

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

JOHN E. MONTEL
&
QUENTIN R. BATES

Interviewed by: Allan Mustard
Interview Date: January 22, 2006
Copyright 2020 ADST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

JOHN E. MONTEL

Background	
BS in Ag. Sciences, Cornell University	1942~1949
MA in Int. Econ., Law, and Hist., University of Geneva	1949–1950
US Army Corps of Engineers	1943–1944
Entered the Foreign Service	1950
Rome, Italy—US Embassy, agricultural attaché	1950–1953
Duties of the Agricultural Attache	
Postwar Reconstruction	
Furloughed, Unfurloughed, and Furloughed Again	
Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic—US Embassy, ag. attaché	1954-1956
DCM to Haiti tells Montel to “know his place”	
Caracas, Venezuela—US Embassy, ag. attaché	1956-1958
Working under Jim Kempton	
Failed Attempts at Making Kempton Retire	
Guatemala City, Guatemala—US Embassy, ag. attaché	1959-1962
Responsibilities also in El Salvador, Honduras and Belize	
First Cash Purchase from the US	
Drought Relief in Mexico	

Brussel, Belgium—USEC, ag. attaché
Fight with the Ambassador During the Chicken War 1962-1966

Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic—US Embassy, ag. attaché
DCM to Haiti tells Montel to “know his place” 1954~1956

Standard Oil Date not listed

Arthur D. Little Date not listed

Retired Date not listed

QUINTON R. BATES.

Background

Littauer Fellow at Harvard University 1949-1950

Iowa National Guard 1941-1946

Entered the Foreign Service 1946

Department of Agriculture training 1946

Bogota, Colombia—US Embassy, ag. attaché 1953-1955
“The reason we’re not shipping corn to Venezuela”
Stopping a Dangerous Demarche about Beans

Retirement 1974

E.A. Jaenke & Associates 1975

Additional Comments from MONTEL & BATES

Negotiations under the GATT

How agricultural Attache’s Have Changed

How Attache’s Reported from the Field

On Why Some Expert Advice is Ignored

On Wolf Ladejinsky Removal from FAS

The Politics of FAS and Early Officials

Smuggling the Body of Clayton Whipple Out of Spain

INTERVIEW

[Note: This interview was not edited by Mr. Montel or Mr. Bates.]

Q: Today is January 22nd, 2006. We are in the home of John Montel, outside Leesburg, Virginia, and present here on our panel are John Montel and Quentin Bates. I'm Allan Mustard of the Foreign Agricultural Service and this interview is part of the Association for Diplomatic Study and Training's agricultural series. This is a joint interview, but John, let's start with you. Could you please talk a little bit about your background, where you came from and then talk about how you became an agricultural attaché?

[Ed: In addition to this interview, Mr. Bates was separately interviewed in this ADST series beginning in January 1990 and his Oral History is at: adst.org.]

MONTEL: It's a long story, since I was born just a few years ago [Ed: early 1920s], but we'll try and give it all we've got. Ever since I can remember, I've always had a desire to work in agriculture. I really in my teens didn't know what I wanted to do, but I decided I'm going to get a degree in agriculture, and my intent was to go to Cornell University and study. But a couple of years prior to that, I began to work on farms, before entering Cornell University. You have to keep in mind that I was born in New York City and I had no reason for this particular desire to work on farms, except that it always appealed to me.

So, about a couple of years before I got into Cornell, I was working on dairy farms in upper New York State around the Finger Lakes area. I went to Cornell for my first meeting with the faculty, and after having told my faculty adviser, which incidentally is an American facility that you don't find anywhere else in the world in colleges and universities. My faculty adviser found out that I wanted to marry my yen for agriculture with my desire for living overseas, so he recommended that I go down to Washington, D.C., and I asked to meet with Fred Rossiter. I'm talking about 1942.

I entered Cornell. I finished my first year-plus at Cornell. We got into World War II. I left Cornell to get into the Army. I got into the Corps of Engineers, went to officer's school, then went overseas, came back to Cornell in 1946 and returned to my studies there; this time with money from the GI Bill. The G.I. Bill was invaluable to finishing my university education. I didn't have enough money to continue after that first year at the university.

I then went to Washington and I renewed my acquaintance with Fred Rossiter. Mr. Rossiter said that he would employ me, hire me, after I graduated, and if I graduated with good grades. So, I was at Cornell then to finish my work in 1949, and I received a BS (Bachelor of Science degree) in agricultural economics, and I still had some G.I. Bill credit left, and so I asked Mr. Rossiter, if I could do graduate work, would he still hire

me? And he said, "By all means." [Ed: By 1949 Mr. Rossiter had become acting Head of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations for that year.]

So I packed up my things and went overseas to do my graduate work at the University of Geneva in Geneva, Switzerland, where I majored in international economics, law, and history. When I finished, I had only enough money to live another month over there, and to pay for my return trip to the United States. So I convinced the American consulate to send a message to Fred Rossiter saying that I was available and did his assurance still hold water, namely, would he still hire me.

They wouldn't believe me, so it took me several days to convince them that this was no fairy tale. They finally sent a cable to Washington asking the Department to ask Fred Rossiter, and the answer came back that, yes, that they were hiring me immediately and that they should ship me immediately to Rome, from Geneva, Switzerland. That's how I entered the agricultural Foreign Service, which at that time was called the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

So, I arrived in Rome [Ed; in September 1950, according to the Department of State's Foreign Service List], finally found a place to live, but I had no more money in my pocket to buy food for my wife and an infant which was soon to be born. The embassy's budget and fiscal officer was a very, very kind woman, whose name I can't remember anymore, but would you believe that she opened her pocketbook and she gave me money to last me until my first salary check came through. That's how I was able to feed us. We didn't have any other money.

My assignment in Rome lasted for three and a half years when there was a worldwide RIF (reduction in force). At that time, as you know, Doug Crawford was heading the attaché service, so according to Doug there was a lot of negotiating going on between Agriculture and State, and Agriculture wanted to keep some people and get rid of others. Doug's account was that he bargained for me and got rid of the then assistant attaché in New Zealand.

Q: Phil Habib.

MONTEL: It was Phil Habib, exactly. I was traded for Phil Habib!

Q: Who then stayed with State Department, went on to an absolutely brilliant career.

MONTEL: That's correct, exactly. But he apparently didn't please Doug Crawford at all.

Q: So when you arrived in Rome, you walked into the embassy and presented yourself and said, "Here I am." Did they have any knowledge that you were coming?

MONTEL: They had a cable and they knew who I was, and I must say, they made every effort to help me out. I knew nothing, absolutely nothing.

Q: But you had no security clearance.

MONTEL: I had nothing. A security clearance was unknown at the time, believe me. I never heard of the word "security clearance" at the time. Anyway, I lasted for three and a half years when there was a worldwide reduction in force (RIF), and I was told – incidentally, that notice came two weeks late, because according to the notice, I was given a month to pack up and leave. By the time I was told, I had two weeks.

So I had to break my lease, pack up my belongings and get down to Naples to take a ship back to the States because there was no air travel at the time. As I'm walking towards the ship, a young vice consul comes running up to me and he says, "Mr. Montel, your RIF has been rescinded." At that point, I turned around and I won't use here the language I used then, but I told him in effect to go to hell and what to do with the notice.

I boarded the ship and arrived in Washington, and I went to Doug Crawford's office and Doug told me that while I was in the middle of the ocean, I had been RIFed again in all of the dealing that was going on. He said not to worry, find a place to live, and he will take care of me, and Doug did.

Doug took care of me and after several months in a rented apartment, the least costly I could find in the Washington area, which was Arlington, Virginia, at the time, shipped me and my family to Ciudad Trujillo, which today is Santo Domingo, the capital of the Dominican Republic. There began my career [Ed: According to the Foreign Service List Mr. Montel took up his duties in the Dominican Republic in July 1954]. By then [Ed: this reorganization dates to 1953] the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations (OFAR) had become the Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS), and from that day on until I retired, I worked for FAS, except for stints with the private sector.

Q: Before we go to Quent and ask him about his background, I want you to talk a little bit about that first day in Ciudad Trujillo, and then when you went over to Port-au-Prince and presented yourself to the DCM (Deputy Chief of Mission).

MONTEL: Yes, as was the custom then, and it may still be the custom now. I'm sort of out of touch with customs. My responsibilities covered both the Dominican Republic and Haiti. And, as was the custom then, I went over to Haiti to introduce myself to the ambassador. At the time, I don't recall who the ambassador was, but the DCM was a gentleman named Les Mallory, and I had an appointment, and I was there 15 minutes early for my appointment. Les Mallory didn't receive me for at least an hour and a half to an hour and three quarters. He deliberately kept me sitting outside.

Finally, his secretary came over to me and said, "Mr. Montel, Mr. Mallory will receive you now." I walked in and put my hand out to greet him and he ignored my hand and his first words were, "Now, let's get one thing straight. You're not coming here to tell us how to run agricultural affairs in this embassy." And that was my introduction to Haiti and to

Les Mallory. And, incidentally, after that, when I was in the private sector, I was working for Arthur D. Little at the time, I needed someone to do some research for me in Mexico. And Les was living in a retirement community in Mexico at the time, so I got ahold of him, and I recalled how we first met and we both had a good laugh over it, and I asked him would he be available to work for me. He thanked me, but said he's retired in the literal sense of the word and he was not looking for any more work of any kind.

Q: You were not aware at that time that Les Mallory was one of the earliest agricultural commissioners to have worked for USDA (United States Department of Agriculture) in the 1930s.

MONTEL: I had absolutely no idea, and I just learned this from you recently. I never knew it before. Which must have been the reason for his telling me I'm not going to tell him how to run agriculture.

Q: So, in the Dominican Republic, what were the kind of things you did? And if you could talk a little bit about your work in Rome, what were the duties of an agriculture attaché, and what were you doing in the postwar period there in Rome, and then when you went on to the Dominican Republic?

MONTEL: Well, Rome was a fascinating post for me. In the first place, the agricultural office was a group of very fine people. Bob Tetro was the attaché; Howard Cottam was the Counselor for Economic and Agricultural Affairs [Ed: Mr. Cottam arrived in Rome in April 1946 and departed Rome in 1952]. Howard, as you know, went on to be an ambassador [Ed: In Kuwait October 1963 to July 1969].

Bob Tetro [Ed: Tetro arrived in Rome, according to the [Foreign Service List](#), in June 1950 and replaced Cottam as Counselor of Embassy in (summer?) 1952 and served in Rome until approximately 1954.] was extremely kind to me and very helpful in teaching me about the work I was going to do. I was low man on the totem pole, but it made no difference. I worked on an even basis with everybody else, and my first portfolio was to cover dairy and farm machinery. But I learned a hell of a lot from Bob. I found the group very pleasant to work with. Eric B. Shearer [Ed: Shearer arrived in Rome in Aug 1949] was assistant attaché, and over me, and Eric retired to Washington quite a time after that, as I recall.

But we did extensive travel all over Italy and Sardinia and Sicily, and for me it was a wonderfully exciting and educational experience for a person my age and with my lack of experience.

Q: At that point, by the time you arrived in Rome, were a lot of the postwar reconstruction already completed, or were you still involved in the rebuilding of Italian agriculture?

MONTEL: We were still involved in the rebuilding of Italian agriculture. Italy was a mess at the time, the agriculture was a mess at the time, and I recall one time we were traveling to inspect the recipients of gifts from foundations, philanthropic foundations, in the United States, and we visited one farm – I'll never forget this – that received a bull, a Holstein bull, from the United States. This was a farm that never should have received any such animal, because it was what you might call a bare subsistence farm. I had never seen such poverty in my life, and of course the poor bull couldn't mount a cow if it tried, it was so badly cared for.

But to show his gratitude, the farmer invited us into his house, and his house, believe it or not, had mud walls on the interior. That's how poor this place was, and it had a dirt floor. Hanging from the ceiling was a leather bag. I would guess that the leather bag may have been about two feet in diameter and about two feet deep. It was conically shaped, and there was a little spigot in the bottom of the bag. The farmer's wife gave us each a cup that was a little smaller than a demitasse cup and she served us the liquid that came out of the spigot.

And, after we tried it, then he told us what it was, and what we were drinking was coagulated blood, animal blood, that had been sweetened, and that for them was a treat, and is what they offered visitors in the house. I'd never forget that experience.

Q: Why don't we switch to Quent for a little bit here? Quent, could you talk a little bit about how you got into the attaché service and why you ended up an agricultural attaché, your background.

BATES: I was born in April 1919 in Jefferson County in Iowa on a farm in an area that had not been settled until the mid 1800s. Both of my great grandfathers had moved into the county at that time and bought land for \$1.50 or so an acre, completely undeveloped land, and I grew up just a mile from where that first farm was. It was very primitive living conditions. We didn't have electricity, running water, but we didn't think of ourselves as being poor, because we had bought the farm.

But my parents had only had eighth grade educations. My father had one year at what they called a college, but it was just a trade school, really. They weren't interested in literature or culture, but I did have an uncle and aunt that were and they had a very extensive library, and I became a voracious reader. My sister was three years older and a born teacher, and she started teaching me to read as soon as she did. I was reading before I was three.

I went to a one-room country schoolhouse, which I think gave us a reasonable education. We competed well, I think, when we went into Fairfield, the nearby town, with the other students, and both of us graduated high in our classes. And we felt that we'd had a good elementary education.

And I went to the Fairfield High School and graduated in 1935 as salutatorian of the class. There was a college in the town, Parsons College in Fairfield, but I didn't have the money to enter right away. I had to spend a year on the farm working, and then the following summer I got a work scholarship and worked out my tuition for the year and was able to start college and had various jobs during my college years besides that. But my first year I had taken what they called an examination, which was a statewide examination, what they called the General Culture Exam. And, as a freshman, I got the highest score in college, so the dean of the college and the head of the history department invited me to take over as his student assistant for the last three years.

That's when I got interested in international relations, because he was very much interested. He was an author and a lecturer in international affairs and also in domestic political and economic affairs and the sponsor of the international relations club, which I joined and became the president of. But I was studying to be a teacher. It never occurred to me, I hoped I'd be a college professor, and I majored in history and government and minored in education and fully expected to start teaching as soon as I graduated.

But, as a junior in college, the international situation was getting rather desperate, and so they were recruiting National Guardsmen. We had a National Guard unit in our home town. So, mostly for financial reasons, although I was very much interested in world affairs, I think mostly for financial reasons I joined the National Guard, and we got a dollar a week for our evening training, three hours of training, and a dollar a day for the two weeks that we had in summer camp in Des Moines.

Then I graduated from Parsons College magna cum laude in 1940 and started interviewing for positions teaching in high schools in the area, but I was in the National Guard, and it was in 1940. You historians will remember that that's when the legislation was passed which permitted the activation of National Guard units, and my division, 34th Infantry Division, started preparing to be activated, so no one would hire me. So I went to work for my uncle on the farm for a few months, but we were also doing intensive training, and we were activated for federal duty in 1941, February of 1941, and spent the rest of that year at Camp Claiborne, Louisiana, in intensive training, and I was sent to Fort Sam Houston, Texas, for a training course as a surgical technician. I was a combat medic.

When Pearl Harbor occurred, our unit was immediately ordered to Camp Dix, New Jersey, to prepare for embarkation. In fact, I had to go back and join another unit. My unit was already gone by the time I got back to camp, and we then spent about three weeks and the 26th of January in 1942, we embarked on the first two ships to go to Europe after the war started. I went to Northern Ireland and I spent seven months there. While there I had made application for officers' candidate school, and in August of 1942 was ordered back to the states for the Medical Administrative Corps officers' training, and was one of the first to join the Veterans of Foreign Wars when I got back, commissioned second lieutenant and was ordered to the Seattle Port of Embarkation, where I was made the

executive officer of the medical supply unit for the Pacific forces. Later I was executive officer of the Fort Lawton Station Hospital, an 800-bed hospital.

Then we were told to prepare to be assigned to a unit that would be going to Japan for the invasion of the mainland, but, as we all know, Hiroshima [August 6, 1945], then the Japanese surrender came [August 15, 1945]. I had enough points to be mustered out, but just before that, the State Department circularized the Army and the military services that people could apply to take the Foreign Service Exam. I submitted my application and was accepted. I took the written exam in November and the oral exam the following May [1946]. On my examining board was a gentleman by the name of Francis Flood, who happened to be the assistant director of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

So the examiners found that I was pretty knowledgeable in international affairs from my college experience, but the agriculture man, Francis Flood, was asking me questions about agriculture. Well, I grew up on a farm. I had never taken an agriculture course, and I was too lazy to enjoy farming. I wanted to be a professor.

Anyway, I knew enough about agriculture that he was satisfied, then I got back to Washington and got my appointment and took the A-100 basic training course and upon my graduation from that we were all notified where we were going. Most of them were going directly overseas, but they said that I was being transferred to the Department of Agriculture for training as an agricultural attaché at the request of Francis Flood.

Q: What did your training consist of?

BATES: Well, I took courses at the Department of Agriculture Graduate School. The course work was designed by former attachés and other agencies that were involved in foreign affairs, a very general sort of course. It lasted a little over three months, and then I was posted to Ottawa as third secretary, vice consul and assistant attaché [December 1946]. Seven months later, Francis Flood showed up as my boss, as the agricultural attaché, and he was a wonderful person, a brilliant man, a brilliant mind.

Now, I had applied earlier for a scholarship to Columbia University, what's called the Roberts Fellowship, and I was notified that I'd been accepted for it the same week that I'd gotten my notice to take my oral exam for the Foreign Service. And I wrote to the director general of the Foreign Service and asked if I couldn't – I was going to study international law – if that couldn't be postponed for a year. He said, "No, we need agents, and badly, but we have a university training program and we'll see that you get on the list for that, as soon as possible." So I gave up my Columbia fellowship, and then while I was still at Ottawa – they sent me out to Winnipeg [July 1947] for a year to study agriculture in the prairie provinces, which is very interesting.

I got my first political experience in covering the annual conference of the Socialist political party in Canada, which was very strong at the time. They were just about equal to the other parties. And I covered that. I had good contacts in that group, because many

of them were in the prairie provinces. I got a commendation for my report on that, which further interested me in the political side.

I was assigned to the Embassy in Ottawa [October 1948] and got a notice. I got a telephone call from Washington that they had an opening at Harvard University for the Tower Fellowship, and was I interested in that? So I jumped at it and I came back and went down to Harvard.

By the way, my replacement in Ottawa was Phil Habib.

Q: All right. Well, I would like to stop there for a minute and ask the two of you to maybe think back to your days working under the Department of Agriculture's Office of Foreign Agriculture Relations and then think to when you were agricultural attachés and counselors for FAS working for State Department after the 1953-1954 reorganization? Were there major differences, were there subtle differences? [Ed: For additional material on the subject of the history of the FAS see the ADST Oral History interview of Richard Welton conducted by Quentin Bates.]

John, do you want to start?

MONTEL: The major difference was that any reporting that we did before the Foreign Agricultural Service was created was run through the embassy's Counselor of Economic Affairs. That's my personal experience, and the reports had to be cleared by that office before they could be sent to Washington, and after FAS was created, the State Department, the economic offices, were very reluctant to relinquish that particular control

Q: Quent, do you want to talk about our experience in that regard?

BATES: Well, I was stationed in Bogotá at the time. I'd been in Paris, first, and then transferred to Bogotá in August 1953. Then the law was passed which turned the attachés back to the Department of Agriculture, and so I had to make a decision as to whether or not I was to stay with the Foreign Service or go join Agriculture, and the ambassador convinced me that I should. He was a very strange character, Rudy Schoenfeld.

I'd enjoyed my work so much, and the job of the agricultural attaché was considered by almost everybody as one of the best jobs in the embassy.

Q: Why was that?

BATES: Well, we had our own vehicle. We could travel around the country whenever we wanted to do it. The ambassador didn't know anything about agriculture, and so he left everything up to us, and even the economic counselor, we had very good relationships, but he wasn't much interested and didn't care. So I enjoyed the work, so I decided to stay with Agriculture.

But in my circumstances, it really didn't change things very much. I got a clerk. I hadn't had a clerk. I just had to borrow help from the economic counselor. I got my own secretary, and then I submitted my reports directly. I just submitted copies to the economic counselor and passed up to the ambassador, but there was very little change in my relationship. At this time most of the officers that were agricultural attachés held the ranks of either FSS (Foreign Service staff) or FSR (Foreign Service reserve).

And they had to join the Office of the Foreign Agricultural Service, as it was then called.

Q: So the only people who were permitted to stay with State were the commissioned officers, the FSOs (Foreign Service officers).

BATES: The FSOs, and most of them stayed with State, and I think in your work you've run across how many of them became – it was a very fine group. Several of them became ambassadors, was it six, or seven?

Many of them became high-ranking officers. Francis Flood, my boss, became an FSO-1 and was consul general in Scotland when he died, unfortunately. He got a brain tumor and died. But I was never unhappy with the change, because I enjoyed working in agriculture so much. We were limited. We could not go beyond the grade 15 at that time without losing your tenure. You could be fired without cause as a political officer if you got a 16 or above. So we had a glass ceiling at that time, which wasn't raised until 1980, really, when the legislation which permitted attachés to get positions of counselor and minister counselor and so forth and then eventually became Foreign Agricultural Service officers again.

I didn't feel I was handicapped. In fact, I think it was an advantage for me, because of my FAS experience and also some political reporting and economic reporting, which I had done in Winnipeg. I was of help to the United States, the FAS service because of that, and also every ambassador found me useful, because not only was I very familiar and kept in touch with the current political affairs there; I also had good contacts out in the countryside. Most of the countries I served in were agricultural countries, and most of their leaders had agricultural ties, and I always had very close relationships with the ministers of agriculture in every post.

Q: If you look back at some of the written records and look at the shifts that were taking place in the 1950s, where in 1954 the attachés came back to USDA from State Department, and there was also a sea change with the arrival of the Eisenhower Administration in 1953. You trace the history and look at the focus of OFAR in the early 1950s under Stanley Andrews, Dennis Fitzgerald, Jack Haggerty. Then, suddenly, in 1953 Jack Haggerty is very abruptly fired, a caretaker came in briefly, Fran Wilcox for a few months, then he was succeeded by Romeo Short, who was also there for only a few months, a lot of churning there. Then, suddenly, Bill Lodwick appears as the first administrator to carry the title "administrator" and the Market Development Cooperator Program gets underway.

So, during that period of transition, in addition to the attachés moving, we see a tremendous change in attitude that OFAR and the attachés were involved in development work, they were involved in feeding programs, reconstruction of Europe, and suddenly in the early 1950s you see that change, that that's all pushed over to State Department, to the technical cooperation people. And FAS is focusing strictly on market development. Could you talk about that change, that transition, and your experiences as field officers who were caught up in the middle of that?

John, do you want to start?

MONTEL: Yes, I'll start with an anecdote, which is based on fact – not really an anecdote. That was when Public Law 480 came out [Ed: July 1954], and we were pushing our exports of our surpluses, and when it first came out, I believe it was Title IV of PL-480 was concerned with sales for cash without credit of any kind. And that appealed like hell to me, because all my life I didn't like credit. I didn't like to build up balances that I owed.

So I grabbed ahold of Title IV, and I went to see the minister of agriculture in El Salvador. At that time, I was assigned to Guatemala, with responsibilities also in El Salvador, Honduras and Belize [Ed: According to the Foreign Service List, Montel took up his assignment to Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras in July 1959]. But I was good friends with the Minister of Agriculture there, and to cut the story short, he and I had dinner at his house and I stayed at his house until about 1:00 in the morning, drafting the agreement of the Salvadoran government to participate in the first purchase from the United States under Title IV. And that was the first one. I don't know how many followed after that, but I was determined I was going to make the first sale under Title IV, and that was that.

As I recall, it was only for \$2 million, but for that time and for a country that size, that was a fortune.

That was really my only experience with PL-480 of any significance, in the context of what you're doing.

Q: Well, what about the changeover in mentality and attitude towards the type of work? Can you talk a little bit both from the field perspective, and then what you were hearing out of Washington?

MONTEL: That would require some thought. How can I best answer that? Well, maybe one of the ways I can answer that is recalling an experience I had while I was serving in Mexico. You may recall that I served in Mexico from January 1980 until I believe it was July or August of 1986. It was almost seven years.

And, at that time, Mexico suffered a drought, but it was a very severe drought that lasted for over two years, and I mean there was practically no rain in the entire country, and crops were minimal, and therefore the country had to rely for the first time in history on massive imports from the United States. This, of course, was financed under PL 480, and imports of that size, we were not prepared to handle in a very efficient way.

To give you an example, at the height of the movement of these agricultural exports to Mexico, U.S. freight cars were backed up from the Yucatan in Mexico to the Canadian border. That's no exaggeration. The rails were jammed in the United States because of the quantities that Mexico had to import to keep its people from dying from hunger, and it was literally that. So, in order to try and resolve that impasse and rail movements of these massive agricultural cargoes, the Department of Agriculture arranged two conferences. They were two different times, two different conferences, with the railroads that were charged with moving these goods into Mexico.

The conferences were held in the private railcars of the Union Pacific, the Southern Pacific and one of the northern railroad companies. I don't recall the name anymore. And that's where we met with the officials of the Mexican government in charge of these imports, as well as our officials from Washington. And I've got to tell you, to use a Ray Ioanes expression, "I've got to tell you," I've got to tell you that we were treated like royalty.

The waiters and the porters on the trains were in white uniforms with polished shoes, and they served our every whim and fancy in those visits. We lived like kings for those two or three days that we lived in these cars and we conferenced, trying to plan the movement of our agricultural surpluses, of which we had a tremendous amount, into Mexico, where they had a tremendous need.

Q: Quentin, back in the 1950s, you've now transferred from being a State Department agricultural attaché to a USDA agricultural attaché, and then you have 1953, 1954, the firing of Jack Haggerty, bringing in a new crowd, a new Republican administration. What's changed?

BATES: Well, my position there in Bogotá [Ed: This assignment lasted from August 1953 to August 1955] didn't change too much. I had negotiated one of the early PL-480 agreements. That was the first change, and that was in 1955. In July 1957 I was in Washington, as reports and training officer, recruited by Ray Ioanes. By that time, Gwynn Garnett had become administrator.

Well, Gwynn Garnett is known as the pioneer, the founder, in many ways, of PL-480, and that of course was his be all and end all, and our staff meetings were completely different than what they had been before I went to Bogotá, the ones that I had covered.

Q: Can you talk about that a bit? What was the difference?

BATES: Of course, the emphasis was always on market development, and the questions were – Gwynn Garnett, he was a great guy, but very much concentrated on that sort of thing. And to get back to Jim Kempton, that you have talked about, you served under and all, he was a historic figure in the Foreign Agricultural Service. He came back to his first conference at the first staff meeting for FAS. So Gwynn Garnett went around the room, asking questions and all, and he got to Jim Kempton. He said, "Well, Jim," he said, "how about Venezuela." He was the attaché coming from Venezuela at the time. "I don't see any of our corn moving to Venezuela. Why don't you do something about that."

So Jim says to him, "Mr. Garnett, are you asking a serious question," and Gwynn said, "Well, of course I'm asking a serious question," and Jim says, "Well, I'll give you a serious answer. The reason we're not shipping corn to Venezuela is that Venezuela grows corn and has corn coming out of its you-know-what."

MONTEL: Let me add one to that that reminds me of something that was very typical of Jim Kempton. Jim had a similar query from Washington regarding exports of powdered milk to Venezuela, and Jim Kempton sent back a message to Washington saying, and these are almost his words, "If the good Lord meant for the Venezuelans to consume powdered milk, he never would have weaned them from his mother's breast. I will not do it."

Q: You've started talking about Jim Kempton. John, you worked for Jim Kempton, and you, Quent, were the reports officer who handled his reports. Which one of you wants to go first talking about Jim Kempton?

BATES: Let John start.

MONTEL: In what context do you want it?

Q: Well, just talk about Jim Kempton, who he was and what it was like working for him and just what he did there, and why he couldn't leave Venezuela. He was there for 15 years.

MONTEL: Well, I was assigned to Jim Kempton's office as an assistant for the one and only purpose of convincing him to retire, because he never had had an assistant, and so they forced me on Jim, and I was shipped out against his wishes. [Ed: According to the Foreign Service List, Kempton served in Venezuela since September 1942 and Montel arrived in September 1956. They may have served together until Montel left post in the summer of 1958.] But Jim was a gentleman to the core, and he never took it out on me, at least not directly. But, shortly after I got there, Jim, who as you know was a prolific writer – he never stopped writing, and he wrote in such detail. Jim said, "Well, John, I guess the first thing you ought to do is to familiarize yourself with the files, so why don't you go into the file room and start reading the files?"

I walked in there, and I think, as I recall, there were five five-drawer cabinets, filled with his writings, and I had nothing else to do, except, according to his instructions, to read those files. So after about a month of doing nothing except reading files, one Friday afternoon Jim called me into his office and said, "Well, John, I think it's about time that you got to know Venezuela." He took an Esso roadmap, because that was the only map that we had at the time, and he said, "Here's Caracas, and over here," and I forget the name of the town, it was to the west of Caracas. He says, "Here is such and such a town on the border with Colombia."

He said, "Why don't you take off Monday and I'll see you in two weeks. Get to know the agriculture." I never got any suggestion as to what to see, who to see, how to go there, and that was Jim's way of baptizing me, so to speak, into the job. He wasn't going to help me, but he knew it was important I knew the country, and the best way to do it was to send me out on my own. So, Jim, as you can tell, especially from Quentin's tale about – what was it you were telling him about, corn? – and my tale about the powdered milk, it gives you some idea of Jim's independence.

I can tell you another quick tale. We had a new ambassador assigned to Caracas. [Ed: The ambassadors in the 1956-1958 time frame were non-career appointee Dempster McIntosh (April 1956 to December 1957) and career FSO Edward Sparks (March 1958 to April 1961)] I don't recall his name, but he was the high commissioner for Austria at the end of World War II – U.S. high commissioner. But he resented Jim tremendously, because Jim knew everybody, and I mean everybody, in the Venezuelan government, not only in the agricultural area, but everybody. There wasn't a Venezuelan affair that Jim and his wife were not invited to.

When this ambassador got there, he immediately resented that, and he took a dislike to Jim. So when Jim went to the States on home leave, the day he left, the ambassador fired off a cable to Washington, recommending that they abolish Jim's position, because there was no need for that agricultural reporting position. So, when Jim got to Washington, his State Department friends showed him the cable but told him not to worry, because they worshipped Jim.

And, Jim, contrary to practice in those times, never sent the embassy a cable advising when he was going to return, so he just showed up surprisingly one day. And everybody was surprised to see him. They didn't know he was coming in. And he went right up to the ambassador's office and the ambassador's secretary almost dropped her eyeglasses when she saw him. And he said, very politely, "Good day," Ms. whatever her name was, "is the ambassador in?"

And of course the poor secretary stumbled and stuttered and said, "Well, yes, but let me see if he can see you, Mr. Kempton." And he said, "Just don't bother." He said, "Just remain at your desk. I'll go see him myself."

So he didn't even knock on the door. He walked in and the ambassador had the same reaction upon seeing Jim, because the department never replied to his recommendation to abolish Jim's job. So Jim walked up to the ambassador and he said, "Good day, Mr. Ambassador. When I was in Washington, they showed me a cable wherein you recommended that my position be abolished. The next time that you would like to do that, if you would just let me know beforehand, I will tell you how to do it." And he turned around and he walked out of the office, and would you believe that from that day on, they were very close friends?

BATES: Jim was that way. He made close friends in situations where most people would make enemies.

MONTEL: Right, but he kept his respect.

BATES: That's right. One other brief story about Jim, I've forgotten what post he was at during World War II.

Q: He was in Caracas. He went there in 1942.

BATES: That's right. He was in Caracas all that time. But when he went there, of course, the staff was very small, and this was during the war, and everybody was scrambling to try to get the time of a secretary. Of course, Jim wrote probably twice as much as anybody else in the embassy.

MONTEL: A very prolific writer.

BATES: And so he always had trouble. So he got a desk right next to the ladies' restroom, and every time a secretary went to the restroom, he'd hail her when she came out and get 15 minutes or so of work out of her. There are Kempton stories by the millions, and I hope that you're able to find them.

There was an assistant secretary of state which had a standing order, every time a report from Jim Kempton came in, and that was practically every day, it would be sent first to his office. He read every one of them.

MONTEL: Well, Jim's reports to OFAR and then FAS, a large number of them were kept in two leather-bound volumes on the sixth floor, and for years they were kept there in a special place, and I don't know where they are right now, or even if they've been protected or secured in some way. That would be of valuable information to you.

If I were you, Allan, I'd try and look for them. I don't know if anybody knows about them.

Q: I'd never heard of them, so I'll look for them.

MONTEL: Other than that, Jim was highly respected, admired, by many, many scientific organizations in the States, among them, the American Museum of Natural History and the Chicago Museum of Science and Industry. And, occasionally, these museums would travel to the jungles of Venezuela and of Brazil, and inevitably they'd invite Jim to come along as a participant, and today there are several species of birds which were identified for the first time by Jim, whose Latin classification name ended with *kemptoni*.

Other than that, I could say that Jim was a gentleman to the core. He never believed much in formal education. I believe he only had two years of college education. He and his wife educated their two daughters at home, and I believe he lived in Spain, didn't he, at one time?

BATES: Unfortunately, as much as Jim wrote, he didn't seem to want to write his memoirs. He was encouraged by a lot of people to write his memoirs, and he never did. I'm not quite sure why.

MONTEL: I'll tell you, if I could remember the name of the sociologist who wrote a column either in the *Ladies Home Journal* or the *Saturday Evening Post*, it was on page one or two of those magazines, if I could remember his name, it would make the story possibly of more interest to you, but this gentleman and Jim Kempton rode the length and width of Central America on mule back collecting specimens for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. And, today, the home of that gentleman, his retirement home, is in Antigua, Guatemala, and it's kept today as a museum, and Jim is part of that particular house museum in Antigua, Guatemala.

Q: So there's stuff about Jim Kempton down in that museum.

MONTEL: Yes.

Q: Well, we leave Caracas behind let's say for a few minutes anyway, and you left off when you went off to Harvard, and you left off, I think, when you were in Bogotá at that point.

John, do you want to talk a little bit about some of the more memorable experiences being an agricultural attaché and counselor over the course of your career and the things that jump out to you?

MONTEL: Including persons knocking heads? Okay, I'll come up with one. I was assigned to USEC (United States Mission to the European Community) two times. The first time I was assigned to USEC, which was 1962 to 1966, the State Department was in the middle of very extensive and far-reaching trade negotiations with the European Community. And, obviously, my job there was to protect and expand our agricultural exports, and this was the big problem for State Department.

Q: Well, that was right about the time the Chicken War broke out.

MONTEL: Exactly. I was right in the middle of it, and of course we didn't have many friends in the Department of State at that time, because we were an obstacle to what the State Department was trying to do. I should start this way, that the economic counselor and I were very good friends, so I recall one day I went down to his office and he was not there, and neither was his secretary, but on his secretary's desk there was a memorandum from the ambassador, whose name was Tuthill [Ed: John W. Tuthill, career FSO, was ambassador to the USEC from October 1962 to June 1966], and the memorandum from Tuthill to the econ minister counselor was, in effect, a recommendation that he, the ambassador, reveal our agricultural ...

Q: Negotiating position?

MONTEL: Yes, but there's another term I can't recall right now – what we offered, what we get for it. In any event, disclosing our negotiating position, before the negotiations began, so that he could try and weasel his way out of the agricultural obstacle. Of course, this was the ambassador's idea and it had nothing to do with what our policy was within the Department of Agriculture. I read that thing and I couldn't believe it. So when the economic counselor came in, I asked him about it.

"John," he said, "I had nothing to do with this." I said, "Well, who did." He said, "Tuthill did." I said, "Well, I'm going to have to go up to see Tuthill, because Ray Ioanes doesn't know anything about this."

He said, "If you do that," he'll have you PNGed (persona non grata) and out of here in 24 hours." I said, "Well, I don't have any alternative. I've got to do it." So I wrote a memorandum to the ambassador and took it up to his secretary, and she looked at it and she said, "You really want me to give this to him," and I said, "Yep."

She said, "You'll be hearing from him," and I said, "I don't doubt it." Well, the next morning I got a call from her at 8:00 in the morning and she said, "He wants you now." I went up there and I walked into his office. She said, "You can walk right in." And there he was, seated, with this, my memorandum, in front of him, in which I told him I had discovered this memorandum and I knew nothing about it and I don't think that my secretary knows anything about it, could he please explain it to me.

He said, "Sit down!" and I sat down. And he took the memorandum between his thumb and index finger and he threw it at me across the desk and he said, "Read that." And I looked at it and I said, "Mr. Ambassador, I know what it says. I wrote that memo," and he began to explode. He said, "How dare you send me a memo like that? Who do you think you are?" And that set the stage for his comments. And after about five minutes, literally, he was frothing at the mouth, and I decided that it would be in my best interest not to reply to him, but let him get the steam out. So I sat there and let him almost literally scream at me.

Finally, he said, "That's all. You'll be hearing from me." So I walked out. Then, the next morning, at 8:00, I got another call from his secretary. She said, "He wants to see you immediately." And I thought to myself, "This is it, I'm going back home." But between those two meetings, I called Washington and I spoke to Ray Ioanes, and I didn't do it on the phone in the mission because I was afraid the phones were tapped. So I went to the post office and I made a public call to Ray Ioanes on the public phone and I told him what was going on, and he exploded.

He said, "I'm going over to see the boss right now." The boss was the Secretary of Agriculture, he was always called "the boss" by Ray. And I said, "Ray, please don't do that, because if you do, they'll kick me out of here before you can blink an eye. I think I can do more for you staying here than I can back in Washington." He said, "Okay, but keep me informed."

I went back to the mission and went up to the ambassador's office and there he had the whole country team, and he said, "Sit down." I sat down, he said, "I called this meeting for one reason only. From here on out, anything that's even remotely concerned with agriculture, I want Montel clued in. That's all. Meeting's over." And that was the end of the incident.

Of course, they didn't do what he said. A lot of things were never passed across my desk, but at least I got over that hump with Ambassador Tuthill.

Q: Quent?

BATES: That brought to mind a Venezuelan story that also involves Ray Ioanes. And I've forgotten the exact date of this, but, in any case, we were selling beans to Venezuela, some black beans up in New England someplace.

New York maybe? Okay. And the importer of them was making a big profit, and he had a deal with the growers in New York, and it was a pretty deal for both. But that was a major staple of the Venezuelan diet, and so the president got upset about that and so he had a law passed that took the importation of the beans away from this private company that was handling it and the government took it over. So that upset Ioanes, and he drafted a memo to the State Department that was a draft of a demarche that was to be sent to the Venezuelan government, a tough one, practically threatening dire consequences if they didn't turn it back to the private industry.

He brought it in to me and said, "Look at this. I'm sending this over to State," and I read it, and I was horrified. I had just gotten back from a second tour from Argentina, a second tour after six years in Latin America [Ed: According to the State Department Biographic Register, Bates was assigned to Argentina from July 1961 to April 1966]. And I had been to Caracas. I knew some of the people involved in the Venezuelan government, and I followed the situation there very closely from Colombia [Ed: August 1953 to June 1955]. So I didn't have time to get back to him, and so at our staff meeting, Ray, along toward

the end of the meeting, said, "Well, I'm taking care of this situation about these beans in Venezuela." And he said, "Bates, what did you think of that letter."

I said, "Well, I'd like to talk to you a little bit about it, Ray," and that upset him a little bit. And he said, "Well, what do you think about it?" I said, "Well, I'd really rather talk to you about it. When the meeting was over, I went to talk to him and he was pretty steamed. He said, "Well, what was it you wanted to talk to me about?"

I said, "Ray, I think that this could be counterproductive, knowing the way Latins feel about us." He said, "Well, I if I had wanted the State Department answer, I would have gone to the State Department for it." I said, "Ray, I spent six years in Latin America. I know some of these people. I know the Latin American temperament, and I'm just giving you my personal opinion, based on experience."

He said, "Okay," and I went out. The letter never went, but for a while he was pretty upset with me, but then I guess he got to thinking about it and he got over it, and we had good relations. I never got that kind of a treatment from him, and we worked very closely together. At that time, I was the deputy assistant administrator for international trade, and in charge of much of our trade negotiations. We just got along beautifully after that.

Q: In that pre-WTO (World Trade Organization) era, where you were working within the framework of the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), under which we didn't have a formal agriculture agreement until the Uruguay Round, how did you negotiate with the foreign countries? What was the leverage you could use with them? And, John, do you want to talk about that – well, let's take the European Community context of the State Department and the U.S. government in general wanting to create the European Coal and Steel Community to unify Europe so that we wouldn't have another world war that broke out in Europe, and agriculture kind of got caught in the middle. So what kind of leverage did we have to ...

MONTEL: Give me a year I can refer it to.

Q: Let's say 1970, the early 1970s.

MONTEL: Well, at that time, things had changed from the first experience I told you about, Tuthill and the memo and the State Department's role in the negotiations, which relegated agriculture to a second or third tier. By the 1970s, the Department of Agriculture was negotiating for itself, and they didn't have State Department negotiators on top of them overseas. So, in stark contrast to that first experience I had in the 1960s, I was doing the negotiating with the Community for Agriculture. And I wasn't doing it with any State Department person with me. That doesn't mean that I was entirely separated from the rest of the embassy. On the contrary, when I negotiated, or what was agreed, or what was said, and I put on paper, also went over the embassy's desk, but they couldn't tell me not to send it, they couldn't change it, because I was the one that was doing it.

So, if that answers your question, the distinction is night and day.

Q: Well, that's kind of the internal dynamic, but in terms of when you sat across the table from someone from the European Community, what leverage did we have that would make them budge from fundamental protectionism?

MONTEL: Leverage, I don't think I can answer your question regarding leverage. I can only say that I was given an assignment, a negotiation assignment, and I'd do it directly with the director general for agriculture in the Community. He would do it *ad referendum*, obviously, and I would do *ad referendum* with regard to Washington. But I was doing it directly with the guy in charge of agriculture in the Community. That's the best I can answer your question.

Q: Quent, comments on negotiating in the 1960s and the 1970s and how it changed over time?

BATES: Well, to start with, in the 1950s, when I was in Bogotá, as I said, I was involved in the negotiation of one of the early PL-480 agreements. That was no problem, because this was something that Colombia would benefit from, and so it was just a question of the details, and so there was no particular problem with that. The minister of agriculture was a close personal friend, and that helped a lot, but it was later on, when I was the deputy assistant administrator in international trade, when we were having our arguments with the Common Market, which was the big problem.

Q: That's my question, is when you were negotiating with the European Community, with the Common Market.

BATES: There wasn't so much a negotiation. It was just yak-yakking back and forth. We couldn't move them on even minor points, usually. It was very difficult.

MONTEL: I can remember one incident when we were able to use leverage, and I'm trying to recall the name of the political appointee at an extremely high level in the State Department, a Texan who was a lawyer in the private trade. I wish I could remember his name. My goodness. In any event, there was a problem with the Community, a trade problem.

There was a trade problem, and he came over with his wife and there was a problem with coal and steel, and there was a problem with agriculture, so I accompanied him to the community conference room and all of the members of the council were there. I sat behind this gentleman, who answered to our president at the time, and nobody else, and he tried to get his point across, and the official of the Community told him that, in a very nice, diplomatic way, and on a very friendly basis, that he regretted it very much, but just didn't think that he could do anything about it. At which point the American official, the presidential appointee from the private practice, got up and said, "Well, in that case," he

said, "John, where's the telephone. I'll just get on the telephone and I'll call" whatever the president's name was." And he used the president's first name. Let's say his first name was Frank. "I'll just call Frank and tell him what you just said."

The councilmember, the European councilmember, said, "No, no, sit down. We can iron this thing out right away." And that's how that problem was resolved. I'll never forget that.

BATES: I think the negotiations with Japan were very interesting, in some ways, even more difficult than the negotiations with the Common Market, and I was pretty much involved, more than anybody else, I guess, in FAS. In four of the five years that I was in that job in international trade, negotiating with Japan, but there, again, it was pretty much a question of making our proposals and then saying well, they're very sorry, they can't do it. The best example was in Geneva, as I was the U.S. member of the GATT Agriculture Committee, I kept in close touch with the Japanese representatives there. I was pushing them pretty hard to have a formal negotiation so we could get together top-ranking people. This was just an agreement of the State Department. The Congress was getting very upset about this, so we said, "The Congress is going to do something pretty drastic if we don't at least talk about this."

So they finally agreed to a negotiation from the top level. This pressure to have these negotiations was from the top level. Phil Trezise, who was then ambassador to the OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development), had been I think an assistant secretary of state either just before or just after that was named head of the delegation. [Ed: Philip Trezise, a non-career appointee, served as the ambassador to the OECD from October 1965 to July 1969. He then served as Assistant Secretary for Economic, Energy and Business Affairs from July 1969 to November 1971.] I was the agricultural representative.

They set the date for the 28th of December, which meant that we had to leave on Christmas Day, deliberately so, so we had our first session and I talked to Trezise about what the agricultural position was. He didn't know too much about it, because he hadn't had a chance to get back from Paris soon enough to get in on most of our preliminary discussions on that subject. He agreed that, for example, grapefruit was one item that was not produced. We had wanted oranges, we'd wanted beef and a number of other things, but they were all produced in Japan.

They didn't produce grapefruit, and he said, "Well, if you at least get an agreement on grapefruit, we could have a good market there for that." And so he mentioned this in his first talk. Then when the Japanese representative came up, he said, "We're going to have good negotiations, we're willing to talk," and all. He said, "Just one thing, grapefruit was mentioned." He said, "When you were negotiating on rice and you finally got some action and some concessions from us on rice, we paid for the rice farmers to shift much of their rice paddies to orange groves." And he said, "We have what we call a summer

orange that's very much like a grapefruit. It's a competitor of grapefruit, and we're having an election next September, and until the election we can't even talk about grapefruit."

Then that night, Trezise called a meeting of the delegation, and so he said to me – they said, "Well, after September, we're willing to come together and talk again." He said, "What's the Department of Agriculture position on that? Think they're willing to do that?" The fact that he hadn't been in on our preliminary discussions had kind of left my mind a little bit. I thought he was just making a joke. "Is that a serious question, Mr. Ambassador?" And then I immediately decided that wasn't a very diplomatic answer. I said, "Well, I'm sorry, the short answer is no. The department wants to go ahead with pressure."

But the Japanese did nothing more, but the deputy foreign minister, being a party for the group, at a fancy Tokyo restaurant with geishas at every table, every person and so on, and we had a great meal. Just at the very end, they came in, the last course, they had a huge plate with a half a grapefruit about that big around, which is strictly coincidence, because it was so much desired, so expensive. Every grapefruit cost \$1.50 or something like that when it was about \$0.10 in the United States at that time. So they thought this would be a real treat for the American group to have a grapefruit, so that was my experience.

Then, one more quick one. When I got back to Washington, and then not too long after that I retired, Ray Ioanes had asked me to write a memo on the Japanese negotiations. He said, "You've been the one in the closest touch with them for the last five years. What's the status of them now, where do they stand and what is it that we should work on?" Which I did, and that went into the files, and years later, Bud Anderson, who became our administrator. This was before he was administrator ...

Q: He was assistant administrator for trade policy for a while.

BATES: Trade policy, he came back for that. He ran across that memo when he was going through his files. He read it, and it sounded as though it had been written that day. That was 10 years later.

Q: And nothing had changed.

BATES: So he struck off the heading of it and all and passed it around the office, and everybody read it and thought it was a current one. There were a couple of items that looked a little out of date that puzzled them a little bit, but other than that, it just sounded like it had been written that day.

So I went to a meeting up in Bud's office. That time, I was working in my retirement job with Jaenke & Associates, and so I came to a retirement meeting in Bud's office, a celebration, so Bud told that story when he came back.

MONTEL: The story I just told you about the president's personal envoy, that was during the Lyndon Johnson Administration [November 1963 to January 1969], who was his close friend from Texas, high-ranking, top political ...

BATES: I know who you mean. I can't think of his name either.

MONTEL: A very wealthy man, and, anyway, he was the one who I went with to the European Council. There was another incident you may find useful. It's after I resigned from FAS in 1966, I went to live in Geneva and started to work for Standard Oil. I had been living there and working for Standard Oil for about a year when I got a call at my home from Ray. Ray said, "John, you've heard about the Intra Bank scandal in Lebanon," and I said, "Yes, everybody in the world has heard about it."

Q: Talk about that a little bit, because a lot of people don't know about that and about how the Commodity Credit Corporation ended up owning a whole bunch of Lebanese assets. Could you talk about that a bit?

MONTEL: That's what I'm going to talk to you about. I can't talk in too much detail, and you'll understand why when I tell you the story. Ray said to me, in his very typical way, "John, you've read about the Intra Bank scandal, haven't you?" I said, "Yes." He said, "Do you understand it?" and I said, "Yes."

He said, "Well, listen to me. I want you to go down there next week and I want you to sit on the board that's been set up to take care of our CCC (Commodity Credit Corporation) accounts there." And I said, "Ray, I'm working here for a corporation." And Ray's reply was, "I don't give a damn what you're doing. I want you to go down to Lebanon and represent FAS."

Of course, nothing came of it, but I think it's a good illustration of the pressure under which Ray was at the time, and he wanted me to resign from Standard Oil and go down there. Anyhow, just pursuing the issue of Ray as a person, my relations with him were always the very best, so I had left Standard Oil because my company disappeared in a worldwide reorganization after I'd worked for them about three years, and I accepted an invitation, an immediate invitation, from a company in Massachusetts, Arthur D. Little, Incorporated. You know Arthur D. Little.

Q: It's a consulting company.

MONTEL: A consulting company. And they took me on as a senior member of the agribusiness group, and shortly after, we went into a short recession in the United States, which was in the beginning of the 1970s, and Arthur D. Little began to lay off people, so I survived one layoff with very little seniority, practically none. I survived a second layoff, and then I heard there was a third layoff coming, and I didn't think that I could survive that with the little seniority I had. I was only about three years with the company.

So I called Ray one day and I said, "Ray, you still want me back?" In his typical way, he said, "Yeah." I said, "Well, when would you want me?" He said, "Yesterday." I said, "When can you see me?" He said, "Tomorrow."

So I resigned from Arthur D. Little and I went back to FAS. That was how I rejoined it.

BATES: I have a story about my retirement experience. Shortly after I retired in 1974, in early 1975 I joined E.A. Jaenke & Associates. And the following year, we negotiated a contract with an organization formed by former high-ranking Japanese agricultural officials and agricultural organizations, academics and so forth in agriculture, and it was one that was trying to influence the Japanese government for the good of Japan, not for the good of the United States, to eliminate many of their import restrictions. That would be of great benefit to the Japanese economy, so they hired us, and I was in charge of this. In fact, we even formed a new company called Commodity Analysis International, and made me the president, to furnish information to this organization, which was not on the Japanese side, but on the American side, to the extent that it would also help Japan.

So that was one of the most interesting assignments I ever had, was the work with that.

Q: Can we go back to Lebanon for a minute? Were you involved at all, or at least somewhat aware of what was going on in terms of the bank failure in Lebanon, so that USDA ended up owning casinos and real estate and all that?

MONTEL: Who was our attaché who was on the board?

Q: Bill Horbaly was there.

BATES: Yes, Bill Horbaly, yes. Well, only peripherally, and it was pretty much more of a joke really, more than anything else. Isn't that right? But as far as I was concerned, and I was just on the staff there and didn't have any particular interest in that, as I say, it was almost a joke, didn't you think, as far as we were concerned?

MONTEL: Sure.

BATES: It was a serious matter. There was a lot of money involved. But we didn't have anything really directly to do with it. Bill Horbaly had his problems.

Q: So we had an agricultural attaché on the board of directors of the bank.

BATES: That's right, and a very important director.

Q: Any last remarks about your respective careers as agricultural attachés and how times changed from the time you entered the service in the 1940s or 1950s and then when you left, decades later? How did the job change and how did the world change in that period?

John?

MONTEL: First, don't date me too much. It was the 1950s for me, not 1940s, but they changed remarkably, because, as all of us really know, we were under the thumb of the State Department until FAS was created, what was it, 1954?

Q: Well, '54, the attachés came back.

MONTEL: And FAS was created at the end of 1954 ...

Q: Well, beginning of 1953, March 10th.

MONTEL: Fifty-three was it? The attachés returned in 1954.

BATES: Right, and 1955. I didn't come back until 1955.

MONTEL: Okay. In any event, it gave us not only a sense of freedom, but it gave us far more liberty in terms of our reporting activities and how we could conduct our job, and we were given more independence as a result of it, which, as you might expect, created a good deal of resentment and envy on the part of many State Department officers, and I can recall at least one FAS attaché who left the State Department because of the attractiveness of a job at FAS compared to the job that this person had in the Department of State, in the Foreign Service. Roger Lowen, is whom I'm trying to think of.

Q: Wasn't one of the rehires John Beshoar?

MONTEL: I hired John Beshoar, and he's one of them. Another one was, I'll recall it in a minute. I ride with him every now and then. I'll recall his name in a minute, but, in any event, it gave us a tremendous amount of very valuable liberty in conducting our work and contacting and researching people and things. I can imagine it was a tough period for the State Department, because they had to take a new look at how they would conduct their relations with us in the field.

They lost a good amount of factual control over our operations, and when it happened and I was in the field, this was resented quite a bit. But, from what I've learned since then, by now, my sense is, and you tell me if I'm wrong, we have a pretty productive working relationship with the Department of State.

Q: I think that's fair to say, and when you look at international trade negotiations today, the lead pony is neither State nor Agriculture. It's now the U.S. Special Trade Representative, and State and Agriculture are pretty much joined at the hip, working with USTR and supporting USTR in the negotiations.

Quent, your comments?

BATES: Well, I guess there's been a lot of change. I mentioned some of the comments early on, and there've been a lot of changes since I retired, so I don't know as I can add too much to that.

My last post, I left for a short time, about two and a half years after I left the trade negotiation job, I was the attaché in Brussels. There, that was just almost exclusively the work on promotion of agricultural commodities, the export of agricultural commodities. We had seven representatives of seven cooperative organizations. My work was almost exclusively with the cooperators, and one thing that I was able to do, I started something that I haven't followed too much, but it was the sale of U.S. wines to Europe.

Q: We're still doing that. We're pushing U.S. wines in Moscow these days.

MONTEL: I was the official wine taster, believe it or not, for USEC.

BATES: Well, on the wines, we had some wine tastings and so forth in Brussels, and, as I say, I'm pretty sure that was the first one that any of the attachés really did serious work on. At the beginning, of course, people were just pooh-poohing, U.S. wines, that's just plunk. It can't compete with the European wines. And now, as it turns out, many of the U.S. wines now are superior, and it has really blossomed, so I consider that a good accomplishment.

Q: Quent, you were the reports officer. Can you talk a little bit about reporting, how the attachés reported from the field, the mechanisms for delivering information back and then how reports were distributed?

BATES: Well, when I came back from Colombia [1955], the reporting situation was pretty chaotic in a way, and Ray Ioanes asked me to reorganize it, and I also had to reorganize the training. I also had the training job and had to reorganize the training schedules, and that particular part of it.

But on the reports, the commodity divisions would send in requests for information and then somebody would approve it and send it out and so forth. It was pretty disorganized, and we tried to get it organized. Everything went through the reports to the reports officer, and any requests for information that came in had to be approved at our level, and then it would be sent out to the field.

Q: How did you send the requests out to the field?

BATES: Well, by cable, usually. Or, if it was not too urgent, I would send it by drafts of ...

Q: Just a letter, or you'd send out an Airgram or something like that?

BATES: Well, the communications then, we didn't have computers and everything was by mail. Some of it was a little faster than others, but we'd just mail them out to the attachés by diplomatic pouch. Some of them were classified, most of them weren't.

Q: When I joined FAS, the Agricultural Marketing Service had a telex unit, and I can remember we would type up FASTOs, "FAS to" the field telegrams, that we would type up on a typewriter on a special form. We would carry it down to the AMS leased wire unit, and you had a bunch of telex operators who would then punch that into a telex machine and would transmit it to State Department, and State Department would then transmit that over their cable network to the overseas post.

Was that the mechanism when you were there, or did you have other mechanisms for sending cables? How did you send cables to overseas posts?

BATES: I'm not too sure what the procedure was. We just prepared the cables and turned them over to whoever sent the cables out.

MONTEL: We followed the practice of the State Department. We didn't have any different way.

BATES: No, it was all State Department communications. It all went through the State Department. Everything went through the State Department.

Q: And then when the cables came in – so cables came in, reports came in, they came to the reports office, and what happened next?

BATES: Well, we would distribute them to the various divisions that were involved.

Q: You did not have photocopiers back then. How did you duplicate the reports and get them around?

BATES: Well, it wasn't easy, and it was pretty primitive. You're probably familiar with, at that time, it was a big job. I can't even remember what it was called.

MONTEL: I can remember what they looked like. The print was light purple on one of them. I remember that. But I don't know who was doing it.

BATES: No, I didn't have anything to do with that.

Q: So it was like a mimeograph of some sort.

BATES: Yes, yes.

Q: Okay. John, any more comments?

MONTEL: None, except that I loved every minute I was in the service. It helped me mature. It helped me learn to get along with people, because I was a real rough fighter before I did, and I can say that I chose my career correctly. I'm completely satisfied with it. Every minute I was in it, never regretted a single instant, enjoyed every moment of it, and I've used it to the best of my ability for the rest of my life up until now, when I'm talking to you.

BATES: The best I can do is just ditto that. That's exactly the way I felt, and, as I mentioned before, I joined a consulting firm after I got out, and some of my work with the consulting firm is so similar to the work that I'd been doing as an FASer, that work that I enjoyed, I think it was useful. But I had a perfect background for it.

MONTEL: It helped me in the work after I left FAS, not so much with working for Esso. It helped me a little bit when I worked for Arthur D. Little, but when I worked with World Perspectives, I used all of my background and experience in FAS to help me in the work I did for clients in World Perspectives, and that was a big, big assist for me, because I only worked with foreign clients when I worked with World Perspectives, so it was a big help for me. [Ed: World Perspectives, Inc., founded in 1980, is a Washington D.C. based consulting firm providing a wide range of agricultural market and policy strategic services to the private and public sectors.]

BATES: I've forgotten the exact date, but Jim Howard got me started on this oral history agricultural series, and Jim Howard had been working with ADST's Stu Kennedy. I wasn't aware of it at the time, but he had started this, I think, in the late 1980s, wasn't it, perhaps? Something like that.

Anyway, sometime in the 1990s. Jim Howard, who had been a good friend of mine ...They had been working on the oral history project, and they wanted me to help them out and get in on it, and I was one of the first to be interviewed, actually. I'd already been interviewed, as a matter of fact, a little earlier, but it was by a young, recent employee of FAS and a very nice young girl, but was a little inexperienced.

Anyway, I wasn't too happy with the interview, but, anyway, we started working on it and we were assigned people to interview. We had to finance our own interviews at that time. We were very short of cash. And Jim Howard had just interviewed Ray Ioanes for one [Ed: Mr. Howard began his ADST interview with Mr. Ioanes in July 1994] , and so then he got ahold of Dick Welton, who had been doing some work on FAS history, and Dick had been my assistant for four years in Argentina. We were very close friends, and this was just a few years before he died. [Ed: Mr. Bates began his ADST interview with Mr. Welton in January 1996.]

But he had been the deputy assistant administrator for attachés, as you know, in the early 1990s, and he had I think enough time on his hands. He got interested in FAS history, so he started putting some files together on it. So we got him – he had just retired, and we

got him involved in it, and then we did that – I think you saw the report. I sent the report that he and I did on that, on FAS history.

I enjoyed that work. I'm still a member of the ADST (Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training), still get their publications and all, but I haven't been working with them directly. I did an ADST interview with Ernest Koenig starting in August 1995, which is a very interesting one, having been in the camp at Auschwitz for three and a half years and so forth, and his experience.

MONTEL: Ernest Koenig was a tremendous assistant.

BATES: He knew more about the Common Market than anybody in Washington.

MONTEL: I was his boss, and he knew much more about it than I did, and he was conversant with so many of the officials there, and especially in German or French. He was bilingual in both, and he was a very valuable asset.

BATES: But for some reason, when he came back from Paris after his last assignment, he was being ignored. People were not interested. For some reason, in his expertise – I've never been able to understand. He got some people upset for some reason.

MONTEL: Oh, I think I can tell you why. Ernie had an insight in the EC (European Community) workings, and certainly an understanding and far greater depth than anybody had to deal with in Washington.

BATES: And he had personal friends.

MONTEL: He had a number of personal friends, but the personal friends were not so much of value as friends but of value as sources of information and intelligence that people in Washington never had. Ernie could come up with solutions to problems which were, not only in retrospect, which were then the real solutions to the problems, but they didn't lend themselves to the political guidelines that people in Washington needed.

BATES: Exactly.

MONTEL: And Ernie was never about to give into the political guidelines. And this was, if you want to call it in quotes, this was part of Ernie's "downfall."

BATES: He was very blunt spoken' not rough spoken.

MONTEL: He was straightforward, and straightforward is not very often accepted in Washington, at least at that time it wasn't.

BATES: Have you read his oral history?

MONTEL: Ernie was, and I can say this without hesitation, Ernie was the most knowledgeable person in the Common Market that we ever had. I was his boss and he was far more knowledgeable than I was, and I respected everything that Ernie ever said or everything he did. The only thing I had to do as his boss was to tone down some of his commentaries, because they didn't fit with what Washington wanted. So what I had to do was to carve the damn things so that they weren't negative, weren't inflammatory, and they weren't deliberately negative. I tried to make them as helpful as possible, but to help Washington see the way Ernie saw it, which was the right way to see it. In that sense, it was a very difficult working relationship. For Ernie, Ernie was brilliant, and his brilliance was never really appreciated by Washington.

BATES: Exactly. I used to have lunch with him very frequently. He was a very disappointed person.

MONTEL: Very disappointed. Extremely well read.

BATES: Oh, yes.

MONTEL: Very educated person, and very intellectual, way, way above everybody else that I knew at FAS, including myself.

BATES: And most of the people at that time wouldn't even listen to him, but he was determined. They tried to get him to retire.

MONTEL: But he didn't want to retire for several reasons, but I think the most important of them was that he didn't want to give them the satisfaction of having him off the scene, and he enjoyed that.

BATES: Another one that I think should be mentioned is Afif Tannous [Ed: Mr. Tannous' interview was started in March 1994 and is part of the ADST collection]. Afif, he was a member of our discussion group, and we learned a lot from Afif Tannous. I think that Afif Tannous was probably as well informed, politically, economically, in every way, of anybody in Washington at that time. And if you read any of his reports and documents and so forth, I think you would tend to agree.

He had taught at the American University in Beirut. He came from Lebanon and had personal friends all over. He had studied with some officials from countries all over the Middle East, top-ranking officials.

MONTEL: But Afif was a gentleman to the core. Very, very well mannered, but extremely well informed.

Q: Does the name Wolf Ladejinsky mean anything? [Ed: Wikipedia starts its article on Ladejinsky thusly: "Wolf Isaac Ladejinsky (March 15, 1899 – July 3, 1975) was an influential American agricultural economist and researcher, serving first in the United States Department of

Agriculture, then the Ford Foundation and later the World Bank. He was a key adviser on land reform to the governments of several Asian countries, including Japan from 1945 to 1954 (during the Occupation) as well as Mainland China and later Taiwan under Chiang Kai-shek, South Vietnam from 1955 to 1961 under Ngo Dinh Diem, and countries in Southeast Asia and the Indian subcontinent. His efforts in Japan and Taiwan were a striking success, but later efforts were frustrated. Improving the welfare of Asian farmers through agrarian reform was his goal throughout his long career, earning him praise as "no typical bureaucrat, but an impassioned reformer."]

BATES: Yes, it certainly does.

MONTEL: Certainly does. I never knew Wolf, never met him, but I knew about him, and I must admit, I know little detail about him, except that Wolf had extensive experience in, I believe, was it Mongolia, or China?

He did the land reform for MacArthur. He designed it. He also, I believe, was ...

BATES: Was it Taiwan?

MONTEL: No, it was MacArthur in Japan, but he had extensive experience in either China or Mongolia, one or the other.

Q: Clare Boonstra told me he was in the Philippines for a while.

BATES: Well, another country was – I can't remember now. It wasn't Vietnam, but he went to another country after he was retired, or fired under the McCarthy-era purges.

Q: I've come across the Washington Post articles about that. Could you talk about that a little bit, about Wolf Ladejinsky being thrown out because he couldn't get a security clearance?

BATES: He had relatives in the Soviet Union, and of course he was so well informed and of course the FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation) had a file on him, because they had a file on Ken Galbraith, for example, for 40 years or something like that. But, anyway, there was enough suspicion there that people said, well, you know, maybe there's some question about...

But there was absolutely nothing to that, and he was finally forced out [Ed: by Secretary of Agriculture Benson in December 1954]. And then he got the president of this country, and I wish I could think of it, hired him as his adviser, because he was the, you might say, the constructor of the Japanese land reform. [Ed: Wikipedia continues, after the Benson firing, "Ladejinsky was almost immediately chosen by Harold Stassen at the Foreign Operations Administration to direct the land reform program in South Vietnam."]

An interesting thing in that development was, when I was at Jaenke & Associates, a Japanese professor came to Washington, and he belonged to some association there, and he had worked with Wolf Ladejinsky while he was in Japan, and he knew the whole story, and he had written an article for a Japanese magazine. He brought us a translation of it, and somewhere that got lost. I wish I could find it, but, anyway, he thought Wolf Ladejinsky was the finest American that he had ever met, and he had tremendous respect for him.

He's very highly respected in academic circles, and particularly agricultural circles. He's just an icon.

Q: I want to throw a few names at you and just see if you met them, knew them. Tell me anything about them and where they ended up.

Let's start with Paul Nyhus.

BATES: Paul Nyhus I just knew, I met at conferences at so forth, but I didn't really know him personally, but he certainly had a very good reputation and of course he retired. [Ed: the [Online Archives of California website](#): "Paul Oden Nyhus was born on April 18, 1894 in Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin. He graduated from the University of Wisconsin's College of Agriculture and served as County Agent in Waupaca County, Wisconsin and Crop Reporter in Madison, Wisconsin. In 1927, he began his career with the federal government and served in the following positions: Agricultural Commissioner for the U.S. Department of Agriculture in China (1927-1931); U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington, D.C. (1931-1934); Agricultural Attaché in the U.S. Embassy in Buenos Aires (1934-1945); and similar positions in London (1945-1952) and Ottawa from 1952 until his retirement in 1954."]

Q: What happened to him in retirement?

BATES: I don't recall. I don't think I ever heard what he did in retirement.

Q: You've already talked about Francis Flood. We've talked a bit about Fred Rossiter. Some of the other people who were running OFAR and the early FAS. Bill Lodwick, for example.

BATES: Bill Lodwick, of course, I was never in Washington when Bill Lodwick was in Washington, but he had already gone to Mexico, had been kicked out and had gone to Mexico. [Ed: Lodwick was the first head of FAS to bear the title "Administrator" and served from 1954 to 1955.]

Q: Why was he only an administrator for nine months?

BATES: Politics.

MONTEL: The details you don't know. I don't know, either.

BATES: I don't know the details. All I know is it was just a political matter and he was forced out.

Q: He was forced out so Gwynn Garnett could come in? [Ed: Garnett was FAS Administrator from 1955 to 1958.]

BATES: Yes. Makes sense.

MONTEL: That makes sense to me.

Q: I'm still trying to piece that together, as to why we had an administrator for nine months who suddenly then was quite clearly exiled to Mexico as a consolation prize.

BATES: Well, we know about – what was the name of the administrator who gave the speech ...

Q: Jack Haggerty.

BATES: Jack Haggerty, we know about him.

Q: We know about him. He was fired. And Fran Wilcox came in as a caretaker for about two months or so, and then after that Romeo Short came in for about six months and then he left and that was when Clayton Whipple showed up. What about Clayton Whipple? [Ed: Whipple served as Chief of FAS from 1953 to 1954] Did you know him?

MONTEL: I knew him. He was attaché in Brussels. He was in USEC. He was attaché in USEC, I believe. Am I correct there? No, he was in the embassy. He was in the embassy where he was attaché. He was never in USEC.

BATES: He was in Greece for quite a while.

MONTEL: And Clayton then went from there to Washington, where he headed up FAS.

BATES: Well, he was deputy administrator. When I came back from Bogotá, he was the deputy administrator, and I got to know him quite well. I was the reports and training officer, and he would call me into the office when a subject came up, and he would tell stories. I think I reported this matter to you earlier. He loved sports, to talk about sports, and we'd go on for about an hour, and he'd spend about 10 minutes on the subject that I came in to talk about. But everybody liked him. He was a very likeable guy.

And then, several years later, when I went to Madrid for the European conference, he was the attaché in Brussels. He came down to Madrid and got a chance to talk to him again quite a bit, and then, at one of our meetings, he sat right across the table from me at this

meeting. He'd had a big lunch. It was right after lunch. And all at once, he just grunted and fell over like that, practically fell into my arms, died instantly from a heart attack, and we had to smuggle his body out of the country to escape the Spanish regulations.

We put him in an ambulance and pretended that he hadn't died until we got him on a plane. But, then, his assistant really ruined his career by bad mouthing Clayton, and I think probably most of what he said was true. He said Clayton didn't do hardly any work, he did all the reporting and so forth and Clayton did all the socializing, the entertaining and meeting people and so on. I could believe that a lot of that was true, but over the years, Clayton had done a lot of good work, and he was coasting a bit as attaché, as sometimes officials are known to do in their later years. I think you've had some experience with that.

Q: Yes, the concept of the retirement post was still current when I came into the service in the 1980s, although I think we've made a lot of progress in doing away with that concept.

BATES: Ottawa in Canada, for example, was at one time a good retirement post. Who was it that was at Ottawa for something like eight years?

MONTEL: Fred Rossiter [Ed: Rossiter had been Chief of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations for the year 1949]?

BATES: Fred Rossiter, yes. And Fred, of course, was a very capable guy, and I'm sure Fred did a lot of work in Canada. He didn't just coast all of the time, but it wasn't a very demanding job. I think he was there eight years or something like that, a long time.

Q: How about Max Myers [Ed: Maxwell Myers was FAS Administrator from 1958 to 1961]?

BATES: Max Myers, I claimed that I recruited him. Now, when I came back from Bogotá, they sent me on a recruiting trip to go to various universities. I think they were all land grant colleges, to talk to the graduates, mostly at the graduate schools of agriculture, to get some candidates for attachés. And I went to South Dakota State and Max – he wasn't the dean of agriculture, I think. I've forgotten, exactly.

Q: We have it in the file. We have what he was doing, when, in his bio.

BATES: Well, anyway, of course he gave me every assistance, and I think Bud Anderson may have been there. He was there about that time. And a couple of others.

Q: Turner Oyloe was there. [Ed: Dr. Turner L Oyloe's April 2013 obituary says, "...Dr. Oyloe completed graduate school with his doctorate in Agricultural Economics at the University of Minnesota and began his career with the Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS). While at the FAS, Dr. Oyloe was posted to London, England, Bonn Germany and

Paris, France. He was recognized for his achievements with the Secretary of Agriculture Award for his work in the Tokyo Round of Trade negotiations. On his final assignment with the FAS, he was formally introduced to the Court of Saint James in London in 1984 and retired from the FAS in 1986 when returned to Reston Virginia. In 1987 Dr. Oylooe assumed responsibilities as the Executive Director of the Walnut Marketing Board in Sacramento, California, a position he held until 1995.]

BATES: Turner, I've known Turner real well. But, anyway, neither of them were in the classes that I lectured, talked with, but then I had some nice talks with Max. What Max didn't tell me was that he'd already been approached as a potential administrator, and then a few months later he came to Washington as the administrator. So I kiddingly, not seriously, but I kiddingly said, "Well, I recruited Max."

But he was rather ineffective. He didn't have much knowledge of the subject of what FAS was doing at the time.

MONTEL: I spent so many years outside instead of in Washington that I really knew very few people in Washington.

Q: But you knew Bob Tetro. You worked for Bob in Rome, so could you talk a little bit about Bob Tetro? [Ed: Bob Tetro was FAS Administrator from 1961 to 1962 and his Oral history, begun in December 1989, is among the ADST collection.]

MONTEL: I knew Bob very well in Rome. Bob was my mentor, so to speak, and he led me by the hand throughout my three and a half years in Rome. Without him, I would have been an abject failure. As a matter of fact, when my wife began labor with my first child at about 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning, he got out of bed and drove me to the hospital with my wife. Bob, I have tremendous regard for Bob. Very, very easy to get along with, very knowledgeable.

Young Bob I knew as an infant, crawling on the floor, and we're friends today with young Bob, of course, and his brother, but I haven't seen his brother in quite a while.

BATES: Well, I knew Bob very well. I first met him when I was in Paris, back in the early 1950s, but he came up from Rome at that time. And then later on, when I came back from Bogotá to reports and training officer, he was an assistant administrator. We got to be good friends. We lived out fairly close together.

Q: He didn't last very long as administrator. What happened?

BATES: He claimed that that was political. I'm pretty close to Barbara, Ray Ioanes's daughter, and talked to her about this a bit. [Ed: Ioanes served as FAS Administrator from 1962 to 1973.] At first, he thought that Ray had really forced him out, which wasn't really true. He was so interested in international affairs and he was on some international councils and so forth ...

Q: He was elected to be the deputy chairman of the FAO (Food and Agricultural Organization) committee.

BATES: Yes, right, and a lot of people in Congress were suspicious of him – "He's too much interested in international." This was when we were beginning to push, of course, PL-480 was already in effect and we were beginning to push exports a lot more than anything else. And they thought he was a lot more interested in the international situation than he was in selling agricultural products. Then, Ray was available there, who had been working with Gwynn Garnett on that.

But he felt that Ray had pushed him out, but Barbara tells me that in later years, they became friends again. But, Bob, he had his hard side, but he was very good.

MONTEL: I never knew his hard side, really. Bob was as much a friend as he was my boss and I respected his ability. Of course, at that stage of my career, I had nothing behind me and everything I was working with at that time was brand new, and I admired him tremendously for what appeared to me to be his total knowledge of everything. He was my mentor, too, and he helped develop me.

BATES: He was technically my boss, and as assistant administrator, he was technically my boss as reports and training officer, but he didn't really get too much involved. But some of the people he worked with thought he was just kind of hard driving. I didn't mean that he was harsh or anything like that, but he was a hard worker and a hard driver.

Now, Les Wheeler ...

Q: Did you know Les Wheeler?

BATES: Well, I could say yes and no. He was the director of OFAR [Ed: 1939 to 1948] when State sent me over to Agriculture.

Q: And he also at one point bore the title chief of the Foreign Agricultural Service Division [Ed: 1931-1938], and for six months he was also the director of the Foreign Agricultural Service [1938-1939], before it was abolished and OFAR was created.

BATES: Yes, that's right. But he was still the director. I was in Ottawa when Fitzgerald came in. I've met Fitzgerald, and that's the only time I met Fitzgerald, I think, is when he came up to Ottawa, visited. President Truman came up to Ottawa and I met him. [Ed: President Truman visited Canada June 10-12, 1947.] I think Fitzgerald may have been with him.

Anyway, when I came in, I was introduced to Les Wheeler, and then he didn't have any particular interest in the program, and I don't really recall anything about him other than that.

Q: Les Wheeler was the head of OFAR and FAS for longer than anyone else, for 17 years. These would have been his last couple of years, and I'm still trying to find a photograph of him. We have no photograph of Les Wheeler any place.

BATES: Well, I have a photograph of him. Well, it isn't of him. It's of FAS. Darn, I wish I could have brought that. I thought everybody had that, practically, the copy of the FAS picnic. He was in that.

Q: Well, I have a very poor copy of that that was scanned, but I don't have an original of that photograph.

BATES: I'll check and see if I don't have a better – I have a photograph and I have the original. And one of the girls in that was one of my secretaries when I came back from Bogotá. She was still in OFAR. Phyllias. Louise Phyllias was her name. It was in her last couple of years, when I was back.

Ruth Donovan. Remember Ruth Donovan?

MONTEL: Very well.

BATES: Ruth Donovan was also in that picture. What was her title?

MONTEL: I think Ruth was in the Office of the Administrator.

BATES: She was in the Office of the Administrator. I can't remember just what her job was, but she was very helpful. I think everybody liked Ruth. I knew her very well.

End of interview

[Ed: The Wikipedia article on the Foreign Agricultural Service is at:
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foreign_Agricultural_Service]