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

RICHARD S. WELTON

Interviewed by: Quentin Bates
Initial interview date: January 6, 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- U.S. Patent Office reporting
- Early trade negotiations

Commodity export growth
- Percent of total exports
- WWI to WWII growth
- Exports to Japan

Developments
- Current Economic Reporting Program (CERP)
- FAO
- Foreign Crops and Markets reports
- Reporting problems and techniques
- Use of foreign nationals
- Regional commodity specialists
- Regional Ag posts
- State Department and agriculture attachés
- Post WWII expansion

Personalities
- Fred Rossiter
- Bryant Wadsworth

Duties of agriculture attachés
- Reporting
- Information to ambassador on issues
- Servicing U.S. Trade
- Assisting AID
- Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act (RTA)
- American Republics Act - 1939

Personalities
- Quentin West
- Afif Tannous
- Other personalities

History of Foreign Agricultural Service
- Office of International Cooperation and Development - 1977
- CCC surpluses
- Trade policy of FAS
- Henry Wallace era
- Inter-department consultations on trade
- GATT origin
- Uruguay Round Agreement - 1995
- FAS growth

INTERVIEW

This paper is dedicated to the late Jim Howard who encouraged me to include in this oral interview some information on the early days of the Foreign Agriculture Service and its predecessors.

Richard S. Welton, October 1996

Q: This is Quentin Bates, a retiree from the Foreign Agricultural Service, (FAS) interviewing Richard Welton. He spent almost his entire career with that service. We are going to discuss first some of the highlights of Dick's career, and then get into the history of that agency. Dick has had for some time a strong interest in that history, and has done considerable research on it. Today is January 6, 1996.

Let's begin with a bit of your background, where you grew up, your education, and so forth.

WELTON: I grew up on a general livestock farm near Moorefield, West Virginia, on the south branch of the Potomac River. I did my undergraduate work at the University of Maryland, graduating in agricultural economics in 1956. I think I graduated on Saturday and started to work for the new FAS on the next Monday. I worked with the Livestock and Meat Products Division as a commodity analyst in Washington for about five years, and then went to Argentina as Assistant Attaché in 1961.

Q: Which I remember very well.

WELTON: You were there at the same time. We worked there for about five years together. Then I came back to the trade policy part of the agency in early 1969, when you were there as well. I spent about four years in Washington, and then went overseas again to Spain in 1973, as Assistant Attaché. Excuse me, I missed a post: I went to El Salvador as Agricultural Attaché in 1966, and then came back to the trade policy area in early 1969 and then went to Spain as Assistant in 1973, and moved to Mexico City two years later as Agricultural Attaché. I was there about three years, and came back to the Agency in the Attaché Service in Washington. I spent a little time with the Foreign Visitors Staff, and then became Area Officer for Western Europe, and then Deputy Assistant Administrator for the attachés. I served for some time as Acting Assistant Administrator between the time that Wayne Sharp accepted another assignment, and Jim Rudbeck came back from Rome. I retired in 1989 after 33 years with FAS.

Q: Dick, you certainly had an extremely interesting and varied experience in your career. When and how did you begin to develop an interest in the history of the organization?

WELTON: When I was in the Attaché Office here in Washington, I ran across a file that had a lot of the background and history of FAS, and particularly the attaché service. We had a junior professional development program, which I worked closely with, and one of them took an interest in that subject, and drawing on some FAS circulars that had been published in the 1960s and 1970s, put together a chronology of FAS, even going before that, back to the early years of the country. The interest in foreign agriculture -- Columbus, for example, introduced cattle and horses, and I think even swine to the colonies. That was the basis for the livestock industry. And a lot of our crops, of course, were introduced from Europe, and the reverse was also true. I think potatoes had been developed in the New World, and tomatoes and corn. Maize was of U.S. origin; the Indians taught the settlers how to plant corn, I recall. So that chronology was the basis for further discussion of the history of FAS. A number of our colleagues have had an interest in pulling some of that history together. Jim Howard was instrumental in compiling and publishing a history of the Foreign Market Development Program, Market Promotion Overseas, which is quite thorough and quite complete. He had asked some of our other colleagues, like Horace Davis, to put down their ideas on the history. They have done some of that, but it's never gotten into one publication, and we certainly don't intend to cover the complete history here, but I thought we would try to append to this interview the chronology and a few other items of information on the origins of the service.

Q: I sat in on the meeting in which a group of us agreed we would take this project on, and we perhaps foolishly volunteered to take it on. Ray Ioanes was one of those who was very instrumental in pushing this, along with Jim Howard and several others in the group.

WELTON: As I mentioned the older FAS started in 1930. That first FAS was a division of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, (BAE) which was a very important organization in the inter war period, between World War I and World War II, of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Q: I think it was fairly unique in the world at that time. It had tremendous prestige, and as I understand it, a great many of the top USA agricultural economists during that period were in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

WELTON: That is true.

Q: Was this a division of the BAE?

WELTON: FAS was a division of BAE. Actually, before that, there had been a Bureau of Statistics and it had sent a fellow named Edwin Moffitt to London in 1881.

Q: In BAE?

WELTON: No, before BAE. BAE was established in 1922. This was before that, even before 1900. This fellow had been sent to London in 1881, to report on crop prospects and other agricultural developments. It appears that there was an officer, or someone in the embassy in London, reporting on agriculture, almost from that date on. A 1960 publication mentions a section of foreign markets, established in 1894, which was in the old Bureau of Statistics, which had monthly reports on agricultural developments coming in from London during that period. And then later, after World War I, the prototype for the Agricultural Attaché , as we know it, was sent to London in 1919. His name was Edward Foley and his title was Commissioner of Agriculture at that time.

Q: What agency was he responsible to?

WELTON: I think he was responsive to USDA. At that time there was a Foreign Markets Investigations Division in the Bureau of Markets. Later the foreign agricultural section was part of the Statistical and Historical Research Bureau before BAE was organized. In 1939, that FAS became the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, (OFAR), as we know it. It was actually a staff section of the Secretary's office. It was separated from the BAE in 1938. It then became a staff office of the Secretary's office and the attachés at that time, in the 1930s, certainly were reporting to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the old FAS, prior to that. But in 1939 the 9 Attachés were transferred to the Department of State.

Q: Let's go back for a minute. You had mentioned at the beginning some of the early activities of the Department of Agriculture, or other agencies, very early on. Can you expand a little bit on that, of going way back ?

WELTON: I say sometimes that we shifted from being seed collectors -- that was a primary role of the early emissaries abroad, to data collectors in the 1930s. Even as early as the Civil War or thereabouts, Mark Twain wrote in Innocent's Abroad, about the seed collectors. I believe it was written in 1869. He said "I was proud to observe [on his ship] that among the excursionists were 3 ministers of the gospel, 8 doctors,... naval chieftains with sounding titles, an ample crop of professors...and a gentleman who had Commissioner of the United States of America, to Europe, Asia, and Africa, thundering after his name!" And he said he almost shrunk in his seat from the awful blast of that title. But then he said that if he'd only known then that "he was only a common mortal, and that his mission had nothing more overpowering about it than the collecting of seeds, and uncommon yams, cabbages, and peculiar bullfrogs,... I would have felt so much relieved." This activity went on for a number of years and still goes on, but I think now generally these researchers go out from the Agricultural Research Service. They have contacts, of course, abroad, and I'm sure they use our Attaché offices at times, but I don't believe we're much involved in that activity on a continuing basis anymore.

I might mention one seed collector that was kind of intriguing. A fellow named Frank Meyer, was sent to China in 1905, and there's a picture of him in a horse cart in the 1962 USDA yearbook. I saw this picture first at the Attaché office in Beijing, so I was kind of curious about him, and explored it a bit further. He traveled as far as Turkestan, at least, and if you look on the map, that's a long way to go with a horse cart. He was in China until he disappeared mysteriously on the Yangtze River in 1918. I don't know if he was shanghaied, but his body did turn up later. In fact, he left a bequest to the seed collection branch, and they fashioned a medal in his honor, and that's still awarded each year, I believe, to the outstanding seed collector of the year.

Q: This is still an ongoing activity?

WELTON: I think so, yes. There are several regional laboratories that handle these collections of plants and seeds. You have to be very careful, of course, because of the disease or pest risk. I might mention in this regard that, as you know, back in our early days in Argentina, we received a letter from a researcher in Pennsylvania, that had gotten some wild seed potatoes from Argentina. This was in the early 1960s that we received the letter. He had written it to Paul Nyhus, the Attaché there in the late 1930s, just like it was last week, or last year. Fortunately, our foreign national employee, Eduardo knew that there was one potato specialist still around that was around at that time, and might have ...

Q: He was retired wasn't he, but still alive.

WELTON: That's right. The potato expert remembered the incident, and where the potatoes came from. So we replied and gave him the information, just like it was routine.

Q: Never heard from the guy about it?

WELTON: We didn't, but maybe some successors did. I mention, too, that I was reading Jim Kempton's guidelines on the Attaché Service, entitled The Official Life and Hard Times of an Agricultural Attaché which has some very good advice, even for today.

Q: Jim Kempton was our Attaché for about 15 years in Venezuela. That's the longest tour anybody ever had.

WELTON: I believe so. I was fortunate enough to go to his retirement party in 1957. He told some interesting stories there about his experiences in USDA, which went way back, I think, to before World War I, when he first came in. One story he told was that when he was a young new employee, and having lunch, the Secretary would come down for lunch, and he would notice all of his bureau chiefs sitting around, and would know that if he sat with them, they would be bending his ear with personnel complaints or whatever, concerns of the day. So he would pick out one of the youngest employees and have lunch with him. Kempton said he never got that close to the Secretary of Agriculture again.

Q: Jim was a fantastic storyteller.

WELTON: Yes. As you know, one of the Assistant Secretaries of State for Latin America had standing instructions that he was to see any agriculture report from Jim Kempton. They went pretty far afield at times.

Q: Very earthy at times, but always funny and interesting.
*W*ELTON: He was an excellent writer.

Q: It's a shame that he didn't write his memoirs.

WELTON: One of the things I noticed in his attaché guidance document was that you should establish contact with museums and the scientific community, because you might get some requests for rare seeds. And in my years overseas, I think the only contact we had like that was on the seed potato case, and that was a bit dated. But most of the guidance was very good.

Q: Dick, you mentioned about the collection of seeds, livestock, and that sort of thing back in those early days. At what point was there an official interest in trade problems? That, of course, is one of our major activities now.

WELTON: And of course the agricultural trade surplus is an important contributor to holding down the balance of payments deficits that we know today. But that started very early on. I mentioned the Spanish bringing livestock to the country and taking tobacco back. But obviously the real interest in trade didn't develop until the U.S. became settled

in the 1600s by the English. They developed a quite active trade in tobacco and tobacco was certainly king among our export products in the early years.

Q: When did cotton start becoming important?

WELTON: Not until the early 1800s. Tobacco was the leading export until the early 1800s and then cotton took over as king, certainly through the mid-1800s. Agricultural products accounted for over 70% of USA total exports prior to 1900 and cotton was over 50% of the total from 1840 to 1860. Later, grains came on as a leading export commodity, partially as a result of the Irish potato famine in the 1840s. I think grains did replace cotton as the leading export in the 1860s. Of course, as you know, during the Civil War, the South was trying to ship cotton to England to finance the war effort.

Q: With blockade runners.

WELTON: Yes, they had blockade runners. But grain started coming in about that time as well. I don't know if we had any relief programs during the 1800s to Europe, but if there were, it may have been involved in feeding the Irish. But I don't think the Irish had that big a lobby in Congress at that time. I'm not sure about that point. We may have to leave that to other historians. Certainly grain exports got a big boost from the opening of the Great Plains and the development of mechanical harvesters.

Q: At what point did the government start getting interested in the statistics of trade?

WELTON: The Department -- I think I mentioned the fellow that they sent to England in the 1880s. Even before the Department was formed, during the Civil War in 1862. Before that, agriculture was covered by the Patent Office. I remember a story: Art Minor, one of our leaders in the modern FAS, was briefing a group from Japan at one time, and he mentioned that the Department of Agriculture started off as the Patent Office. This got the Japanese all excited. They got so interested in that facet I think he hardly got them back to the history of Agriculture. Anyhow, I think the Patent Office started collecting statistics as early as 1839, when Congress appropriated some money for that purpose. In 1842, the chronology on agricultural reporting mentions that a Patent Office report discussed foreign markets and duties for such commodities as cotton and fats and oils. Then the system of reporting was basically established in the latter part of the 1800s. And besides the fellow in London, they were getting some information from other diplomatic posts abroad during that period. By 1894, there was a foreign markets section in the Bureau of Statistics in USDA, and they were publishing some reports -- I remember reading one from a missionary in Argentina on sheep raising in the Pampas.

Q: Is there any record of any trade negotiations in those days, or any diplomatic protests on some of these duties and taxes that you've mentioned?

WELTON: I doubt if we had formal negotiations on a wide scale. I think that's largely a post-World War II phenomenon. But there certainly were discussions with some of our

neighboring countries and other major trading partners and some trade issues could well have taken place. I have read of some discussions about the British Imperial preference. And of course prior to the Revolution, the colonies had a colonial preference in London. And the colonies were prohibited from shipping rice and tobacco to other countries prior to 1730.

Q: Well, we also made a protest in Boston Harbor, with a tea party.

WELTON: Yes, there was that one. And I think I read also that there was quite a trade with tobacco going -- well, not tobacco so much -- but food commodities going to the West Indies. Sugar, of course, was their export crop, and they didn't devote much time or energy to food crops. So they needed to import grains which came mostly from New York and Pennsylvania. In fact, I think we exported quite a bit of flour to that area in exchange for sugar, I presume. In fact, I saw bread mentioned as well. It must have been pretty stale. In fact there were problems with quality and the Pennsylvania assembly adopted rigid inspection laws in 1720. And there was small trade in meat products as well during those early years. I read somewhere that meat was a leading export from Pennsylvania in the early colonial days, which surprised me a bit. It must have been beef jerky. We know that a little later Argentina became a major beef supplier to London and Europe.

Q: I guess they iced it down.

WELTON: Refrigeration came later, probably in the late 1870s. About the same time, the opening of the West coincided with a substantial growth in USA agricultural exports which were still over 70% of total USA exports until 1900. Prior to 1870 the value of USA agricultural exports was less than $200 million annually. That total more than doubled in the 1870s and reached $700 million by the 1890s. The World War I boom and the food relief efforts that followed pushed that figure to $4 billion in 1919. But it fell sharply in the 1920s and in fact was already down to $2 billion by 1921. It declined further during the Depression in the 1930s and by the end of the 1930s we were down to about $500 million a year. And then of course, during World War II -- we'll get into that a little more later -- exports rose again. We were the only supplier to some parts of the world. Our shipments to most of Europe and Japan were eliminated during that period. But by the time I came into the Agency in 1956, we were probably back to a level of $4 billion or thereabouts. And then there was a fairly steady rise in exports after that period. I remember when, and Ioanes mentions this in his interview as well, that President Nixon came out with a goal of $10 billion for agricultural exports in the late 1960s, and some of us thought that was a pipedream. But it wasn't too long after that, in the early 1970s, that Russia came in for large amounts of grain, and we did reach that goal and surpassed it rather substantially in the 1970s. By 1981 we had reached a peak of about $43 billion. But then exports dropped rather substantially. Dick Smith mentions in his interview that they declined every year that he was Administrator. Not through any fault of his, in my opinion.

Q: I can remember when it was just beginning to rise pretty rapidly. It was about 1969 or 1970, when we celebrated the first $1 billion exports towards any one country, which was Japan. We had a big celebration and I helped organize that.

WELTON: I hear that Japan is up to about $11 billion today.

Q: We are shipping about $1 billion worth of meat, aren't we?

WELTON: Oh yes. You and I worked on the famous beef and citrus negotiations with Japan in the early 1970s.

Q: That was a career in itself -- negotiating with Japan.

WELTON: They said their stomachs were not big enough to absorb all this beef. But they learned differently. And beef exports has become a major success story.

Q: And Japanese stomachs have expanded substantially.

WELTON: Perhaps so. But anyhow, in total we got up to a record $43.8 billion in FY 1981 and agricultural shipments didn't get back to $42 billion until 1992. And then we had a very good year in fiscal 95. I hear they are now projecting $58 billion for the current fiscal year. It's been a very successful result of a lot of efforts by a lot of people over a lot of years, in fact, to reach that level.

Q: Agricultural reporting, for quite a number of years now, has been one of the core activities of the Foreign Agricultural Service, and of the Agricultural Attachés specifically. What about the early days of that activity?

WELTON: It certainly has been, and I've mentioned some of the early pioneers in that effort. We also should point out in the early years travelers abroad brought back information and the embassies were involved in supplying statistical data. One of the things I recall from my early days in FAS, and you will too, is that in the commodity divisions, they received the annual trade books from a number of countries all over the world. Those were sent in from the embassy under, I think we called them CERP publications. I believe CERP stands for Current Economic Reporting Program. We had in each of the commodity divisions some statistical clerks who would laboriously take off that data each year and put it on the large world trade tables, and the information which was compiled from those reports, got published and sent out to the various interests in the states and around the world. Also, in the early 1900s, a Californian became interested in getting more worldwide data. He had seen the reports from USDA on U.S.A. agricultural statistics in great detail, and thought that we should have similar information from abroad. He was instrumental in finally selling the King of Italy on establishing a worldwide organization, which became the International Institute for Agriculture, the predecessor for the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), which is also headquartered in Rome, and which has been compiling statistics on worldwide agriculture

since that time. One of the early yearbooks mentions that prior to 1930 very few countries had done an agricultural census. But with the help and support of the International Institute, some 60 countries took a census of agriculture during 1930. So that was an important step in compiling and disseminating this most basic information.

I might also mention that in USDA, began a series of monthly reports on agricultural developments around the world in 1919 called foreign crops and markets. When I came in in 1956, we were still submitting items for a weekly report of that same title. It was combined with the Foreign Agriculture Magazine in 1963. And that became a monthly information bulletin on foreign agricultural developments, which has the name Ag Exporter today, but is still a monthly publication. I believe that pretty much covers the early reporting and statistical information. We may get more into that in a later period as we go on.

Q: I think the quality of that reporting was very good almost from the beginning, and pretty much accepted around the world as the best statistics available.

WELTON: That's correct. We've had reports of foreign governments that pretty much accepted the local Ag Attaché's views.

Q: I've had experience on that. Once in a while I'd pick up the official government report, and it would sound familiar, and then I'd go back to a report that I had written which I had furnished to the Ministry of Agriculture, and found that it was almost word for word my report.

WELTON: I think some people wondered, with the International Institute, and later FAO, why FAS and its predecessors felt it necessary to have their own people abroad. The big reason was that FAO and its predecessor had to rely entirely on what the host country government supplied it in terms of statistics.

Q: They felt that they couldn't publish figures that were at variance with what the official figures were. There were many countries, where the official data were not just guesses, but deliberately distorted.

WELTON: I think we had a very good experience in Argentina, where we had good sources of information outside of the government. I never felt that anybody deliberately tried to mislead us there, but when I got into Central America and the coffee republics -- this was the time of the International Coffee Agreement, which had established quotas for each country -- and their interest was to convince us that they had a tremendous surplus of coffee, so that they could get a larger quota. There I did feel that they misled us. In fact, the Ambassador, before I went there, told my predecessor, that was Dick Smith, who later became the Administrator that he had been called in to a Cabinet meeting, where they had been discussing the coffee situation. And that the President said, "Now, just how can we convince you that we've got all this coffee?" And the Ambassador replied, " Well, it

might help if you stopped lying to the Agricultural Attaché." Diplomacy and tact weren't two of his stronger elements. Anyhow, that was the situation we had in coffee.

I remember also a personal experience when the Chairman, or whatever he was, of the Coffee Company, which was a state trading agency, who invited me to accompany him around to see the coffee plantations just before harvest. I was staring at red coffee beans through the car window all day long, and got the worst headache I've ever had. But he was trying to convince me that they had a tremendous crop. But I'm sure there were a lot of similar experiences at other posts as well.

One thing I should mention, perhaps, on reporting: In later years when the agency became more focused on market development, there's been a lot of concern that perhaps the Attachés were spending too much time on mundane reports on different crops, rather than focusing on encouraging more export sales.

Q: And were getting requests for information from a lot of different sources.

WELTON: That's right. In fact, the commodity divisions might write or call and request specific information. So to control that a bit, a reports office was established in the 1950s in the modern FAS to review reporting schedules and make revisions. And in fact, over the years, FAS has dropped some of the commodities we used to report on. I started out as a wool and mohair expert in livestock, and I believe there were 19 commodities that were dropped completely during Dick Smith's tenure as Administrator. Wool and mohair were two of those. And there were other similar commodities which we no longer report on, on a regular basis.

Q: I might note that I was directly involved in the establishment of that reports office. When I came back from Colombia in late 1955, Ioanes gave me the responsibility for reorganizing and redrafting the reporting schedule, and setting up this office to control the flow of reports. I'm not sure that that wasn't the first formal...

WELTON: I think that probably was the first formal office that handled that. I don't believe there was a separate office with that function prior to that. Of course the agency prior to the time I came in was fairly small.

Q: That was in 1956.

WELTON: I just want to mention two other areas on reporting that I might elaborate a bit on. Jim Howard mentioned that one of the things that might be of interest is how some of the early Attachés collected information. For example, he mentioned that Owen Dawson, our man in China before World War II, would take a train trip through the same growing area each growing season. And he would count the telephone poles opposite each field, to get an idea of how much wheat for example they were growing that year in comparison with the year before. And I remember Brice Meeker, who was in Russia, had a mechanized gizmo, that would attach right to the odometer on a car, and you could do the

same thing. And he'd have different crops, and he would punch a button whenever he came to a field with that particular crop, to indicate how many miles of that crop they had in that particular area. It was a good example of what we later called ground truth, which they need to base the estimates that we can now calculate using information from satellite data, which are overflying some of these major producing countries.

The other thing he mentioned was that Paul Minneman, who was in Cuba in the mid 1940s, and was asked to report on the size of the sugar crop, which of course was the major crop in Cuba. He would visit the mills, and tell them that if they gave him information on their production, that he would share the data of the whole country with them, which they found of course quite useful and interesting. That helped get information.

I might mention one of my favorite stories about statistics involving a fellow we both knew in Argentina, John Crume. He was in Iran, I believe, and got one of these requests that went out from the Department from time to time in those days, kind of an overall view of the tallow and soap industry, and the production and consumption statistics. And John found out that there was one man that really controlled the industry. In Iran, as in many developing countries, one fellow would control the whole industry. In fact, in Spain one of the things that Franco did was kind of parcel out those industries to his friends and they of course prospered over the years from control of those industries. But anyhow, the one in Iran -- John was reading this detailed survey request to his source and he was just providing the answers very readily to the questions. But John got to thinking that the figures just didn't sound reasonable. He said to the General, "The figure you gave me for soap consumption would work out to about 4 bars per year per capita." And the general looked him straight in the eye and said, "Would you like me to double it?" So he realized that he might not have had the irrefutable source that he thought, which of course many of us discovered over the years, that we had to get more than one source for our information. That's the way it was done in many cases. Finding the people that really knew the industry, obviously, was a key. And the offices developed those contacts over the years.

I might mention in this regard that among the most valuable resources that we had in FAS, and I think you'll agree, were the Foreign National professionals who stayed with our offices for many years, and really knew the key people who had the information, which we needed. They were an invaluable resource, and still are.

Q: Many of them were very highly educated, and some of them had been in the various Ministries. In Bogota, a former Minister of Agriculture applied to me for a job, but we didn't have anything for him. The one we had in Argentina, had also been a high-ranking official .

WELTON: And had received some training in the U.S.

Q: That's right. He'd been through the Point Four or a similar program in Kansas. In some of the Iron Curtain countries, these people were invaluable, but there was

considerable personal risk and some actually were imprisoned, not necessarily for what they had done, but they were just under suspicion because they were considered to be working for the enemy.

WELTON: That's right. We worked with many countries where meat inspection was part of our activities. Not that we were inspectors, but we would arrange for visits by our inspectors, and that was true in Argentina.

Q: Also fruit inspections were important.

WELTON: Yes. I remember when, before my time, when Dick Smith was in El Salvador, just before me. They had to, in effect, tell the meat inspector in Nicaragua that he had to close down General Somoza's plant. This inspector started sweating rather profusely when they told them that. I think he had visions of going before the firing squad shortly thereafter. Those were some of the risks involved.

Another thing that Jim Howard brought to my attention was that in the early post-war years, although I'm not sure if we had any of these prior to World War II, there were regional commodity specialists that might be located in London, for example. They would travel all over Europe, providing information for the whole region on cotton, fruit, or grain.

Q: Didn't we have one of those in Cairo at one time?

WELTON: There might well have been. I suspect there was. P. K. Norris was one of those, with cotton, I remember. Wheatly Palmer was another one Jim mentioned. Jack Hudson on tobacco, Gordan Boals on grain, and Gordon I know was later the Washington representative of the Millers National Federation, which was a cooperator on flour exports. He was there for a number of years. A fellow named Doc Motz on apples. I don't know if he reported on other fruits as well. And there must have been someone on citrus.

Q: Oh yes, Henry Burke was a famous character.

WELTON: There is some talk of trying to revive something along that line. Our resources from time to time get stretched and we have to reduce posts abroad, and so forth. The question of regional reports is being considered I understand, in the current setting.

Q: Other than the London and possibly the Cairo offices, what were some of the other important regional posts that we had in the early days.

WELTON: They weren't all regional, in the 1920s we had an Attaché in Buenos Aires. In fact, a fellow named Dr. Dilman Bullock was in Buenos Aires from 1920 to 1923. And I believe that other than London, Buenos Aires has the longest continuous run of Agricultural Attachés at post.

Q: I didn't realize that.

WELTON: There may have been a brief period in the 1930s where Buenos Aires was vacated later we had the Balance of Payments (BALPA) cutbacks where we reduced overseas staffing because of budget considerations, and certainly the 1930s was not a plush time for budgets either.

Q: I think we had to pull the Attachés out of Buenos Aires temporarily for security reasons, didn't we, a few years ago?

WELTON: That's right. But we operated out of Montevideo for a period there during the bad times in the 1970s after our departure. We pulled an assistant, I know, out of B.A. in the 1930s, but it may have been closed for a year or two during that period, I'm not absolutely sure. Anyhow, the other posts in the 1920s were Berlin, Rome -- we had a representative to the International Institute that I mentioned earlier; Mexico City, Shanghai, Marseille...

Q: What were they concentrating on in Marseille?

WELTON: I suspect more on competitive crops -- maybe fruit. I'm not sure about this, but it could well be. Certainly the focus of some posts was on competition with U.S.A. Agriculture. B.A., Pretoria, Sydney, which were similar posts that opened in the 1920s. I think the only other one was moved between Budapest, Vienna, and Belgrade. That became kind of a regional post for the Balkans and shifted around quite a lot. The Commissioner in Shanghai also had reporting responsibilities for Japan in the late 1920s.

I may have mentioned that Belgrade is now covered from Sofia, and we've had regional posts shifting in that area from different locations over the years. By 1944, the Attaché Service was under the State Department, and some of these posts that I mentioned earlier were still there, but we had added Rio, Ottawa, Havana, and Moscow. A couple of those, I presume, certainly Moscow, had limited staffing before the end of the war, but we were shipping a lot of food there under Lend Lease at the time, and we had Ag reporters in several Latin American countries by 1944, including Caracas. I think Jim Kempton was probably there by then. Fortunately, the late Bob McConnell, whom we knew very well, when he was an area officer, took the Attaché lists that had been utilized in FAS for a number of years, and compiled a series on post staffing by post from 1945 on, which is an excellent place to check on who was where when. It's been very useful to a lot of people.

I might mention that in 1939, when the Attachés shifted to the State Department, there were nine Attachés. At that time we only seem to have seven posts still operating overseas, and the extra two attachés I assume, were on home leave or assigned here in Washington, but they transferred to the State Department with the Attaché Service. I mentioned earlier that Paul Minneman and Paul Nyhus, and Dawson in China were all on that list. Another old timer was Cliff Taylor who served in Buenos Aires and in New Delhi. And of that group, just a couple reverted back to FAS in 1954. And the only one to

serve for an extended period after that was Paul Minneman, who was considered by many of us as Dean of the Attaché Service in the 1960s. He went on to Bonn and Paris, and was there, between those two posts for about 13 years, after 1955. Those are some of the pioneers in the Attaché Service. At the time they switched back to FAS in 1955 Taylor was the most senior of the group as a GS-18, with a salary of $14,800. Omer Hermann in Paris and Eric Englund in London were GS-17's.

After the war was over in 1945, there was a substantial expansion by State in the number of agricultural officers overseas covering agriculture, particularly in Latin America, and we were getting back into Europe after the war. I'm surprised to see in Bob's list, for example, that we were back in Belgium in 1945. It was have been pretty late in 1945. I guess we liberated Belgium at the end of 1944.

Q: Most of Belgium, anyway.

WELTON: I guess that was the Battle of the Bulge, I think was Christmas of 1944. And then there was some further expansion right after World War II.

Q: That was a rather difficult time, in many ways. That was the time that I came into the Foreign Service IN 1946, as a Foreign Service officer. But I had been assigned to agriculture from the beginning. In those early days, a great many of the agricultural people in the Foreign Service -- agricultural officers were essentially wartime temporary appointees. But after, at the end of the war, probably more than half of them, or a large percentage of them, anyway, went back to universities, to the USDA, or to their pre-war pursuits. So that was quite an exodus, and the State Department was rather frantically looking for replacements. When I came in Francis Flood was an Assistant Director of OFAR, and he was on my oral examining board. He asked me a great many questions about agriculture. I asked myself why they were so interested in that, because I was actually a history and government major and hadn't had any formal agricultural training . But anyway, I had always had an interest in agriculture, having grown up on a farm. So they sent me to the USDA graduate school, and I took courses in one thing or another, and learned by experience. But I got most of my training on the job. And there were several that were assigned as Assistant Agricultural Attachés with limited agricultural background. I know Bob Brand said that the only connection in his background that he could think of was that as an English major, he had taken a course on Piers Plowman, an Old English class. He stayed with the State Department, as did the Foreign Service Officers that had been assigned as Agricultural Attachés. That was a rather difficult period, those first few years after the war, personnel wise.

WELTON: That raises an interesting point, Quentin. I'm sure you found your farm background quite useful and helpful, because I certainly did, in establishing rapport with agriculturalists overseas. I think they appreciated that. Certainly when I came in that was something that was still fairly common. By that time we were hiring largely agricultural economists and frequently they came out of our land grant colleges and had some

previous experience or farm background growing up, which we don't find very much anymore, obviously.

Q: There's not a very large pool nowadays.

WELTON: Not as large, certainly. Also, I think I've read elsewhere that many of the early Attachés came out of an academic background, and some certainly with Ph.D.s, certainly a larger percentage than we had later. And there were a few that came from diverse backgrounds, even missionaries. I believe Fred Rossiter, one of our early Acting Administrators, on a couple of occasions, had been an agricultural missionary in China.

Q: I think his parents were missionaries.

WELTON: That could be. And I mentioned the fellow in Argentina, although I don't think he was ever formally with the agency. He did send in reports from there on sheep and wool in Argentina. And later we've gotten Bryant Wadsworth, whom we hired in trade policy when I was in Washington, who had been a Mormon missionary in Japan and was fluent in Japanese, and so he went back to Japan first as Assistant Attaché, and then as an Agricultural Counselor, and spent a number of years with us in Tokyo.

Q: We were hiring when I came back from Argentina, in the trade policy area -- we were hiring mostly international economists, many of whom had very little agricultural background, but trade negotiations were so important at that time, that many of the agricultural economists did not have the specific training necessary for that.

WELTON: That was a common background of many during that period, that's correct. And occasionally we would get someone who didn't have much training in either field. We had one that came from Texas that had been head of their international marketing division at the Texas State Department of Agriculture, but his major was in music. I got a call, when I was in the Attaché Service, from one of Senator Tower's staff fellows, who asked me what the requirements were for getting into the Attaché Service, and I gave him the standard report, that we liked to get Ag economists, generally with a master's degree in Ag economics. He said, Well, I know one down there that doesn't have that background. He was referring to the music major, of course. But, many of those turned out to be excellent Attachés as well. But Ag economists were what we were generally looking for.

Q: We've discussed the key functions of the Agricultural Attachés on the reporting side. What were some of the other activities in the early days that the attachés were performing?

WELTON: Generally, I would say, what some of us would refer to as the old-line functions of the Agricultural Attaché in addition to supplying data and reports on a wide range of commodity and livestock products, there was the broad general representation function in which they represented both the Department of Agriculture and the

Ambassador on agricultural matters within the country. Certainly along with that, they had a key role of keeping the Ambassador informed of broader agricultural issues and developments that he should know about in managing the post operations in those countries and in developing countries, agriculture was certainly the major economic force. I recall in Central America, the Protocol Officer told me one time that I might have the second most important position there. I assume the Ambassador was first. I recall the Ambassador would love to comment that at every cocktail party that he went to he could see the cotton interests ganging up on one side of the room, and the coffee guys were over in another corner. Sugar was another key commodity there, and they were quite concerned about our import policies on sugar, and in the case of cotton we were competitors, so we were accused of dumping cotton on the world market, and that was a primary concern. So he was quite cognizant of the fact that he needed to be well informed on all of those activities as well.

And of course, certainly another broad role is servicing the U.S.A. trade in the host country. Often there are importers and exporters who wanted information on the U.S.A. Some of the standard guidance we used to give attachés going overseas was to get your reports in on time, and take care of visitors. I think that's probably still good advice. When I was serving in Mexico I used to say that I served two countries, maybe three including Mexico, but certainly the U.S.A. and Texas. I had to be aware of and take care of visitors and telephone calls from the border, whenever there was a problem getting some U.S. product in, or maybe something being shipped from Mexico that was causing problems on the other side.
Beyond that, depending on the post of course, participating and assisting in international meetings was another role that the Attaché at post would get involved in from time to time. I'm sure you can add a lot from your own experience.

Q: One activity that wasn't stressed so much in our briefings and instructions when we went to the post, but that at some posts became a very important one, was the AID program. Now the Agricultural Attaché was very useful to those programs, in the sense that he could provide information and so forth, and he had a little more direct access to the Ambassador, and the Ambassador was responsible. And the Ambassador would sometimes put functions on the Agricultural Attaché, somebody he knew and trusted, that went a little bit beyond what FAS in Washington thought was necessary. And you had to walk a kind of tightrope.

WELTON: Occasionally I know we've had experiences where the Ambassador might be quite interested -- In Bolivia he was aware of the development of the soybean industry in Argentina and Brazil, which happened after we were there, fortunately, in Argentina. But he was quite interested in having AID assist with developing the soybean industry in Bolivia, and our people in Washington weren't too enthused about that, in USDA, that is, and the Attaché had to walk a difficult tightrope there between those interests.

Q: I had the experience of having one of my former Ambassadors, who was being transferred to another post, and came to the USDA for a briefing. He was briefed by the

Assistant Secretary, and the Ambassador commended me very highly for the fine support I'd given him with the AID program. There were some lifted eyebrows about that as they were thinking -- "Why weren't you out there pushing U.S. agricultural products." It was perfectly understood that there were legitimate functions that the Attaché should and needed to provide in that area. But you had to walk a tightrope.

WELTON: In Central America we had a very large AID mission under what we called at the time a Participating Agency Service Agreement -- PASA -- where they would contract with U.S.A. university technicians to help develop agriculture in the host country. And we had a very good working relationship. They would get together from time to time and I would sit in on their staff meetings and have some input and also get a lot of feedback from them as well.

Of course reporting was a major function of the Attaché offices prior to 1940. An FAS report in 1970 titled The Agricultural Attaché: His History and His work notes that:

"Principal developments in then work of the Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) in the 1930's included: 1) more emphasis on commodity (rather than area) reporting in the European offices; and(2) a marked increase in participation by FAS officers at international conferences; and (3) a considerable extension in the activities of the agricultural attachés as advisers to the heads of the embassies or legations to which they were accredited. Foreign projects of a typical year (1936) included appraisals of French wheat policy, of the agricultural production capacity of Germany, of the expansion of cotton production in Argentina, of recent developments in Soviet agriculture, of the present and potential agricultural resources of Manchuria, and of agricultural production in the Philippines."

Those were sort of the old-line functions that the Attachés took care of back in the old days, and still do today with , perhaps, slightly different priorities. Of course , the two major areas of responsibility that took on a much heavier role in later years were the market promotion function and the trade negotiations functions of the agency. Although I'm sure in the early days they would on occasion have reason to complain to the host government on particular trade actions that involved Ag interests. I was interested in reading that when the transfer was made to the Department of State of the Attachés in 1939, they did spell out in the Secretary's Memorandum of that time, the functions of OFAR in Washington, which mentioned that one of them was to direct and coordinate the participation of the Department of Agriculture in the reciprocal trade agreements program. I think there was a Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act (RTA) in the late 1930s, but of course, after 1939 World War II was underway, and the RTA was pretty much in abeyance then until after the war. We'll get into that later. And it also mentions as well that USDA would direct and coordinate Agriculture's participation in the development and cooperation programs in Latin America, which had started earlier, and got expanded quite a bit by Point Four in the Truman Administration after the war, to other regions of the world. And some of the OFAR people were quite heavily involved in that activity.

Someone interviewed Leslie Wheeler, who was Administrator of the old FAS and OFAR for many years, about the shift, and he mentioned that this Memorandum, setting up OFAR, gave the new office specific authority which they in fact had been carrying out under the old FAS, in addition to the staff relationship they had with the Secretary's office.

Q: Dick, with regard to the technical assistance work that this organization has done over the years, I understand that it goes back a long way. What have you found are the origins of that?

WELTON: One of the first references I found, Quentin, was in 1871 when the Commissioner of Agriculture was at the time -- I believe his name was Horace Capron -- was asked to head a team to Japan to assist with agricultural development there. I assume this perhaps was Japan's initiative to request assistance from the Department of Agriculture. But this team, I think, developed a plan to develop agriculture in Hokkaido. I believe I read somewhere that this was sort of the origin of the dairy industry in Japan, which Hokkaido I think is still a leading producer area for dairy. And by 1900, I think, a lot of countries had become aware of the research and extension success of agriculture in the United States, and wanted to learn more about it. So they began to send some of their students to study at land grant universities here in the U.S. In fact, as you know, that was a source of some of our good contacts overseas, and some of our Foreign National professionals came out of that experience.

As I mentioned earlier, a comprehensive technical assistance program began with the cooperation with the America Republics Act in 1939. An Institute of Inter-American Affairs was established in 1942 to work with Latin American republics on technical programs in education, health, and agriculture. Some of our colleagues that were involved with this program early on included Carlos Ortega, who stayed with the agency for many years, and Ross Moore, who was the head of that activity in OFAR. Similar efforts were underway by the OAS, which established an Inter-American Institute for Agricultural Sciences in 1940, set up a research center in Turrialba, Costa Rica, which specialized in postgraduate training for agriculturalists from throughout Latin America.

Q: That's still in operation, isn't it?

WELTON: Oh yes, it is. I meant to call Quentin West to see just when that was started. He worked there for a couple of years after he retired from the Economic Research Service.

Q: Unfortunately Quentin West passed away several weeks ago, a week or so before Ray Ioanes was going to interview him.

WELTON: He certainly would have been a good interviewee, because he had a rich knowledge of USDA's activities. One of my favorite Quentin West stories is this: We were on a trip with Secretary Bergland to the Middle East. There was a reception at the

embassy, and a lady was checking us in at the gate, with a list of the names of the Bergland team. One of the fellows from the private sector, Bill Taggert, was in the group. Quentin was rather heavy, but Taggert was much heavier. She asked Quentin if he was Bill Taggert, and he said, " No, he's the next size." I enjoyed hearing some of Quentin's stories on that trip. He had come into FAS on the regional side of the agency, and then went to the Economic Research Service (ERS) when that was established in 1961, and later became Administrator of the ERS.

Q: During that early period he came to Manila while I was Attaché there in 1959.

WELTON: I think Ross Moore left the agency about the time that the new FAS was formed in 1954, but some others were in that group. Claude Horn, with whom I worked later in Central America was among them. I'm not sure if Clayton Whipple was in that side of the agency or if he was in the regional branches, which I'm sure were heavily involved with the technical assistance part of it, certainly for Latin America.

I mentioned OAS, but of course FAO was established in 1945, and FAO was also heavily involved in technical development assistance. I had an experience with FAO in El Salvador. They sent an agricultural economist from Israel. And since not many Agricultural attachés from other countries were there, he sort of adopted me as his confidant, and would come by to see me frequently. We would visit on developments there. He came in all excited one day, and said that he had found just the product for El Salvador, that was produced in only three countries in the world. And I said, " Mohair? " And he looked at me sort of aghast, and he said, How did you know that? So I had to confess that I was a mohair specialist in FAS in my early years. But I don't believe that they ever did do much with Angora goats. Anyway, he tried.

And of course our good friend Afif Tannous was heavily involved in this activity, particularly after it got expanded to other areas such as the Middle East, which was and still is his area of expertise, and for which he has a worldwide reputation.

Q: Yes, we were very fortunate to be able to get a fairly lengthy interview with him last year some time. He just celebrated his 90th birthday, I believe, and he is still very alert and has a fantastic memory.

WELTON: I should run this section by him, to see if he has anything to add later on, but I think he covered it well in his interview. I should also mention that the OFAR had a key role in developing the Point Four section of President Truman's speech, which of course broadened the technical assistance to other areas of the world -- the Middle East, Africa, and Asia, after World War II.

Another related activity that got involved about that time was land reform. You will remember Wolf Ladejinsky was the top Ag man for General MacArthur after World War II.

Q: Yes. He was the father of the Japanese land reform program. And he's venerated in Japan. A Japanese professor who had known and worked with Wolf, and visited me when I was working with the Jaenke Associates, about 7 or 8 years ago. And he brought me a very laudatory biographic sketch of Wolf he had written, primarily concerning the work that he had done in planning and implementing the land reform program.

WELTON: Then he went back as Attaché to Tokyo in 1950-1954.

Q: Our friend Joe Dodson was one of his assistants in Japan during that time. Joe was later an Attaché in Tokyo, wasn't he?

WELTON: Yes. Land reform, as Afif said, became taboo when the Republicans came in in 1953. The technical assistance activity was considerably scaled back when the new FAS was set up in 1954. Afif, I believe was the liaison for FAS with the development side of State and the AID predecessor agencies that were there at the time. Afif also mentioned that development assistance had drawn considerable flak in the late 1940s from California agricultural interests. This led to quite a reduction in OFAR staff at that time. I was going to mention on Wolf Ladejinsky that OFAR had sponsored an international conference on land reform at the University of Wisconsin. I think that was in the early 1950s. Ross Moore left to join ICA, which was the AID predecessor at that point. Wolf had also left to join ICA by 1954, when FAS was set up. I also believe, and you may know this better than I, that he was a victim of the McCarthy hearings at that time.

Q: Exactly. He was forced out eventually. He had relatives still in the Soviet Union, and he was hounded out of FAS and became the agricultural advisor to Diem, the Prime Minister of Vietnam.

WELTON: I didn't know that, or that he still had relatives in the Soviet Union. I didn't know that was his origin. That's interesting.

So technical assistance was phased down considerably in 1954 in the new FAS, and the only major activity I recall when I came into the agency in 1956, was the foreign training division, which arranged training for foreign graduate students and others in the United States with the university land-grant colleges and other facilities around the country.

Q: Cannon Hearne was heading that up?

WELTON: Yes, and I guess he was the head of it for the next 20 years, a long time. And then when the Kennedy Administration came in in 1960, that activity, I believe originally went with the new Economic Research Service, which took the regional and country area specialists out of FAS, which was still a major activity in 1956. Some well known FASers who had been around for a long time, like Hans Richter, and Lois Bacon, Mary Long and Wilhelm Anderson went to ERS. So that was a major loss to the agency. And they also set up a separate agency for the development side, IADS, International

Agricultural Development Service, headed by Les Brown, who became famous for his famine predictions in the book: Man, Land and Food. Les was a graduate student with me at the University of Maryland. I didn't know him all that well, but I'm sure we had some courses together. And he's still on the scarcity bandwagon -- China is his latest theme. And one of these days it may turn out...

Q: He is the president of the World Watch Institute. They do a lot of good research, but many people think he's gone a little far in his predictions of drastic scarcities that he sees in the fairly near future.

WELTON: I believe that activity came back to FAS briefly -- the development activity -- maybe when Dave Hume was Administrator, which was in 1974. But then when the Carter Administration came in in 1977, they established the Office of International Cooperation and Development as a separate agency. But that has recently come back now in the latest reorganization plan, which began during the closing stages of the Bush Administration, and has been carried out by the Clinton Administration. That activity is back with FAS. The only major activity which we had in the early years, which is still in the Economic Research Service, was the regional expertise and country specialists. And those I think still do the food balance sheets, which I guess they may have been doing since World War II. It was probably started during the war. Obviously scarcity was a concern then and I recall reading that the Attaché's primary responsibility at the outset of World War II was to locate exportable supplies of foodstuffs.

Q: I suspect they did start during the war.

WELTON: I might add at this point another major activity, which has been in and out over the years, is the Office of the General Sales Manager. I believe that started as a separate activity with the Kennedy Administration. You remember when Ed Jaenke came to Buenos Aires, he came with Frank LaRoux who I think was the first General Sales manager with that title. I suppose about that time the PL 480 activity was transferred over to that agency and it gained agency status-- as the Export Marketing Service in 1969.

Q: And then it was brought back into FAS, but I don't remember exactly when.

WELTON: I'll have to check that too. [It came back in 1975, but has retained a certain degree of autonomy in operating the PL 480 and CCC credit programs.]

An interesting operation. It's been in and out over the years, largely because of the insistence of one man, Jamie Whitten, Chairman of the Agricultural Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. Now that he's gone perhaps they will be able to keep it in FAS. As you know, Jamie Whitten had one theme which he harped on annually in the budget hearings, that the CCC had the authority to sell agricultural products, and that's what they ought to be doing.

Q: He strongly believed that should be our program; put CCC surpluses on the market and sell them.

WELTON: That's right -- for whatever they would bring. Even in the height of the scarcity period, in the early '70s, when grain prices shot through the roof, he didn't miss a beat. He still harped on the fact that we ought to be out there pushing our products, for whatever we can get for them. Anyhow, that's now history. Although these things have a way of cropping up again from time to time.

Q: The Congressmen who have agriculture as one of their primary concerns -- they are rapidly dwindling. We may not have quite as much of that in the future.

WELTON: That's true. Perhaps one indication of this is that we now have for the first time a career head of the General Sales Manager's wing of the FAS, Chris Goldthwaite, who had been Acting for several years, and was named head of the General Sales Manager's office in recent years. It's also curious to note Chris is a Harvard graduate, and the current Administrator is also a Harvard graduate. I don't think we've ever had two Harvard graduates in such high positions in FAS.

Q: We wouldn't have had it in Jamie Whitten's heyday. Also, I think it's interesting that this new agriculture bill which has been passed by the Senate is a pretty drastic revision of the original farm legislation, which has been in effect since 1949, and which is still the basic legislation for agriculture, though drastically amended, from time to time.

WELTON: It would boost the cost of our programs by a huge amount if they didn't enact new legislation to supersede current legislation as it expires.

Q: Yes. Otherwise the legislation would revert back to the original language.

WELTON: The other area that I touched on briefly, but hadn't gotten into in very much detail, is the trade policy area of FAS. I did go back and review some of the yearbook chapters on trade policy, which were written by such renowned experts as Clayton Yuetter, who was later Secretary of Agriculture, and the President's Special Trade Representative. I think the order is reversed -- first Special Trade Representative and then Secretary. And of course, was Assistant Secretary when I went to Mexico in 1974. His chapter mentions that the first trade agreement was negotiated with Germany, in 1844. But it was never ratified, and the first one to be ratified and take effect was in 1855 with Canada. Also, the 1890 Trade Act was the first to authorize trade agreements without approval of Congress, which of course is key, because Congress has seldom looked very favorably on trade agreements. Then, I was also curious to learn Ray Ioanes wrote a little earlier, in the 1964 yearbook, that by 1940, agreements had been negotiated with 29 countries, which surprised me. I didn't think we'd been that active prior to World War II. But the sharp decline in farm prices after World War I led to a succession of tariff acts I mentioned earlier, which culminated in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930. This, of course, has been shown to have been very restrictive trade legislation, which hampered

our trade for quite a period. But from then on, there were a series of trade acts to reduce tariffs on farm products and other commodities. Ray mentioned that the 1930 Act had raised the average tariff on farm products to 85 percent. And Ag exports had fallen by more than 50 percent during the early '30s, which of course were the Depression years. We had Ag surpluses and programs to cut back on production. You remember this period better than I.

Q: That was the Henry Wallace era. We took a lot of heat for killing the little pigs in trying to reduce the pork surplus.

WELTON: I don't think that program lasted very long. But certainly the ploughing up of grain and programs to curtail acreage in basic crops has been an integral part of farm programs ever since.

Q: It may be on its way out at this point.

WELTON: They're trying to phase it out but I'm still skeptical that we won't have another period down the road where surpluses are a problem and there will be an effort to reinstate some of the acreage control programs. Getting back to trade policy, the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1934 helped turn the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act around and reduce these average tariffs about 55 percent by the time World War II started. The war caused a hiatus in all of that activity, obviously. One thing they did do, during the war, was to set up the interdepartmental committee to consider how to reestablish world trade, after World War II. This was probably the predecessor organization of the one we were familiar with in the '70s, and which I think continues to this day -- what we called at one time the Trade Staff Committee. I'm not sure what they call it today, but a similar type of organization that involves trade experts from Agriculture, Commerce, State, Tariff Commission, Labor, and all the other agencies around town, who sit around the table and discuss different types of trade actions that Agriculture , or others, might want to pursue to lower barriers, or in some cases to try to raise them.

Another thing that was started in 1945, actually, was that the U.S. invited some 15 countries to a conference on international trade and employment. That conference was at Hot Springs, VA. The GATT followed in 1947, and we've had a whole series of trade negotiating rounds since then. One thing on the trade policy side that I found interesting in reading Reed Dunn's story on his work with the cotton council was the Farm Bureau's role. He mentioned that the cotton sector had been strong supporters of free trade in the New Deal era, but at that time the Farm Bureau supported protectionism which I think is quite different from their current stance in recent years, they've been strong supporters of the trade agreements to reduce tariffs, and also have been strong supporters of reducing USA price supports so that our products can compete in world trade. Another key development in the 1940's was the signing of the International Wheat Agreement in 1949. I had mentioned that there have always been groups very active in resisting free trade in some areas of agriculture. Section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1935 provided

for import controls when imports interfered with domestic price support programs, and that led to a quota system for dairy products, wheat and flour, and peanuts. Sugar was covered by the Jones-Costigan Act of 1934, but imports have been fairly tightly controlled since that time for sugar. And then meat imports, particularly beef, were controlled a bit later, under Section 204 of the Agriculture Act of 1956, which set up voluntary restraint programs, which we've had with the major suppliers, Australia and New Zealand, from time to time. Those were first applied in 1964. But all of that has been superseded by the signing of the Uruguay Round Agreement, which became effective January 1, 1995. Those quotas have been replaced by tariff quotas, which are quite a bit more liberal, certainly in the case of beef, than the previous ...

Q: Has Section 22 actually been superseded now?

WELTON: Yes, it has.

Q: Section 22 in the years that I was the U.S. delegate to the GATT Agriculture Committee in Geneva, was one of the major targets of our trading competitors, that I had to be constantly defending. We clung to that through all the trade negotiations and the multilateral trade agreements over the years, which the Common Market and other competitors resented tremendously. And that was the source of much of the friction in our trade negotiations.

WELTON: It was certainly a major bargaining chip in our negotiations, particularly with the Common Market, their variable levy system that we wanted to get under the same controls with a maximum tariff and tariff quotas which were all on the table.

Q: I guess the Uruguay Round was the first negotiation in which both the EC and the U.S. finally made rather significant changes.

WELTON: I think that's right. In fact, that agreement, the so-called Blair House Agreement, probably held up the completion of the Uruguay Round for a couple of years.

Q: Yes, many people thought at the time that it would destroy it.

WELTON: I remember there was a cartoon on one of the doors in FAS in the trade policy area. Carla Hills saying that " This Uruguay Round negotiation will absolutely be finished by the end of 1992... " , or maybe it was even earlier than that, but it was the end of 1994 when they actually reached agreement and it took effect on January 1, 1995.

Q: I have gone into this to some extent in my own interview, but the major argument that we had in support of Section 22 restrictions was that we also had in our farm legislation that the production controls and what we were arguing with the Common Market at that time was that very few of our competitors had as stringent production controls as we had. They had subsidies, but pretty well open-ended in most instances as far as production was concerned. And there was considerable logic in our argument, but we didn't have all

that much support from other agencies in our position. We fought very hard, and I think some of our trade negotiators, Ray Ioanes was the leader for many years in that effort. And Ernest Koenig, when he was stationed in Brussels and Geneva -- certainly he did a lot of good work in that area. But in many instances, we didn't have much support from other agencies, and outright opposition from many in the State Department. Those were very difficult years to be involved in the trade policy area.

WELTON: Yes. Another bone of contention was that the U.S. had gotten a waiver in the original GATT legislation, which permitted us to continue the Section 22 restrictions. I guess there was an annual review of that waiver, wasn't there, that was defended all the time?

Q: Yes, and there was constant review in the committee in Geneva.

WELTON: I'll probably get into some of the trade rounds a bit more later. I just wanted to go back and pick up some of this early history on trade policy. We have, as you know, a staffing pattern of FAS at the time the new FAS was formed in 1954. Oscar Zaglits headed up the trade policy area in OFAR at the time. And I think you mentioned that he said it was pretty much a one-man division. He didn't have anywhere near the staff that we were familiar with when we came back from Argentina. We had two divisions.

Q: Even a few years before that when P. K. Norris was heading up that work. He had about 2 or-3 assistants and a couple of secretaries, and that was about the size of the trade policy organization.

WELTON: But now they have six divisions, including a new office for food safety and the trade statistics staff. Now they must have about 50 people in that area. Most of that expansion began with the Kennedy Round and certainly grew during the Tokyo Round. And of course the Uruguay Round later.

Talking about the size of the agency, we might go back and look at some of the budget figures. I recalled seeing a photo of the FAS picnic in 1934. There are about 30 people there, including approximately 10 dependents. So I would guess at that time we probably had no more than 50-60 in all of FAS, including 10-20 in the field. I mentioned those numbers to Ralph Phillips, who was in China during World War II with OFAR, and he said that sounded about right to him. On the budget side, going back to that picture, you'll notice that there are two long-time Attachés there: Dr. C. C. Taylor, and Paul Nyhus. They may have been on home leave, or assigned to Washington at the time. Lazar Volan, who was our Russian expert was also there. I was intrigued that we had a Russian expert back that far. I don't think we had a lot of trade with Russia in those days but they may have been grain exporters then.

Q: I don't think he was hired, nor did he serve as a Russian expert, actually.

WELTON: That may be, although he certainly was after the war, when I came in.

Q: There was Oscar Zaglits, who isn't in this group, but he must have come in fairly soon afterwards. Most of these people were still in what became OFAR. I think this was the original FAS, perhaps, in 1934.

WELTON: That's right.

Q: It had become OFAR, but most of the people in the picture, including an early FAS director, Les Wheeler were still on the job when I came in 1946.

WELTON: Several of these were still around when I came in 1956, including Volin and Leo Shaben. This FAS newsletter was printed in 1965, and they mention that two of them, Ruth Donovan and Louis Fillius were still at FAS at that time. Volin and another lady, Geniama Edwards, were in ERS by then.

Q: Louise Fillius worked in my office when I came back from Bogota in 1955, as Reports and Training Officer. I believe that she had started to work for -- I'm not sure if it was in USDA or not, but she started to work for the government during World War I, and she retired not too long after that.

WELTON: She was still there in 1965, so it was probably shortly after that.

I mentioned the agency grew rapidly in the mid-50s after the new FAS was organized in 1954. Of course, Public Law 480 helped a great deal in providing funding for that growth and the expansion -- particularly of the trade programs and market development side of the agency. Staffing in those areas had been very limited before that time. By the early '80s, the number had leveled off at about 800, with some 120 Americans overseas and 180 foreign nationals at some 70 posts abroad, covering some 110 countries. I think we're over 1,000 now with the addition of the OICD staff, which came back to the agency last year. But overseas I don't think our full numbers have varied a great deal since that time. In fact, the recent budget figures show a slight decline in overseas personnel since 1985. We've had some shifts in posts of course, and some of the smaller posts are part of a regional grouping, and we just have one foreign national at a number of those. One of your old posts, Brussels, at the embassy, is now a post covered by our man in the Hague. We still have a sizeable contingent of course, at the USA Mission office, in Brussels covering the European Union.

I think I'd mentioned earlier on the budget side was that Congress allocated $1,000 in 1839 to the Patent Office, before USDA was established, to collect statistics abroad. By 1934, that had jumped to $23,000, which was allocated to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (BAE), to gather information on markets for American agricultural products in Europe and the Orient. I should also mention that funding for FAS in 1930/31 came from the Federal Farm Board, the precursor of the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) which was created in 1933. We also found reference to the budget in 1939, when the Attachés shifted to State. The FAS budget was $300,000. I don't know if that was just for

the overseas portion, but I don't think so. $100,000 was shifted to State to pay the cost of the Attaché Service. Of course, as I mentioned Before we only had about 9 Attachés who were transferred to State in that reorganization, so it was still very small. In 1954, when the Attachés returned to FAS, I saw some material from Art Minor -- you know he was our Assistant Administrator for Management for many years -- and was heavily involved in that process. USDA requested $1.2 million from Congress to run the new FAS, including $400,000 from State to offset the switch of the Attachés. Congress eventually authorized $800,000, all to be transferred from the State Department. By the mid-80s, the funding for the Attaché Service was about $20 million, and recently it was nearly $40 million, and the total FAS budget was about $130 million. We're talking real money here. I mentioned that the total staff had gotten up to about 900, with some 260 in the field in 1995. I think that might be before the shift back of the OICD.

I might also note at this point that the current FY 1996 budget proposes a number of new posts including Vietnam, the Ukraine and Kazakhstan, plus six new agricultural trade offices: Shanghai, two in Latin America, Russia, and Africa. The total of those that they'll get -- that seems a bit optimistic for one year, and even if they are authorized, that doesn't always mean, as you know, that they get filled. We still have to convince the Department of State to let us have offices in some of these places. Sometimes they resist our closing offices, and they also often resist opening new offices in some countries.

Q: The State Department is being -- I get the Foreign Service Journal -- they are being hurt pretty badly in these budget reductions, so I can understand their concern about anything that increases the load on State, any new additions of ours, which in one way or another will have repercussions on their budget. The Embassy would be resistant, I'm sure. They'd have to be fully remunerated for it.

WELTON: There's a transfer of funds for administrative support, which of course is involved when we open new posts abroad. One interesting or curious development in the past year has been that Senator Helms, who is not known as a staunch supporter of the State Department --

Q: Let it be known that that's irony.

WELTON: ...also proposed that all of the trade functions go back to the Department of State from both Agriculture and Commerce -- but I believe that wiser heads have prevailed. That proposal did not go very far.

Q: But Senator Helms did hold up not only all nominations for Ambassadors in key positions, but also the ratification of some very important treaties on disarmament. He held it up for a couple of years almost, wasn't it?

WELTON: He did hold up a lot of Ambassadors' appointments.

Q: All of that has been freed, and the START agreements have finally been ratified.

WELTON: The next thing we might discuss a bit are the early Administrators. We mentioned Leslie Wheeler, who was not the first Administrator -- well, I use the term Administrator, but we should clarify that, prior to 1954, the people that we talk about were all Directors of either the old FAS in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, or the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, the old OFAR. They had the title of Director rather than Administrator.

The first Director of the old FAS was Asher Hobson. I think he had probably been in the Bureau for some years. He probably retired in 1931, so he was just there for a short time after FAS became a separate Division in 1930. Leslie Wheeler then became Acting, and a few years later in 1934 became Director, where he remained until 1948, so he was there for practically 17 years, the longest running head of the organization. And Jim Howard, who also died recently, and who has been heavily involved in this operation of oral history interviews, did talk with Duncan Wall, who was head of the Information Division in OFAR for a couple years, about Les Wheeler. I guess he had left before Jim came into FAS. Did you know Wheeler at all?

Q: Not very well, he was the director when I came in, but for the first nine years of my service, from early 1947 until I came back from Bogota in late 1955. I was overseas continuously, except for nine months at Harvard, studying international economics and agricultural economics. So I met Les Wheeler several times, but really didn't get to know him.

WELTON: I gather from Jim's conversation with Duncan Wall that he was rather an intellectual type, as he said he was a very bright man. I guess he must have had some abilities to stay in that position that long. And he didn't remember exactly why he left. He left the agency, I believe, to head up an Aid mission in Latin America, but he had gotten some criticism, I think, as a result of the transfer of Attachés out of FAS in the late '30s. I mentioned that the development assistance side became rather big during the war, and there was some resistance to that from some of the agricultural interests in the U.S. So it appears that he probably decided that he might be better suited for ICA or AID at that time. And some of the early ones also left via that route were Stanley Andrews, who I think was heavily involved with Ray Ioanes in the German recovery program after World War II.

Q: The German mafia.

WELTON: I think we called them the German Club also. As you know, there were a number of those in FAS in the early years. Francis Flood, although he didn't go to ICA, opted to remain with State as an FSO in 1954.

Q: Francis was one of my bosses in Canada, my first post. I knew Francis very well. He was Acting Director of OFAR for just a few months. He'd been the Associate Director for some time -- in fact, he was Associate Director at the time that he was on my oral

examining board for the Foreign Service and recommended that I be slotted for Agriculture, after I was appointed as a Foreign Service officer. Francis had asked me a number of agricultural questions, and having been raised on a farm, I knew something about it, although I had not studied agriculture in college. I was actually a history and government major. But then OFAR gave me a few months intensive training, including special courses at the Department of Agriculture's Graduate School. Then I was sent to Ottawa early in 1947 as Assistant Agricultural Attaché and Francis took over the Attaché slot later that years.

WELTON: After Wheeler left, we had quite a series of Directors -- well, Stanley Andrews was there for a couple of years, but other than he, there was a series of either Acting or Directors for the next few years. Even during the early years of the new FAS, there were a number of short term Agency heads. Between 1952 and 1955 7 different Administrators, including several that were just Acting for a short time.

Q: Was Fred Rossiter one of those?

WELTON: Fred was Acting on two different occasions. Then he became Attaché in Canada for a number of years, about 9 years, after FAS was established.

Q: I knew Fred quite well. I think he was the son of missionaries in China.

WELTON: Yes, I believe Jim Howard mentioned that his father was an agricultural missionary in China. A couple of them: Francis Flood, and I believe John Haggerty, that were in this group, then went to the field -- I think both of them stayed with State when the Attachés transferred back in 1954.

Q: Yes, Francis became a Consul General in Scotland.

WELTON: I've mentioned that two of them had stayed with the State Department when the Attachés transferred back in 1954, including Jack Haggerty. He came back then from State and didn't come back to FAS, but Dick Goodman was telling me that he was on the Food and Fiber Commission that Hubert Humphrey set up in the early 1960s. Woody Berg, who had been our Attaché in Denmark, and later became Dean of Agriculture at the University of Minnesota, was the main man there, but Haggerty was delegated to pull a lot of stuff together for that committee.

Q: Woody Berg was one of the early graduates of the training course I set up in 1956. He told me many years later that he had found that course very helpful.

WELTON: You trained him very well. Then when we had the change of Administration, of course, the Republicans came in with the Eisenhower Administration, after the Democrats had been in office almost throughout the years of the old FAS, and the old OFAR as well. Of course, there was quite a turnover, and a couple of the new guys didn't last very long either. Francis Wilcox was the first Acting Director, and I think he was

there just two months. I gather he was from Sunkist, and maybe he decided government service wasn't for him, and Sunkist looked better. Anyhow, he didn't last very long. And then the name that really intrigued me was Romeo Short, who was actually the first Administrator of the new FAS.

Q: He didn't last very long either.

WELTON: No, he sure didn't. He lasted four months. Then he became Assistant Secretary. But he only lasted about two months there. I don't know whether he ran afoul of the Secretary, or the White House, or what. But he didn't survive very long.

Q: Was he from the Farm Bureau?

WELTON: Yes, he was. One of these quirks of timing. He was the head of the Arkansas Farm Bureau. And then Vice President of the National Farm Bureau. But I thought if he had just come to Washington in 1994, instead of '54, he might have been Secretary of Agriculture. Anyway, he was short-lived with FAS. I don't know if he was short, or a Romeo either. I don't think we had many Romeos as Administrators, but there were a few that were short.

Q: Who followed Short then?

WELTON: Fred Rossiter was Acting for a period again, and our friend Clayton Whipple.

Q: Oh yes. And Clayton was a short timer also?

WELTON: Yes, but Clayton stayed around quite a while, as Deputy Administrator for several years. In fact, he was the one who recruited me at the University of Maryland, and talked me into coming to FAS. Clayton had a great job teaching a course at Maryland in international agriculture, but he'd bring his tobacco division chief, or some of the regional branch chiefs down to give a lecture every week. He was mostly just a rapporteur, and introduced the speakers, but didn't have to prepare the lectures. Some colleagues note that his work habits with FAS followed a similar pattern.

Q: Did Gwynn Garnett then follow?

WELTON: No, Bill Lodwick.

Q: Bill Lodwick was from Mount Pleasant, Iowa, which is 25 miles from my hometown. And of course his son still farms in that area. I was talking to him just a few weeks ago.

WELTON: The son Seeley became Assistant Secretary.

Q: But Bill went to Mexico as Attaché, following that, for a few years. And at that time, I think that's when Gwynn Garnett came in. Gwynn had just taken over not too long before I came back from Bogota in 1955.

WELTON: Gwynn was Administrator when I came to work in 1956 and he was Administrator until 1958. And Gwynn, of course, was a very dynamic individual.

Q: Yes. He was also from the Farm Bureau.

WELTON: Gwynn also died recently. He was certainly one of the architects of the PL 480 agreement. His obituary, I noticed, mentioned that during his experience in Germany, he'd gotten the idea that if countries could use their own currency, they would be in a better position to import agricultural products, and use them for the development of their economies. So that was the kind of thing (PL 480) that gave FAS a big boost in the 1950's and later.

Q: The Farm Bureau got behind it and helped push it through.

WELTON: And I guess by that time, too, the surpluses were building up and were becoming quite a concern, so I imagine it was certainly very easy to get a lot of support from the farm state legislators for PL 480. Which I believe was called a temporary surplus disposal program, which is still around 40 years later. Although there's been some talk that it may be now phased out. If so, USDA would rely more on its credit programs we have to sell abroad in developing countries.

And then we had Max Myers from South Dakota for a couple of years.

Q: I may have unwittingly helped to recruit Max. I went to South Dakota State on a recruiting mission which took in a tour of seven land grant colleges. Max was the head of the agricultural economics department at South Dakota State, and he set up my appointments. Then, not too many months after that, he came to Washington as Administrator. Actually, negotiations had already been going on were before I got there, which I hadn't been told about!

WELTON: He probably didn't leave a very great impact on the agency. But Ioanes was his deputy, and of course Ioanes became Administrator in 1962.

Q: But in the meantime, of course, Bob Tetro was the immediate successor of Max.

WELTON: Max was forced out when Truman came in as Secretary in 1961 with Kennedy.

Q: Tetro became Administrator, and then was Administrator for a little over one year. We had our World Attaché Conference in May 1962, which I came up from Buenos Aires for, and I think the turnover had been in April of that year.

WELTON: Actually, I guess he wasn't officially -- I thought he'd probably taken over in January, but according to this he wasn't on board until March of 1961.

Q: Well, he actually, for all practical purposes, had taken over in January. But it didn't become official until a couple of months later. And then almost exactly a year later Ioanes took over and Bob went to Rome. Bob died in 1991, I think it was. Bob had had a long history of service in FAS. He'd been Attaché in Rome and Buenos Aires, and then came back from Buenos Aires to be Assistant Administrator for Ag Attachés, and I was on his staff as Reports and Training Officers.

WELTON: I guess he was the first Assistant Administrator for Attachés.

Q: I think that's true.

WELTON: I think there was a period when Attachés and some of the other programs were lumped together, but I believe Tetro was the first Assistant Administrator in the modern setup that's pretty much continued since that time.

Q: I think one of Bob's problems was that he was very much interested in the international organizations, and had been for years. And that was one of his priority interests. And people like Jamie Whitten, and many other legislators, didn't give a damn about international organizations... And many of the farm groups in the U.S. I think that that was one of his major problems. And Ioanes who had been Deputy Administrator for a number of years replaced him. Ioanes had come in after he came back from Germany. He was a Special Assistant, or some such title, to Gwynn Garnett. Ioanes recruited me, came to Bogota and interviewed me for the job of Reports and Training Officer which I took over in late 1955.

WELTON: Ioanes was then Administrator for 11 years. His was the second longest tenure in the organization's history after Wheeler's.

Q: And he remained Administrator until he retired, actually.

WELTON: And he of course had been Deputy Administrator, or certainly had had a key role in the agency, almost from the beginning.

Q: The Chief Operating Officer, you might say. Max Myers had had no experience in government, and he just didn't really get hold of that very different job too well. A very capable, very nice guy, but he just didn't fit in that slot.

WELTON: Ioanes was quite a dynamic individual, and still is. And commanded a lot of respect in the interagency forum.

Q: A brilliant mind. His breadth of knowledge was just amazing. He seemed to be in touch with everything. He always conducted himself very well, and was very impressive at hearings and meetings when he met with the congressional committees, because he was so knowledgeable and always seemed to know everything about everything that they were discussing. He was widely respected, but not always liked by his contemporaries in the State Department and other departments. Aggravating sometimes, because he was very -- what term would you use to describe his --

WELTON: He wasn't soft spoken. Diplomacy, perhaps, was not one of his fortes, either.

Q: And he'd be the first to admit -- in fact, I was just talking to him the other day, and he made a comment somewhat along those lines.

WELTON: I think he could be rather hard on his inner circle at times.

Q: He was a very demanding boss with a hands-on style - did not delegate much authority.

WELTON: I never saw too much temper in the broader agency staff meetings, although I remember when I retired, I got a nice letter from Bryant Wadsworth, who served in Japan and a number of other posts. He came in while I was in Trade Policy, and worked for us for a while. He said that his first staff meeting was one where one of the staff kind of took on Ioanes, and it ended rather abruptly. That was his introduction to FAS. That was an exception, but I think some also perhaps criticized him for browbeating people, so that he didn't get as much interaction as maybe he should have. But not many people wanted to take him on, that was for sure.

Q: But he got things done.

WELTON: Yes, he was very effective. I remember one of our longtime Attaché wives -- she had worked, actually, in FAS, in the Information Division. She said she always thought of Ioanes as the prototype of an Administrator, and I thought that was very well said.

David Hume -- we had a series of career administrators after Max Myers: Tetro, Ioanes, and then Dave Hume, who was highly regarded within the agency and outside too. He had headed up the Dairy and Poultry Division, and then I think he was in charge of the market development side for a while. He had been an Assistant Administrator, and then had served in Tokyo and London two of the largest posts.

Q: Yes, he was Attaché in London when I was in Brussels. He was then Administrator until he retired.

WELTON: I think he would have stayed longer if there hadn't been a change in Administrations. The Carter Administration came in and kind of eased him out a few months later. And then Tom Hughes was Administrator, who had been...

Q: Then didn't we have a series of non-careers, as far as FAS was concerned, for a while.

WELTON: Not a series, really, because Dick Smith came after Hughes. Hughes had been on Secretary Freeman's staff, and I think you may know this; I'm not sure this is correct. That he was a roommate of Mondale? I think he was Mondale's roommate.

Q: Are you sure it wasn't Freeman? Anyway, he was one of his top staff people when Freeman became Secretary.

WELTON: He had a very good Deputy, in Tom Saylor.

Q: From the Hill, I believe.

WELTON: He was widely admired by the staff.

Q: He knew government, he knew agriculture, Tom Saylor did.

WELTON: Tom Hughes was very temperamental, and he, I don't think, fully trusted the career staff. But he was able to accomplish some things there. And then Dick Smith took over for five years, came into the agency about the same time I did, and had grown up with the agency, and also rubbed some people the wrong way at times, but I think he was successful. He was certainly in charge too. I don't think there was any question about that.

Q: Although he jokingly said that he was the first Administrator who saw exports go down.

WELTON: Almost steadily. They set a record in 1981 and didn't surpass it until last year.

Q: I don't think people blamed Dick. There were extraneous causes of that.

WELTON: And then another non-career appointee, Tom Kay, who had been the FAS legislative liaison, and I think had also been across the street as congressional liaison for the Department as a whole. I'm not sure, but I think maybe he was a Deputy Assistant for International Programs for a period, and he left when the Bush Administration came in. I remember he said when he left that he was bipartisan, because he'd been fired by both the Democrats and the Republicans. Ioanes was the other way around: he had survived both the Democrats and the Republicans.

Q: Bud Anderson?

WELTON: Bud Anderson came back then. A long-time career Attaché. In fact, Bud was supposed to come back earlier to replace Tom. No, that was it; maybe that's where the confusion comes in on the Assistant Secretary slot, Tom was named for either the Deputy or maybe the Assistant Secretary position at that time, but ran into some flak and it never got approved. In fact, I was slated to go to London myself, to replace Bud at that time, if he had come back. But that didn't get worked out. Then Tom left in 1989 and Bud came in as Acting for a while, and then was Administrator for about two years.

Then we had another political appointee, Duane Acker, who had been head of OICD, and in fact, that's probably where the recombination kind of got its roots. He was acting head of OICD for a period while he was also Administrator of FAS. Later he moved across the street into one of the Assistant Secretary positions in mid-1992, and his deputy, a young man named Steve Censky, was Acting for a while until the Administration changed in early '93. Rich Schroeter, who was head of the trade policy side, and still is, was Acting until mid-1994, when Gus Schumacher came in, who had been with the World Bank, and the Secretary of Agriculture for the state of Massachusetts, when Dukakis was governor.

Q: Rich Schroeter was a junior officer in Brussels, one of the Assistant Attachés in the mission in the Common Market while I was there, two years. Then he came back as Assistant ...

WELTON: Well, he was head of the Fruit and Vegetable Division for a while.

Q: I see. And then he became Assistant Administrator for International Trade, and then was Acting Administrator for two years.

WELTON: A little over a year and a half; a long time. This Administration took a long time to get organized, to get people in place. Anyhow, that completes it. A full list of the Administrators (and Directors) is attacked.

Q: Let's go back a ways. We've discussed the fact that during the Carter Administration, the Administrators and some of the top-level people were brought in from outside. They weren't necessarily non-career. Some came from the Hill. But they weren't FASers. But I understand that when the Republicans won the 1980 election, for the next several years, the Administrators were largely career. Is that correct?

WELTON: Well, that's true. Dick Smith took over as Administrator in 1981, and he stayed until he retired in 1985. He was followed by Tom Kay, who was not career, but had been in the previous Republican Administration with FAS as a Congressional Liaison man. In fact, Tom had a great line at the FAS staff meeting when he came back in 1981, also as Congressional Liaison. He said, "As I was saying four years ago, when I was so rudely interrupted..." Tom was almost career by that point, and he had earlier served on the Hill, but was not technically a career officer.

Q: Wasn't he on the Agriculture Committee staff? Or was he Tom Foley's assistant? I can't remember.

WELTON: Gene Moos was Foley's assistant, who later became Assistant Secretary and still is.

Q: Anyway, I remember working with Tom Kay when I was with Jaenke Associates.

WELTON: Dick had held a key position as Assistant for Management and Administrator was there, of course, at a crucial time, when the Foreign Service Act included the Department of Agriculture's overseas staff, and Commerce's as well. This got the agency back all of the privileges of the Foreign Service, and we had the option to become Foreign Service officers, but remained on the FAS payroll and under FAS supervision.

Q: All of the Attachés were not Foreign Service officers, were they? I never did quite understand the procedure.

WELTON: Yes, they were all offered the opportunity to come into the Foreign Service -- to, in effect, be blanketed in. Certainly those that were in the field. There was a bit of a distinction on those that had served overseas and were back here in Washington. Many of them had only served one tour overseas, or had served in only one post, and I've forgotten just what the criteria were, but there was some limit on which ones could be blanketed into the Foreign Service here in Washington. As I recall, Larry Thomasson, when he left the Assistant Administrator's spot, noted that about 80 percent of those who were eligible opted into the Foreign Service at that point, and a few more, I think, came in later. But not all of those that were in Washington were given the option of joining the Foreign Service. All those in the field were. So that was quite a change for the agency, and required, in effect, a dual personnel system, which created some management problems that we hadn't had before. There were also problems with morale, because of the split. Those in the General Service category didn't feel like they had the same opportunities necessarily, that the Foreign Service people did for promotion. The promotion system was different, and of course the requirements for getting in were different as well. They were certainly more rigorous than those for the civil service. We did require an oral examination. Not everybody passed. I was on the board for many of those, and I think in the early years maybe only about two thirds passed.

Q: Who composed the board?

WELTON: We would have, I believe, a panel of two Foreign Service officers from the FAS, and one from State or another foreign service agency, on the panel with us.

Q: But it was dominated pretty much by the Agricultural members.

WELTON: Ah, yes, we had the key vote. And I might mention also that Dick Smith had been in the previous administration, or prior to the Carter Administration, he had been, I

believe, deputy Administrator for both Attachés and Management, which was a very powerful position because they were both very large elements of the Foreign Agricultural Service.

Q: Deputy Administrator, or Assistant?

WELTON: I think he may have started out as Assistant Administrator for both areas, and then I believe he was later Deputy Administrator to Dave Hume. Under the Carter Administration he reverted to Assistant Administrator for Management. Larry Thomasson came back to be Assistant Administrator for Attachés. They were both key supporters for the Foreign Service Act.

Q: I had heard talk that some people thought that was railroaded through.

WELTON: I notice that Larry mentioned in his farewell letter to the troops before going back to the field in Canada that we had a big conference in Williamsburg, where all of the top level staff met and had an opportunity to express their views, including all of the Assistant Administrators and all of the Division Directors, many of which were not eligible for the Foreign Service. Larry, in his letter, said that we didn't take a vote because the field staff wasn't at the conference. They were overseas. But we knew that they were for it. I think the real reason they didn't take a vote was that it might have been defeated, by those present.

Q: At least a very high negative vote.

WELTON: Exactly. I'm not at all sure it would have passed. Anyhow, that was the way that transpired.

Q: How do you think? You were very heavily involved in all this for years after that. How do you think it worked out?

WELTON: I had kind of mixed emotions. In some ways, it was certainly easier without the dual system. But there were advantages, of course, in the assignment process. We almost felt obligated to appoint some people to overseas positions previously. And we did with some misgivings at times. The entry requirements being more strict, limited that pool., but provided, certainly, adequate numbers to fill the overseas assignments. There were certainly, from a personal standpoint, some benefits, with a little better retirement, and being eligible for retirement at 50 instead of 55. I don't think many officers other than Dick Smith, took advantage of the early retirement option. But it was a plus to have that opportunity.

Q: What about Dick Bell?

WELTON: Dick had already left by then. He came in about the same time as Dick Smith, and maybe rose even more rapidly in the organization, going from GS-7 to Assistant Secretary in about 15 years.

Q: Although he spent a few years as the Deputy Director of the Grain Division.

WELTON: I believe he was Director or Acting Director for a brief period. Then he went across to the Under secretary's office as his deputy. I believe the title was still Assistant Secretary at that time. He then became Assistant Secretary near the end of the Nixon Administration. Then when the Carter Administration came in, he of course was out of that job. He could have been assigned back overseas, I'm sure, but he had a better offer outside. He left to eventually be the head of the Riceland Foods Cooperative.

Q: Is he still involved?

WELTON: The last time I heard he was the CEO of Riceland Foods. He's still there. The other thing I wanted to mention was that Tom Kay, having a congressional background, was quite helpful in achieving many of our goals in Congress on farm legislation in 1985 and this led to the export enhancement program (EEP). Earlier it was called targeted export assistance (TEA). But on the flip side, Congress also levied a lot of added responsibility on FAS during those years. Special reports, and different things that we had to do to satisfy their desires, without increasing our staffs or budget very much. Also this was the period that the General Accounting Office became very active in overseeing the FAS operations, both there and abroad. It tied up a lot of time in the Agency, and led to some criticism of the operations. Tom may have made a mistake in taking them on, so to speak, rather than being cooperative, and trying to do everything that they felt was necessary to have changed. I remember his poking fun at them at one of our annual cooperator conferences, where they were in attendance. The cooperators were pleased with that, but I don't think it improved relations, and that may have created some additional problems in later years.

Q: We haven't discussed too much the question of the titles of the Attachés. Were the Attachés permitted to use the titles -- to be given the titles of Counselor, before this went into effect, or was this part of the ...

WELTON: This was part of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, which incorporated USDA and Commerce. It did make it a lot easier to obtain the Counselor rank, even Minister Counselor.

Q: Had it been possible ... it hadn't been too long though, had it, before that?

WELTON: Previously, I believe it was the 1979 Act which ...

Q: OKAY. Because when I retired in 1974, Art Minor, way back, maybe even in the '50s, but at least in the '60s, Art Minor and others had been working very hard on it. They took

it to the very top levels on three or four different occasions, and State was always adamantly opposed. They just refused to permit it, and no one was willing to try to force it down their throats.

WELTON: As I recall, the 1979 Act, which established the Agricultural Trade offices, also mandated at least 10 Agricultural Counselors.

Q: So it was really forced down the State Department's throat, legislatively.

WELTON: Right. Those weren't in place yet by the time the Foreign Service Act took effect, but with the Foreign Service Act we were then able to provide the Counselor rank -- and that took considerable doing on selecting which posts where those Counselors would be named, and so forth. So it was always a hassle to try to get an additional Counselor named for a post where we felt they should have Counselor rank, and State perhaps didn't. But the Foreign Service Act certainly made that a lot easier. In fact, it became almost routine that any Class I officer, which was the equivalent to a GS 15, at a Class I, II, or III post, which included just about any post that he had anyway, would include the Counselor rank.

Q: I know that for many years when we were trying to get State to grant our more senior people the title of Counselor; at that point we weren't thinking of Minister, but anyway Counselor, we thought that we were very seriously handicapped in our work in many ways. Do you think that it worked out that way, that we did gain considerable benefits from it?

WELTON: Oh, I think so. Certainly having the Counselor rank put us on a more equal footing with the Economic Counselor, in particular. In many posts, as you know, the Agricultural Attaché had to go through the Economic Counselor, and in many cases was tasked by the Economic Counselor to report or contribute to certain economic reports at post, which many of the Attachés felt took away from their regular agricultural reporting. This was always a bone of contention in some posts. Having the Counselor rank, and even Minister-Counselor rank later for many of the important posts, put them on a more equal footing, and got them included in the senior staff meetings at the embassy.

Q: The country team meeting.

WELTON: Yes, the real country team meetings, whereas they may have only been included in what was called the expanded country team previously. It was certainly helpful, I think, in that regard.
We mentioned Dick Bell was one of our Assistant Secretaries, but there were a number of others that also contributed a lot to the FAS mission over the years. When the Eisenhower Administration came in, it was the first time that the Department was organized along functional lines with Assistant Secretaries -- an Assistant Secretary responsible for, say, soil conservation and related agencies, and another one for marketing and foreign

agriculture. Previously, I believe you mentioned that when Brannan was Secretary in the '50s, why, there was just one Assistant Secretary, or Deputy Secretary at that time.

Q: There was one Under Secretary and one Assistant Secretary.

WELTON: But some of the large agencies were headed by very powerful individuals, more powerful than the Under Secretary or the Assistant Secretary.

Q: Neither of them had much influence before...

WELTON: He was there when the Secretary was gone.

Q: And that was about it. The agency heads were kings in their own areas, pretty much ...

WELTON: That was certainly true with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which was the policy planning areas for USDA and I'm sure others of a similar stature.

Q: They all had strong constituencies outside, and in the Congress as well.

WELTON: Anyhow, Benson organized it with the Assistant Secretary in charge of certain number of agencies. The first one, I believe, in charge of the Foreign Agricultural Service, was John Davis. I see mention of his name in some of the earlier documents. When I came in, in '56, Earl Butz was Assistant Secretary. Of course, he went on to become Secretary later. And a couple of the others that I think played a key role were Clarence Palmby, whom we both know. He didn't follow Butz, because we had a change of administrations. John Schnittker, I believe, was later Under Secretary under the Freeman in the Kennedy Administrations. I think he was a fairly strong individual as well. And then Palmby came in with the Nixon Administration. He had been head of one of the major cooperator groups, and took a active role certainly, and was very supportive of FAS operations when he was Assistant Secretary.

Q: Schnittker played a pretty direct role in negotiations as well. I remember he came over to Geneva for the final negotiations and the signing of the Kennedy Round in May 1967. He and Ray Ioanes came for the last few days of the negotiations, and they were there for the victory party that Mike Blumenthal for that your agreement.

WELTON: I think Dale Hathaway also took an active role in the negotiations when he was there with the Carter Administration.
Q: Probably in the Tokyo Round. Mike Blumenthal, with the rank of Ambassador, was the chief negotiator for the Kennedy Round, and later Treasury Secretary.

WELTON: I guess Hathaway was there for the Tokyo Round, I believe.

Q: I believe so.

WELTON: And then of course, in the Uruguay Round, Dan Amstutz and Crouder were the Assistant Secretaries for a period. And then Joe O'Mara, who had been in Geneva, came back. He was a FAS career officer, and had served in several posts and had been the Assistant Administrator for Trade Policy under Dick Smith, and Tom Kay as well. He played a key role in the negotiations on the FAS side. Then he came back from Geneva, and went over to the Secretary's Office, and really sort of carried the negotiations, I would say, during the changeover to another Democratic Administration with Clinton in '92. He was one of the few that remained after the transition, and had a leading role and was a Special Advisor to Secretary Espy on international trade. He was really the point man on finishing up the negotiations for Agriculture.

Q: It was during this period that Rich Schroeter, who had been Deputy Assistant Administrator, and then Assistant Administrator, for International Trade -- and then he was Acting Administrator for almost two years. It was very strange. Was it that they just politically had trouble getting a consensus on who would take over?

WELTON: Yes, I think so. As I recall, there were a number of candidates mentioned for the position. But the eventual winner, Gus Schumacher, didn't surface until at least a year later. It took quite a while just to get the Assistant Secretaries all in place, too, although Gene Moos came in fairly early. A number of those positions were hanging for a couple of years. I'm not sure they are all filled yet, as a matter of fact. It took a long time. Certainly those Assistant Secretaries that I mentioned played a key role in the '50s, '60s, and '70s, both in the interagency framework, and with the trade negotiations with foreign countries as well. Clayton Yuetter was certainly another one in that category, who went on to be the Special Trade Representative, and then came back as Secretary of Agriculture. So he had a leading role in various high-level positions over a considerable span of years. He was Assistant Secretary, I recall, when I was in Spain in 1974. In fact, he came to Spain to personally look me over as to whether I could take on this big assignment in Mexico when they brought Dick Smith back. I was in Spain as Assistant, serving with -- actually, a former Assistant Secretary -- Clarence Miller, who had been in the USDA during the Benson era. And of course, the Secretaries generally have been very supportive of FAS as well, over the years. They appreciated, I think, the importance of exports to the domestic farm economy, and recognized that there is good press there, if it is done right. I might mention that I had the pleasure of accompanying both Secretary Bergland to the Middle East, and Secretary Block to South America, and back to our old post, Buenos Aires, on that trip. Also, I want to mention one of the fellows who was quite helpful in arranging those Secretaries' trips, was Lou MacElroy, who was a retired Colonel, and had come to FAS in the early '70s. He was our main liaison man in making the arrangements. He took care of the gifts, which was always a bit of a difficult and sensitive operation, and did liaison with the Air Force on the planes. You really go first-class when you travel with the Secretary. It wasn't Air Force One, but Three, Four, and Five aren't bad either.

Q: It's often the same plane, but they call it Air Force One when the President is on it.

WELTON: And they have them made up in different ways. It reminds me that I never traveled much on luxury planes, but you see in the movies the way those were fitted out. First Class service in terms of food and drink as well.

Q: I go back far enough to remember when we all went first class, both on planes and on ships. That lasted until, I guess, when we were in Argentina, in the '60s.

WELTON: I believe when I went to Argentina we could still go first class.

Q: Yes, that's right. But it was in the '60s, while we were there, that they changed the regulations.

WELTON: It was shortly thereafter, because I don't think I ever got to go first class after that. I know I made a domestic trip in the late '50s, and it was standard procedure, maybe even required, that we go first class in those days.

Q: It was just routine, anyway.

WELTON: As a Grade 5 or Grade 7, it seemed a bit much for me. This was when they rolled out the red carpet on the United flights, as I recall. MacElroy -- he was a bit of a character, and had a bit of a temper too. He would certainly stand up for the Secretary, when appropriate, and even when it wasn't appropriate at times. I recall when we landed in Panama. It was just a layover for refueling, but it was going to be a couple of hours. Mrs. Block, when she came down the steps, and was greeted by the military brass, said, "Say, I'd like to see a bit of Panama while I'm here." And this, of course, kind of threw them into a tizzy, because they hadn't really foreseen that, and certainly didn't think it was reasonable, since we were there such a short time. So the Colonel, or the General, grabbed Mac when he got off the plane, and said, "She wants to see Panama. What are we going to do?" And Mac says, " Well, you better get your rear in gear, General." or something to that effect. And he did. But Mac got along really well, generally, with the embassy staffs that were making the arrangements. I was there mainly to brief the Secretary, and making sure the Attachés were on their p's and q's at all times, and taking care of their wishes. The secretaries generally were good travelers, and didn't get into trouble. But you can't always say that for everyone in the Secretary's party. I remember one of the Deputies we had that, was a bit of a lady's man. It didn't take him long to seek out the lay of the land, so to speak. And he was sort of famous, or infamous for that. But we didn't have that problem with the Secretary. Although I think there was a story about one of them fraternizing a bit too closely with the French Minister of Agriculture, who was female, I hasten to add. Certainly we didn't have any problems like that with Secretary Benson who later became the head of the Mormon church. I had a different problem with Secretary Benson in Colombia. He would ostentatiously refuse to take coffee from his hosts.

We're digressing here a little bit, and we've gotten into the modern era. Perhaps we need to go back and pick up on some areas we only touched on before.

Q: Yes. Following the war, as we've said, we had major relief operations for a number of years. There was a severe shortage of food, and all of the extra supplies that we built up earlier were pretty well depleted for a number of years. But then, at what period of time did these surpluses begin to build up again?

WELTON: In the early '50s the surpluses became a problem once again, similar to those of the '20s. In fact, the surplus disposal programs basically had their roots in the Depression of the '30s. The Federal Farm Board was established in 1929 as an action agency to implement farm programs. That provided funding for outlook services, and also provided funding for the initial Foreign Agricultural Service Division in the BAE, as the Board was interested in increasing foreign sales of agricultural products. The Commodity Credit Corporation was established in 1933, as a legal entity which provided -- and still does -- the funds to operate the Department's Price Support Program and related programs, including those to assist exports. It can buy and sell surplus agricultural commodities, and also donate food for domestic or international relief agencies.

Q: I understand it had very broad authority to do that. Congressmen like Jamie Whitten were always goading Agriculture to use its authority more, to a greater extent.

WELTON: I think we mentioned before that he would raise that every year at the hearings on the Hill. Ray Ioanes told me that Jamie often accused him of trying to follow the State Department's lead all the time. He said he got so fed up with it that he stood up one day at a hearing and said, Mr. Chairman, I just want you to know that I don't even wear striped shorts, and he kind of dropped his pants there and mooned the committee. I don't know if you call that a harvest moon, or perhaps a half moon. He hastened to add that it was all male in those days, as I'm sure it was. But anyhow, we certainly did hear that from Whitten all the time, that the Department had the authority to buy and sell, and they should be out there selling agricultural commodities.

Q: For whatever price they would bring.

WELTON: Right. CCC also had the authority for food relief donations. I don't think it did much of that abroad before World War II. Of course, the situation shifted quite drastically during the war, and we had a War Food Administration, which was set up in the Department to help allocate scarce food resources at that time.

Q: Was that under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, or was that a separate agency?

WELTON: No, it was in the Department, but the Administrator of the War Food Administration, reported directly to the White House. But I gather from some of the things Art Minor wrote, and some of the others I have talked with, they worked very well together, so there wasn't as much friction as there might have been in that kind of setting. I'm sure there were disagreements at times. In fact, I believe it was Miner who mentioned

that one of the top officials of the War Food Administration said the USA would have a tremendous surplus of food after the war and wouldn't know where to put it. But others argued that there were still a lot of hungry people out there. And of course, there were. Even during the war we had the Lend-Lease activity to the former Soviet Union, which was quite substantial, I'm sure. The Attachés at the time were quite heavily involved in supplying information on food supply and needs around the world wherever they were located. I mentioned, getting back to the relief programs, and the subsidy programs -- they were different, but came along about the same time. In 1935, there was Section 32 of PL-74-320 was enacted, which earmarked a certain amount of all customs receipts to be used for export subsidies. So that was the basis for some of the subsidy programs utilized after the war, in fact.

Q: This became a bone of contention in subsequent trade negotiations.

WELTON: Yes, I'm sure. Our subsidy programs always draw a lot of fire from other competitors around the world, and is probably always the number one issue when the Secretary or President meets with the Australians, certainly.

Q: Our position is that in most instances it's the pot calling the kettle black. Particularly when the EC complains, or the Japanese.

WELTON: Later, Public Law 480 came along in 1954, which provided a lot more funding and set up the program which has been in effect to this date, State was always concerned, certainly in the early years, with whether this would displace normal supplies from other nations around the world. In fact, one of the things the Attaché had to do was to get certification that the importers would purchase from their normal suppliers as well. There was frequently a bit of contention between the agencies in getting that assurance.

Q: In 1960-61, I was Executive Secretary of the Trade Staff Committee, I believe it was called-- an interagency committee which developed the PL 480 agreements. Of course, that was always a major item of controversy, particularly with the State Department and some of the other agencies. Would these sales replace commercial sales, or on the other hand, would they adversely affect agricultural production in the recipient countries, in effect, to make them more dependent on foreign aid, rather than less? Both of those were heatedly argued. And of course, there was a lot to be said on both sides.

WELTON: I didn't have much experience in the field with PL 480. Argentina, of course, was not a recipient. They were one of the competitors that we were dealing with. However we also covered Paraguay, and the economic chief there -- I think he told you, didn't he, that he would never do another PL 480 program for less that $20 million. The headaches were just too much to make it worthwhile. The only direct experience I had was in El Salvador. They had one of the first private credit programs, and they were supposed to be the first ones to pay off this particular agreement amount. But the Salvadoran agency that normally made those payments -- they had a budget cut, and somehow became involved in an interagency struggle there to see who would make the

payment. It got delayed and delayed, and finally after considerable effort, we got this last payment. But by that time, there was another few dollars of interest involved, and I told the agency I would be happy to pay it, if they really insisted, but that I didn't want to go back to collect those few dollars. I think they agreed to let that pass. Considering what they wrote off in later years for India, which was way up in the billion dollar or more range, it was small potatoes. It would be an interesting study for someone to go back to see how many of those we did collect in full.

Q: One of the interesting things, a little bit different, was when we took over properties in Lebanon, for default of payments. Bill Horbaly was the Attaché and he was appointed to the Board of Directors of the leading bank in Beirut.

WELTON: We inherited some interesting assets, including a night club and casino.

Q: I'm not sure how that happened.

WELTON: They'll have to interview Bill to get the complete story on that one. I'm sure there are a lot of stories like that involving the PL 480 program.

Q: At least tens of millions of dollars were involved in that one. It was a very large sum.

WELTON: It would have probably been in that area. I doubt if it was more than $100 million, but it might have been.

One additional piece of legislation which was important in this whole area was Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, which provided authority for the donation of commodities by the CCC to people overseas. This remains in effect today as well. Certainly by the mid-'50s, after the Marshall Plan and the German Program that many of the founding fathers of the FAS were involved in, the Surplus Disposal Programs, had became an important part of the FAS activity after 1954. I saw somewhere that between 1955 and 1969 concessional sales accounted for between 20 and 40 percent of all U.S. farm product exports. It's a much lower figure today, but it's still fairly substantial, and certainly an important part of our operations in many of the developing countries in the world. In the old days, a lot of countries were recipients which we wouldn't even think of today for concessional sales -- Japan was a participant, and many of the European countries. And certainly Korea and Taiwan later were recipients. Egypt -- it's interesting, Egypt is no longer a participant, because they discovered that with -- and here's where the two programs come together -- with the subsidy program, you can't use the EEP subsidy program with the PL 480 program. So you have to pay the going price, so to speak, for the PL 480 commodities. So they found it a better fit to buy under EEP and get the cheaper price, and then use the Credit Guarantee Program to finance it. They've been doing that for a couple of years. Anyhow, that about wraps it up on the export programs. We may want to add a bit later, when we review this.

I think that wraps up the early history of the Foreign Agricultural Service. We'll pick up now with the new FAS in 1954.

Q: As I understand it, there were some major changes that came about as a result of the Agricultural Act of 1954, the transfer of the Agricultural Attachés from the State Department to USDA. What were some of those changes?

WELTON: It became a much larger organization. I might mention that we have the list of Attachés that transferred to the new FAS at that time, which included a lot of the Attachés who were to play a key role in the Service during the next 10 or 20 years, like yourself, Horace Davis, Assistant Administrator for the Attachés in Washington, who also served in Russia and India, two of our more important posts during those years. Chester Davis, who was in Cuba for many years. In fact, he was there when we got kicked out of Cuba. And others, such as Joe Dodson, Eric Englund didn't stay around too long-- he was already a very senior official in London at the time of the transfer.

Q: Bob Tetro?

WELTON: Bob Tetro, John Montel, Paul Minneman, who I mentioned had joined the earlier FAS as an Assistant in the 1930's, and then after coming back to FAS in '54 was our Attaché in both Paris and Bonn for a number of years. Bill Rodman, who was a fairly young officer at the time, was in Argentina and then served in a number of posts overseas. Bill was one of our -- I don't know if I mentioned this before -- we sometimes called the attachés yard dogs or house dogs. Bill was one of the yard dogs, who spent most of his career in the field. The house dogs would only serve in one or two posts abroad, and served most of their career in Washington.

Q: I had 18 years overseas altogether, and 10 years in Washington.

WELTON: Mine was just about the reverse. I also noted on this list some of those that didn't opt to join FAS, but stayed with State and went on to become Ambassador. In that category we have Clarence Boonstra, and Phil Habib. Ambassador Habib, I remember, wrote one of the more amusing reports I ever saw. They were having an exhibit in Seoul, Korea, when he was ambassador there. The idea was to promote rabbits as a source of meat for the domestic population, so that they could reserve the scarce beef supplies for the hotel and restaurant trade. So they had this exhibit set up in this hotel. The Ambassador noted that the rabbits were doing what rabbits do naturally and attracting quite a crowd. He remarked to the Korean that was showing him through the exhibit, that it might have been better to select the rabbits all of one sex for the exhibit. And the Korean said, Oh, you can tell the difference, Mr. Ambassador? He said, No, but it's obvious you have a mixture here. I always enjoyed that one.

But to get back to our list of those that became Ambassadors. There were a couple of others as well, that I may have mentioned earlier, that had served as Agricultural Attachés earlier in their career, including George Vest. He was not on this list. I guess he was not

serving in an Agricultural capacity at that time. There is also on this list, one which I found quite interesting. Dick Schwartz, who I found out had served overseas in the inter-war years. In fact, he was a steno-clerk for the war relief mission in London in 1919. He was born in London, so I think he joined as a local employee at the age of 18. Probably our first example of upward mobilization. Later, he became an Assistant Attaché and then an Attaché, serving after World War II in several posts.

Q: Another one of those officers, Howard Cottam became an Ambassador in Kuwait, and then a professor after he retired, at American University. I took a course from him, in 1975. He was also head of the of the FAO office in Washington a bit later.

WELTON: I found this was a very interesting list. It also gives their ranks and salary in those days.

Q: Francis Flood was both an Attaché and Acting Director but stayed with State Department. He was serving as Consul General at a Scottish post, when he was stricken with cancer in 1956 and died a few months later.

WELTON: Yes, that's right. And John Haggerty is also on this list. He was also Director for a brief period. In fact, I don't know if I've told the story about Haggerty. When he left FAS, well actually, I think he went to the field. He was Director when the Administration changed, and he was called over to see the Under Secretary. They had just established an intercom system in the Secretary's office, and they didn't have all the bugs worked out. They didn't realize it was on in the outer office. So Haggerty heard True Morse say to the Secretary, Haggerty's outside, what do I do with him? And Secretary Benson said, "Well, fire him." So he learned about it a little sooner than he maybe wanted to.

This infusion of new blood, plus a number that were recruited from within the Department and outside the agency in 1954 and 1955 led to a considerable expansion of FAS, and a substantial change in the organization of the agency. It was pretty well established, along lines that exist today, by the middle of 1954. We had an Administrator, a Deputy, and several Assistant Administrators for market development and commodity programs, management, etc.. We didn't have an Assistant Administrator for Attachés per se at that time, but that developed later.

Q: When I came back from Colombia, in 1955, it had been organized by then. Bob Tetro came back from Buenos Aires, to be Assistant Administrator for Attachés, and Gerry Tichneor was his deputy.

WELTON: And I believe there was an Assistant Administrator for Trade Policy. That was probably also a bit later. In 1954 Foreign Service and Trade Programs were all kind of lumped together. We had separate breakouts later for the PL 480 programs and trade policy, and the attaché service. Dick De Felice came in a bit later...

Q: From the General Counsel's Office.

WELTON: He actually came to FAS in 1954 under Dick Roberts in the Trade Programs Division, and Ioanes was Roberts' assistant at that time, before he moved into the Assistant to the Administrator position in the Front Office. Then De Felice took over trade policy, and I think was there just about as long as Ioanes was. Ioanes left in 1974.

Q: I think Dick actually retired -- he was just about the same year.

WELTON: He was still there when I left for Spain in 1973.

Q: Ioanes retired in late 1973, I retired in June 1974, and Dick. I'm not quite sure when he retired, but he was under contract for a while, working on the Tokyo Round, I believe.

WELTON: Yes, I suspect he was. So he was involved for quite a number of years. Part of the time that I was there, Howard Worthington was the Associate Administrator, a very effective man involved in trade policy for a number of years, in a number of different agencies.

Q: I replaced him as Deputy Assistant Administrator in 1968, when he went to State as head of the Office of International Trade.

WELTON: And then he went to Treasury.

Q: And then he went to Treasury as Deputy Assistant Secretary about 1974. Actually, first he came back to FAS as Associate Administrator in 1970.

WELTON: I thought he went to Treasury first, and then came back. I thought he died as Associate Administrator.

Q: No, he was at Treasury, when he died in March of 1975. I had recently retired and had just joined Jaenke Associates and I went to his funeral.

WELTON: I may have that reversed. Howard was very effective at interagency meetings that I attended with him. I always remember one expression he used: A good negotiator should remain calm but abusive.

Q: He really believed that, too.

WELTON: I'm not sure he always remained calm, but ...
Q: He didn't always remain calm, nor was he always abusive!

WELTON: He was one of the relative few that we had that practiced the policy of changing agencies about every 5 years or so, and moved up the ladder very well in doing so.

Q: I remember he was at Treasury, because on the day he died, he was scheduled the next day to go to Geneva to an important trade negotiation. The Treasury Assistant Secretary, his boss, said the next day that Howard was a key player in the trade negotiations, and what a loss it was.

WELTON: He died very young.

Q: He was 46, I believe.

WELTON: That organization chart in the mid 1950's established the basic structure of FAS, which still operates today. Getting back to the Attaché Service, which I'm most familiar with, at the same time, or certainly by the time I came in in 1956, they established the Area Officer arrangement with a group of about four or five area officers for the different regions of the world. This provided a lot more supervision and guidance for the Attachés abroad from Washington. I remember Horace Davis mentioned that in the early years, before World War II, the Attachés were very few in number. He said they operated pretty much as stray cats overseas. There was not a whole lot of direction or guidance from Washington other than I'm sure that they had reporting requirements. Other things were kind of assigned as they went out. But not a whole lot of contact, and certainly visits were limited in those days. By the 1970's we tried to have either the Area Officer or the Assistant or Deputy Administrator visit each post about once a year. We kept to that schedule pretty much while I was there, and I think they still do. Also, the Attaché Conferences were another effective means of communicating with the Attachés. I don't know when those started, but it certainly was very early; probably late '50s, early '60s.

Q: Well, there was one while I was in Manila in 1959 - A Far Eastern Conference in New Delhi. Oh yes, and a Latin America Conference in Mexico City in 1954, while I was in Bogota.

WELTON: There was a worldwide conference during Kennedy's Administration.

Q: In 1962, I believe. Yes, it was a worldwide conference. I came up from Buenos Aires.

WELTON: And I think there was another one in 1973. I think those were the only two that I'm aware of, until one was held in the summer of 1996. But the regional conferences have been held regularly since the 1950s, generally about once a year.

Another thing I've noticed on our list of Attachés in 1954 was that there's been quite a change in the diversity of the organization in recent years. In this list, we had two females. One was Anna Gomez, in Mexico City. She stayed there for many years, as an American resident Assistant Attaché.

Q: She was originally hired as a clerk, was she not?

WELTON: May have been, I'm not sure.

Q: But she was there for 30-some years.

WELTON: The other one I don't think stayed with the Agency very long. It was a few years before we had any females actually assigned as Assistants from Washington. There was one named Donna Hersey who went to Caracas in the 1960s. By the time I came back from Mexico in the mid-'70s, we had several overseas, including two who had used upward mobility program and had previously been secretaries overseas. One was Mattie Sharpless, who went on to become Assistant Administrator, just before I left in 1989.

Q: And still is?

WELTON: No, she has gone to Paris now.

Q: That was fairly recently?.

WELTON: Yes, just last year. And Molly Iler was the first one to achieve the rank of Agricultural Counselor, in Rome. I don't think there were any minorities on the 1954 Attaché list. Well, of course, Anna Gomez was a minority, but I believe the first black Attaché was Garth Thorburn, who was probably on board when I came in, in the mid-1950s.

Q: He went to Paris about in 1956 as Assistant. I briefed him, because I'd been to Paris just a few weeks before.

WELTON: And then of course there were a number of others that came in later. Just as an indication of the diversity in more recent years, I was intrigued to note last year's postings for overseas assignment, when Mattie went to Paris. There were a total of 21 officers, which included 11 white males, 5 blacks, 1 oriental, 1 Latin, 1 from the Middle East, and 2 other females besides Mattie.. That was almost 50-50. That was quite a change from even when I came back in 1977, when all of the area officers and the Assistant Administrator and Deputy were all white males. We brought in Cline Warren, one of our black officers, to be Area Officer during that period --about 1980. He was very effective in that position.

Q: Dick you came into FAS during a rather interesting time, when there was quite a buildup in personnel, and so forth. Why don't you tell us a little bit about your experiences and career in those days.

WELTON: My interest in FAS was largely generated by the Deputy Administrator, Clayton Whipple, who was also teaching a night course at Maryland at the time. I came in in 1956, shortly after the Attachés had switched over in 1954 or 1955. They were bringing in a lot of us fresh out of the university at the time, and of course a lot of other people were being recruited from industry and other areas at the same time. We had many good

people, and certainly there was an excellent esprit de corps in FAS in the 19 50s and 1960s. I remember one of my colleagues referring to the Forest Service as the Marine Corps of USDA, and I think in some respects the Foreign Agricultural Service was along the same line, very professional and with high morale. I'm afraid we've lost some of that in more recent years, but I think it's still considered a very strong agency, and an excellent group of people. Of course, when you bring in a big group, sometimes you get a few that perhaps should have been passed over.

We had some real characters in the livestock division, where I started out. One lady, I recall, sometimes referred to the Cat Lady. She had about 25 cats. But she was a good secretary. She had another interesting characteristic -- she talked to the hereafter, i.e. she claimed she could reach those that had passed on. You may remember Grover Sims, an Economist in the Livestock Division, who came to Argentina when we were there. I always felt bad about it, because I'd made a series of appointments, and as frequently happens, you run a little late, because you talk a little longer than you anticipate. I'd be hurrying along for the next meeting, and he would be kind of huffing and puffing, and saying, Could we take it a little slower? And the poor fellow, when he came back, had an open heart operation, and didn't make it, so he died. It was probably one of the early heart operations of that type. But I remember one of his colleagues had the task of taking the deceased Grover's notes .This was Martin Morgan, who, as you know, comes to our retiree lunches. So Martin had to finish up Grover's report. And he mentioned that this secretary, the Cat Lady, was very helpful to him, because she would talk to Grover, and helped fill in certain information as she went along. And there was another statistician, who was almost committable. She was very emotional, and would get very upset when Attachés would send in reports changing some of her statistics. She liked to have her tables consistent, and didn't like to change all these figures for previous years. And then there was another one, and this was a professional analyst, who told one of his bosses -- I don't want to mention his name, we'll just call him Turner -- that he'd taken out a hit contract on him. Turner, naturally was a bit upset. I don't think anybody ever took action on the case, but kind of brushed it aside. But Dick Smith was Administrator at the time, and we were having an Attaché Conference in Europe, I believe. He asked Turner which plane he was going on -- he said he didn't want to take the same plane. Turner did not see the humor in that one at all. Those were a few of the characters we had there in Livestock. One other name that comes to mind ,not in the same vein, but in the Livestock Division, that I had always thought had found the proper niche in FAS was Claude Dobbins. You recall he came to visit us in Argentina with one of the livestock groups. I've often thought it was useful in the foreign service to have a hook that you can fall back on, and have a special characteristic which people remember you by. Claude had an artificial limb.

Q: He lost his hand during WWII.

WELTON: That's true. I remember being on a ranch in Argentina. They had a little girl, about 5 or 6, I guess. She was fascinated that Claude could hold a cocktail with that hook. I think he could hold a pencil and even write a little bit with it as well. Her father asked if

Claude would show her how that worked, and he did. I'm not sure he liked to do that too often, but he consented to show her how it operated.

But we also had some people with unusual talents. One I heard about had been a belly dancer in her college years. I don't know if we still had our nightclub in Beirut at that time, but we could have used her over there.

Q: Is that when we'd taken over the PL 480 debts?

WELTON: I think we did manage to get rid of that, maybe during Bill Horbaly's time.

Q: Bill was on the Board of Directors, I understand, to protect our interests.

WELTON: And then there was a young man who had posed for some ads in one of the ladies magazines. He's now our Assistant Attaché in Brazil. I'm not sure that was a good choice to send him to.

Q: It wasn't an underwear ad, was it?

WELTON: I think it was, as a matter of fact.

One other fellow that we worked with who had an interesting background was Henry XXX, who was our colleague in Montevideo, when we were in Buenos Aires. Henry had run for Congress, and had a lot of friends in high places. I remember Horace Davis was Assistant Administrator for Attachés when Henry was down there, and came back for home leave, or maybe it was after he retired, I don't know. He thought it was kind of a routine welcome home party, but I think they had several Supreme Court Justices, a number of members of Congress, and other high level Washington officials at this affair. Henry was there for many years, and I don't know that he distinguished himself too much as an Attaché, but he did have an interesting background.

Certainly we had some excellent people. Some went on to significant achievements outside the agency. I remember Susie Early was one of our economists in the Livestock Division. She left FAS and went on to the Trade Representative's Office, and is now the Assistant Trade Representative in charge of Agriculture. And another colleague in trade policy, Don Phillips, also went over there about the same time, and he's now the Assistant Trade Representative for manufactured, industrial products. They both have key positions there. And I'm sure there are others that we could think of.

Q: Didn't Jim Starkey...

WELTON: I don't know if he had the same position that Susie Early has now?

Q: I think he did.

WELTON: Yes, he worked on the Tokyo Round. In fact, I remember Jim saying that that would be the last major trade negotiation of this century.

Q: And then Howard Worthington had been in Commerce, came to FAS, and went to State. He went back to FAS as Associate Administrator, and then to Treasury as Deputy Assistant Secretary. And then of course died tragically of a heart attack when he was still in his 40s.

WELTON: Yes, I think we mentioned Howard earlier.

There are a number of staff people that certainly made a strong impression on me in the agency. I know Ray Ioanes paid tribute to the Front Office secretaries, Frances Wolf and Vivian Cole. And I think all of us would certainly second his high regard.

Q: Vivian was my secretary for a few years after we came back from Argentina.

WELTON: They were almost like housemothers to us, in some ways, looking after us. I remember Frances one time calling me and said, Ioanes wants to talk to you. And I asked, On the phone or come up? or something to that effect. She said, Well, he wants to chew you out. Which way do you prefer? Also, I certainly learned to appreciate the Foreign Visitors Staff during my years in FAS. They took care of arranging programs in the U.S. for our colleagues overseas. Many of them of course wanted to visit certain areas of the States, and they had the contacts with the land-grant universities and the State Departments of Agriculture, to best fill those wishes. And they also of course worked closely with the foreign Attachés here in Washington in setting up programs for them, when they wanted to go out and visit U.S. agriculture.

Q: I might mention that one of my first bosses, who was also on my examining board for the Foreign Service, and at that time was the Assistant Director of OFAR when I came in, went on to be Acting Administrator at one time, and then went back to the Foreign Service and was Consul General in Edinburgh -- Francis Flood. Francis had had a rather colorful career as a journalist in Oklahoma. He also was a writer. He would take some rather exotic trips. For example, he went across the heart of Africa, the Sahara Desert, with another fellow, who actually wrote the book, called Free Wheeling Through Africa. Then Francis went back and wrote articles about this trip for his magazine, Stockman's Journal, or something like that, in Oklahoma.

WELTON: There is a Stockman's Journal for livestock.

Q: He also took a trip through the Indonesian jungles, and wrote about that. He was a very colorful, and very brilliant guy.

WELTON: We both knew Ford Miles, who I guess really was kind of our first regional Attaché for a lot of Africa. We had people, of course, in the early years, in Egypt and

South Africa, but Ford covered the rest, almost. I guess it was really West Africa. But still, he covered a large territory.

Q: Lagos?

WELTON: I believe so. I remember him talking about -- this was still when it was under the French -- and the French were very helpful to him in making arrangements and really trying to keep track of him on his travels, and alerting the next post on the way that he was coming through.

I should also pay special tribute to one other one I wanted to mention on the staff level, who was very helpful over the years. Ed Cornick, in our publications office, just had a very pleasant personality, and would always go the extra mile in digging out anything you wanted to know about U.S. agriculture, and certainly any FAS publications. He was most helpful, and was there for many years. I also wanted to pay special tribute to our secretaries in the Attaché office here in Washington, Ruth Mihalic, and Peggy Jacobs, who worked closely with me during the last 10 years or so that I was working in Washington. They kept me out of trouble -- a lot. I sometimes regretted that I never got back into commodity work. I enjoyed working in commodity analysis, but they and the area officers were certainly great people to work with in FAS, and were quite helpful to me over the years.

Q: Dick, you had some interesting posts in your career. Can you tell us a little bit about them, and what were some of your experiences there?

WELTON: Well, we've talked quite a bit about Argentina, since we were both there. Certainly it was in some ways the most fascinating post to work in. I probably got to travel more than just about any post that I served in, probably because I was there the longest. And there were a lot of similarities to U.S. agriculture, and a lot of differences too. But it was a fascinating place to be at that time. You mentioned all of the revolutions that we had. One of the more unique experiences and perhaps one of the more harrowing experiences there was when we had our car commandeered in Cordoba, I believe. The policeman flagged me down and he said, Follow that boy on a motorcycle -- he's stolen some cars. So I didn't argue. He jumped in the back seat. Helen was with me. He rolled down the window and stuck his pistol out one side. Then he'd slide across and stick it out the other side. He was kind of weaving in and out of traffic. He turned down kind of a dirt lane, so I had to follow him over some pretty rough terrain. Helen was kind of curled up on the seat, panicked. Then he turned into what looked like a warehouse. I always remember the policeman, after trying to shoot this guy. He gets out of the car and says, Senor... He was very polite, asked him to stop and apprehended him. I don't know how at that point he got him back, but I'd done my job.

The next post was El Salvador, which was almost an opposite extreme, in that it's a very small country, and we also covered Nicaragua, so I traveled down there. At that time I was going down about once a quarter. I found quarterly visits were about all I needed to

do in connection with the reporting schedule. I sometimes felt that some of my best contacts were in Nicaragua, because we would go down for most of the week, in a very concentrated visit. I'd call people for breakfast appointments, so I'd make the rounds and try to make sure I'd see everybody. It was an interesting time. Fortunately it was before a lot of the troubles that broke out in El Salvador and Nicaragua. I could see it coming in Nicaragua, but in El Salvador things seemed to be fairly tightly controlled.

Q: That was probably one of the problems -- too tightly controlled.

WELTON: Probably so.

Q: The elite pretty well controlled things.

WELTON: Certainly there was quite a disparity between the so-called fortune families and the rest of the people. They did have a fairly sizeable middle class there too. But Nicaragua had more of a dictatorship and you could certainly see it coming there.

And then Spain was a short tour. The family didn't really enjoy it very much there. It was interesting in many respects, but some key differences, perhaps, worth noting was that being a cosmopolitan city, Madrid, there wasn't a very strong embassy wives' group, and everybody sort of did their own thing. I thought Helen really missed that. I said early in my career that I knew of two American wives that really enjoyed the foreign service -- Helen wasn't one of those, but she went along with it pretty well, and was a good sport and good host on most occasions. I probably pushed it a bit when I took some of our cattlemen in to see her in the bedroom when she was suffering from a particularly bad case of Montezuma's Revenge. I was in the process of showing them around the house. I thought I should at least introduce them, but she would have just as soon I'd passed on.

And then of course it was a different experience. I had been Attaché in El Salvador, and then I went to Spain as the Assistant Attaché. The Attaché was Clarence Miller, who had been an Assistant Secretary years earlier, in the Eisenhower Administration. Clarence had not had experience before that as an Attaché, so we had to take care of a lot of things in supporting Clarence. Clarence was very good with visitors and in the market promotion side, as well. I think probably the most rewarding post in many ways was Mexico. I was there also a fairly short time -- only two and a half years -- but I have asthma, so that was a drawback there. But we had a lot of programs going on. Lots of visitors, including Secretary Butz, who came there shortly after his ill-fated trip, when he told the joke that got him in trouble. But he was a great visitor.

Q: He visited us in Brussels, and met the top officials in the Ministry of Agriculture. He was very capable and very helpful to us.

WELTON: I thought one of the best Ambassadors I had was John Jova in Mexico. He probably took more interest in his American staff's welfare than any other ambassador I've served under. He tried to get to know the staff. Secretary Butz made a compliment -- I

asked that Butz meet with him and the larger embassy staff, and there must have been fifty people there. And the Ambassador went around and introduced them all by name. Secretary Butz said, Mr. Ambassador, that was an amazing performance. You may have stumbled over one name or two, but you have gotten to know all the people. Actually, I think all of the Ambassadors that I had were fairly easy to work with. Probably the most eccentric person I had was Ambassador McClintock in Argentina. He had a dog that went everywhere with him, and he had a monthly visit to the staff, when he would come around to the Attaché's office every month. I remember somebody commented once that he came in and we had a big dictionary on a stand, and he said, You don't use this dictionary much, do you? He'd noticed that it was opened to the same page it had been the month before. As I say, they were all fairly easy to work with. Some of the wives, on the other hand, were a bit more difficult. I remember the DCM's wife in Mexico, and we had an Ambassador's wife who had been a sheriff. She was kind of difficult to live with at times. Kind of the epitome of the Ugly American. I won't mention that name, of course. But those were some of my more memorable experiences. One I might mention in El Salvador. It was one of the advantages of a small post was that you get to know the Minister of Agriculture and other high level officials better than at some of the larger posts, where you may not have access to the Minister, except on rather rare occasions. We had one of the U.S. cattlemen.

This fellow, the Alabama cattleman -- I think he was Secretary of the Red Angus Association. He decided as a goodwill gesture that he would donate a bull to individual countries. I think he did that for most of Central America, and maybe even Colombia and Venezuela in South America. So they sent the bull down and I went out to receive him, and turned him over the Ministry of Agriculture. And then he came down a few months later to see how the bull was doing. So we arranged to visit with the bull and the Ministry of Agriculture people. He also requested a meeting with the President. Surprisingly, this was granted, and he said, Well, I now know where I can get my other box of pecans. I was a little nervous about taking this box into the President's office. So I said that there may be some security concerns about bringing this in. He said, Well, I gave one to President Kennedy. So I said that I thought we could do it here, and there was no problem. I accompanied him to see the President, and I was surprised the President invited us both in, just the three of us, so I had to serve as a translator for him. But he got along okay.

Q: In Colombia, one of our visitors presented a prize bull to the President of Colombia. And very shortly thereafter the bull got sick. They sent a veterinarian up from the States to try to save it. I don't know what the problem was, but the bull died a horrible death.

WELTON: That was one of my fears with this one, because I remember when it came into the airport, they came out to get him with a very small panel truck. And I had visions of this bull jumping out of the truck and breaking its neck on his way into San Salvador.

Q: And breaking somebody else's neck at the same time.

WELTON: But at least he survived until Joe's visit was completed. I don't know how many years after that, but as I said, I wasn't there very long. That was my experience in El Salvador.

Q: Did you have any other interesting visitors?

WELTON: Secretary Butz was one of the more interesting visitors. We had a lot of visitors in Mexico. One of the groups that came around that was kind of interesting was the Houston Livestock Show. I don't know if they organized that before or when you were in Colombia. But they would certainly come around Central America and northern South America, promoting their show, to encourage visitors from those countries. They had a special Latin American visitor's lounge for that, in Houston. In fact, I went up the show myself when I lived in El Salvador. I tried to lay on a usual program for them, but I think they had been playing pinochle all around Latin America, so really all they wanted to do was sit around the hotel pool and play pinochle, and host the reception.

Q: They came to Colombia while I was there. I got some sort of certificate from their Board for helping out.

WELTON: Somebody told me they still tell this story in FAS, that I went out to the airport to see them off, and one of them said, You didn't have to do this. And I said, Well, I wanted to make sure you all got on the plane.

Q: You were in Argentina while I was back in the States at the time for a conference or something, when Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. brought a group -- he as a shorthorn?

WELTON: Maybe that was before you arrived.

Q: I guess it was just before I arrived.

WELTON: I remember we have pictures; John, our son, was just about two and a half months old. They arranged a very nice 'asado,' a picnic, for FDR, Jr., and a fellow from Maryland who was with the Hereford Association. And then the Secretary of the Association. That was quite a nice introduction to the Pampas of Argentina.

Q: Well, I benefited from the fallout of that, because Franklin Jr. later on, when we had the World Attaché conference in Washington, in 1962 -- he arranged with the White House to have a reception for the Attachés from Latin America. They invited all of the Attachés to the White House, but Franklin Roosevelt took the Latin American attachés all out to lunch, and took them to the White House and introduced them to the President, who spoke to the whole group.

WELTON: I knew that the whole group had gone there, but I'd never heard that story.

Q: And then, he took us out to the ranch of this Maryland breeder that you are talking about.

WELTON: Royer was his name.

Q: A beautiful place. We had an all-day picnic there.

WELTON: It wasn't very far, was it?

Q: No, it isn't very far out in the country. That was a very interesting day.

WELTON: He was probably one of our more famous visitors. And I'm sure there are other that I might think of later.

Q: Did you have the opportunity to get back to some of your old posts since you left, Dick?

WELTON: Yes, I had opportunities to visit them all, as Deputy Assistant Administrator for the Attaché Service. We and the area officers tried to visit each post just about every year. One time I counted up that I had been in 55 countries, all told, including my attaché days. But I got back to visit them all. I got back to Argentina twice. The first time was in the early '80s, on a regular supervisory visit. And then it was about 1985, that I went back with Secretary Block, in his group, on a tour of South America. It was particularly enjoyable, especially the first time, after 20 years, to get back there to visit some of the old haunts. I stayed in the Sheraton Hotel, which is down near the Retiro train station, right across the plaza, and down the bottom of the hill, near the court also. I got to go back to the Italian area, the Boca, and walked down Florida. Some of the restaurants are still there.

Q: It's still a pedestrian area?

WELTON: I believe so. There's a new super highway to the airport, that goes through town, so that you don't have to got clear around town, the way we used to. And of course, I got to see a few of the people that were still around. Edna, of course, is still there, as one of the assistants.

Q: Bob Tetro hired her back in the mid-'50s, a good 40 years.

WELTON: I think she worked for the Military Attaché in the embassy.

In Spain I just had one very brief visit, just overnight, when I went with Secretary Bergman and his party to the Middle East. So I don't think I ever got back there either as area officer or on a post supervisory visit. I got to see some of the staff, but that was about it.

I think I visited El Salvador twice; once just before I retired in '89, and once with Secretary Block on the way to Buenos Aires. I think we stopped in El Salvador and Guatemala -- I think it was a 4-hour visit. They wanted to get him out of there pretty quickly. Actually, we were there on a holiday, so it was fairly calm, a good time to visit. The second time I was there there was a bomb scare, and they sent everybody home in the early afternoon.

I don't believe I got to visit Mexico on a supervisory visit. We went back as tourists a couple of years ago, after I retired, to visit the office there. Spent a week in Acapulco, and got familiar with that part of the country. I don't think there were a whole lot of changes in Mexico City, although I thought the traffic moved a little better. They've had to make some changes in that way, to make some of the streets one way. They have cracked down on trying to control some of the pollution problems. You can only drive even-numbered license plates on one day, and odd-numbered on the other. I guess a lot more people have two cars now, which may have defeated the purpose.

NOTE: The following documents on the early days of the Foreign Agricultural Service are on file with Mr. Welton's interview in the office of the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training in Arlington, Virginia:

1. A chronology of OFAR/FAS Leadership from 1938 to the present
2. Transferees from the Foreign Agricultural Service to the Department of State, July, 1939
3. Posts in 1944
4. Attachés who later became Ambassadors; Early Assistants; Early Agricultural posts
5. Agricultural Officers in the Foreign Service - list from October, 1952
6. List of Agricultural Attachés from 1954, when they were transferred from State to USDA
7. Administrative Assignments, 1954
8. Copy of the *FAS Letter*, September 1965, with a photo from 1934.
9. Historical highlights of Foreign Agricultural Relations
10. Chronology of Agricultural Reporting and Foreign Agriculture Magazine

End of interview