I did something besides being just a secretary.

When I came into the foreign aid program, I helped with the aviation program. That was not in my job description. Certainly when I came into the Civil Aeronautics Board, I drew up the entire African aviation air transport policy for them and for us, which, as far as I know, was adopted government wide and acted upon. That, I think, was one of my greatest achievements. I was very proud that I had the opportunity to do that.

In Montreal, of course, a milestone was the adoption of the 25 percent assessment ceiling in ICAO, which then was adopted throughout the U.N. system. The adoption of the seventeenth annex to the Chicago convention in ICAO, the annex on security was a

milestone. We don't just every day amend or add to a multilateral convention or treaty, which is what that was.

Taking the chairmanships of the ICAO committees, the Committee on Unlawful Interference and the Joint Financing Committee, were very important achievements. It was important that the United States have those chairmanships so we could use them to accomplish things, but it was, I think, quite an achievement that they went to a woman. It's never happened in ICAO before or since, that a woman chairs a committee, and it happens very seldom in the United Nations system generally.

*Q: Very true. It's never happened since in ICAO?*

DILLON: No. The fact that I was the first and only woman on the executive council of ICAO was an achievement. But as I look back over the years, the things that matter the most to me, and I hope would be long remembered somewhere, are those special little occasions when someone from another country said to me, "We trust you," or, "You understand us," or, "You have changed my opinion of the United States," or, "Your friendship means more to me than anything," or, "You're a wonderful diplomat. We appreciate the opportunity of working with you." Those are the things that I remember most as achievements because they meant to me that I was being effective in my representation of my country and of my government.

*Q: May I add one here, which I think is an achievement? That is that you have accomplished all that you have without compromising your own ethics. That is something.*

DILLON: Yes. Thank you. Thank you very much. I've been, as you know, very careful about that over the years. I've always kept confidences, even among my international colleagues. I've always been honest. I've always given more than a day's work, always more than an eight-hour day or a five-day week, because I felt that in public service, we *should* give even more than is expected of us. After all, the American people are paying us. The taxpayers are paying us, and they deserve everything we can give. I've always thought it was a privilege to be in public service.

*Q: If you have no other last-minute thoughts, I'd like to thank you very much, indeed, for a splendid interview.*

*End of interview*