

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

AMBASSADOR FAITH RYAN WHITTLESEY

Interviewed by: Ann Miller Morin
Initial interview date: December 7, 1988
Copyright 2002 ADST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background

Early Years in New Jersey and New York
Wells College
Summer in Austria
Univ. of Pennsylvania Law School
Ford Foundation Grant –Academy of Int. Law, The Hague
(Family Recollections,

Early Professional Life

Summer Stock
Marriage
Teacher in Philadelphia Inner City Schools
Banking Law Research
Law Clerk to a Federal Judge

Early Career

Husband’s Campaign for Pennsylvania Legislature
Lawyer in Department of Public Welfare
Assistant U.S. Attorney
Response to Vietnam

Political Career

Pennsylvania Legislator
Death of Husband
County Commissioner
Delegate to Republican Convention of 1976
Political Struggles as Party Leader
Reform of Southeastern Penn Transportation Authority
Candidate for Lt. Governor of Pennsylvania
(Comments on Political Figures

Reagan for Presidency Campaign

1980

A Founder of Penn. Committee for Reagan
Struggle for Political Power
Contacts with National Politicians

Post-Election Activities

Member of Philadelphia Law Firm
Job Seekers
Pressure to Join Reagan Administration

Nomination as Ambassador to Switzerland

Comments about Nancy Reagan
Ambassadors' Course
Preparations for Post
Briefings in Washington
Swearing-in Ceremony

Bern I

1981-1983

First Days
Resentment of DCM
Relationship with US Ambassador in Geneva
Relations with Swiss-American Chamber in Zurich
Staff
Dismissal of DCM
Change of USIA Officer
Controversial Appointment of New DCM
Operations
No Disadvantage as a Woman
Public Diplomacy
Insider Trading Issue
Comments
On Political Appointees
On Functional Specialists
On Reception of Guests

White House Assignment

Assistant to President for Public Liaison
Rival Camps within White House
Women's Issues
Outreach Program on Central America
Comments about White House Officials
"Last Conservative on Reagan's Staff"

Bern II

1985-1988

Reappointed Ambassador
Senate Hearings
Comments of US Religious Groups

Soviet Disinformation
Issues
Airplane Sales
Banking Problems
Staff Matters
Dismissal of USIS Officer
Consul General in Zurich
DCM
Political Officer
Personal Attacks on Self
Controversy over Entertainment Fund
Economic Officer
Congressional Hearings
Media Criticisms
Iran-Contra Scandal
Department of State Bureaucracy
Accomplishments
Resolution of Insider Trading Controversy
Civil Aviation Agreement and Sale of Planes
Law Enforcement Cooperation
Export Control Agreements

Post-Bern

President of American Swiss Association
Swiss-American Friendship Award
Member of Law Firm

INTERVIEW

Q: Ambassador will you tell us about where you were born and where you grew up, a little about your earlier years?

WHITTLESEY: I was born February 1, 1939 in Jersey City, New Jersey. My father was first generation Irish. His father had come from County Cork in Ireland and landed in Hoboken. He worked for the railroads in New York state. He was what we would describe today as a court stenographer for railroad work-related hearings. His father's mother came from Ireland as a widow with three small sons. She had a bakery shop.

My father never went beyond the eighth grade. He came from a family of six. In the way the Irish have been described in the United States, I suppose his background would be described as that of the "shanty" Irish, not the "lace curtain" Irish. He grew up in Hoboken and was the oldest of six. He had to leave school to go to work to help support the other children in the family and his parents. My father retained his Irish wit and charm, for which the Irish are famous, and love of people and a genuine nobility of spirit,

which was always a great inspiration to me. Even though my father had limited education and made grammatical errors, he was a true gentleman in every respect of the word, in that he would be uncomfortable when a waitress took his plates from the table. Instinctively he wanted to help her because he was a gentleman and didn't want to see a lady lifting things that were too heavy or doing work that he thought was in some way demeaning to her.

My father's family members were involved in politics. In particular my father's sister was active in the Kenney machine in Jersey City, but my father himself was never involved in politics nor took any particular interest in it. My father was always doing things for people, though, like local Irish politicians often did. He would go up and down the block wherever we lived, helping various households, wives, grandmothers, other men who needed assistance in various projects. He was a very generous and outgoing person.

My mother was born in far northern New York state near Ogdensburg. My mother's family came to the United States in 1648 from Scotland and Northern Ireland. They were staunch Calvinists. My mother lived a very hard life. She was one of 17 children, one of two girls. There were four sets of twins. My grandmother was the teacher in the one-room school in the town. Land for the school had been donated by my grandfather to the town. My mother grew up on a farm of about 400 acres, living with 17 children in the family in what amounted to a log cabin. There were three rooms. My mother was a twin. Ten of the 17 children died at home before puberty of some mysterious illness.

They believed in education. My grandmother was the teacher in the one-room school. They recited Shakespeare in the barn. My mother went to what was then called a normal school in Potsdam, New York, Potsdam State Teachers College, to become a teacher. She also had gone to high school in Gouverneur, New York, which required her to travel in a wagon and a horse with all her belongings and food and supplies for the week to the town of Gouverneur, which was some twenty miles away from her farm, where she lived alone in a rooming house. As a young girl, it was quite an ordeal for my mother but she is a highly intelligent woman and a woman of intellect and interest in learning - so she endured.

Because life for her had been so hard in northern New York state, my mother inspired me profoundly. She believes in strict discipline. I suppose one humorous way of describing her approach to life would be "pleasure is the absence of pain." She had an injury to her knee at the age of nineteen which caused her great pain throughout her entire life. She limps but never utters a word of complaint.

Ten of her seventeen siblings died before they reached puberty. They were all cared for at home with the exception of the last one, who died in the state hospital. They were very proud of the fact that despite the fact that these children had what amounted to a deteriorating mental condition, amounting to some kind of degeneration of the brain which resulted in loss of control, both mental and physical, they never asked for any help from anyone. The family had a tradition of taking care of its own. This tradition, of

course, has been entirely lost, well not entirely lost today, but largely lost when families today believe that they are entitled to state care for every imaginable ill. This is in complete contrast to the attitude of my mother's family which was that the family would take care of its own difficulties within the family. This model, of course, was always very much in the forefront of my mind when I became involved in politics and as I looked back on the experiences of my parents which formed my attitudes and beliefs.

My mother became a teacher in a one-room school in the Catskills region of New York state near Maybrook where she had gone after she taught in various other places in New York state. She was the truant officer, she was a teacher, she was everything. She had to go to the mountain families and persuade them to put their children in school. When she went to visit their homes she told us that she would see the children running away into the woods because they weren't used to seeing strangers. The Catskills was a different place in those days.

At the age of 29 in that part of New York state she met my father and they were married. My mother was brought up as a strict Protestant; my father was Roman Catholic in the Irish tradition. My mother's family did not approve, not only of my father's religion, but of his lack of education. My mother's brothers had gone to Colgate University and St. Lawrence University and they looked down at my father. As a result they barely spoke to my mother from that point on in her life, and virtually ostracized her from the family, which was a cause of great pain to her throughout her life.

My father's family, being Irish was more welcoming. They also had some difficulty with the mixed marriage, but were generally more open to my mother. My father has always been deeply in love with my mother and he remains so to this day. (They're both over eighty now.) As a result, he left the Roman Catholic Church and I was raised as a Methodist.

My parents lived in Teaneck, New Jersey, which is where they settled after they were married. My father worked in the railroad and related railroad positions. During the war he was sent to western New York state to work in the transportation industry. He was too old to be drafted. My mother, because she was college-educated, was enlisted in the war effort and worked testing airplane engines throughout the war. My earliest memories are of being taken to some kind of a day-care center which was associated with the war plant where my mother was working. We were living at that time in a housing project which was constructed for the purpose of the war machine. My earliest memories are of living in a war-time housing project outside of Buffalo, my mother working in the war plant, my father working in the transportation industry. Those were generally very happy years. I remember coal being delivered to our little house and piled in a big heap in the front yard to be taken into the house in pails.

I had a very happy, loving home. I have a younger brother, Tom, who was born December 25, 1941. We were always very close as children and he remains to this day one of my best friends. He graduated from Yale magna cum laude and received a National Defense Scholarship to study Chinese. He went to the University of Michigan to

get a master's, and then he went to Taiwan; he got a master's degree in Chinese language and literature. After his stay in Taiwan lasting for two years, he came back to Columbia to work on a Ph.D., which regrettably he never finished. Because he spoke Chinese, Russian, French and German he was asked to apply to Harvard Business School. He had tested in the 99th percentile of the 99th percentile but turned down a full tuition scholarship at Harvard Business School to continue his Chinese training. Later he went down to the University of Alabama to teach Chinese. Later he and his wife Joan who was a professor of English started a business. They came to Philadelphia to join me there. They are the parents of two boys, Ben and Sam/ They're my closest family relations. Their business is booming. They used to be liberals, but now that they're entrepreneurs and successful they are Republicans, even conservative Republicans. But previously in the world of academe they had been influenced by their peers and could only be classified as Democratic liberals. Their politics have changed and they are now part of the thousands of new businesses that have begun under the Reagan economic boom. They are in the direct mail business. As two former academics, they write direct mail packages for industry. They maintain their ties with their academic friends, but very much enjoy the good life and being able to provide for their children in the way that they think they should rather than living as church mice as college professors.

Q: He's your only sibling?

WHITTLESEY: Tom is my only sibling. I never really knew my grandparents. They died before I was old enough to know them or remember them. I did have aunts and uncles. My mother's family ostracized my mother, so we saw them very little. My mother would try to see them, but they never returned the visits. My mother had one sister who was very good to me growing up. She never married. Well, yes, I guess she did marry once, for a few months, but the marriage was unsuccessful. She died when I was seventeen. She sang and encouraged me in my music.

My father had siblings. Of his six siblings, three died of various causes, illnesses and the like. One of my father's brothers was killed in a gunshot accident with my father's gun when he was thirteen. He always felt very badly about that. Another brother of my father, Tom, died an alcoholic with a welfare check in his pocket at the age of 24. For that reason my father never permitted any alcohol in our house. He had seen the damage that alcohol could cause in Irish families and was therefore determined that it would not touch our family. So we never had it in the house.

My father did have a sister who was involved in politics. She was a member of the Jersey City school board, as I mentioned earlier, part of the Republican Kenney machine in Jersey City. She died recently. I did not have very close relations with her.

My father had another brother, a younger brother, who was seriously wounded in the war in the Pacific. He had children but we never really stayed in touch, although he did come to my swearing-in at the State Department the first time, with his wife. These are people in my father's family of very limited education. They were happy-go-lucky people, not terribly ambitious in life and I would say typical Irish lower-middle class.

My mother instilled in me somewhat of a sense of shame about my Irish roots, because she looked down at the shanty Irish, as her family did. I also developed those feelings as I was growing up because I lived in a community in which the Protestants generally looked down at Catholics who were at that time and in that place of a lower socioeconomic strata. It was only after I became involved in politics that I rediscovered my Irish heritage and my Irish roots, and learned what a wonderful heritage it was to be Irish - to be a son or daughter "of the old sod." The feelings of solidarity that Irish politicians have for one another regardless of political party was something experienced continuously as an Irish politician.

Now I'm proud to be Irish. I used to have St. Patrick's Day gatherings at my home to sing Irish-American songs. My children learned lots of Irish-American songs growing up. When I went to Cambridge to work after I graduated from Wells College, I was working at Harvard School of Social Work in a summer job, and I discovered in Boston what I believed to be discrimination against the Irish (my name at that point was Ryan) discrimination by the WASP establishment of Boston. Many of my friends were WASPs and their parents were part of the Boston establishment. I sensed in them a certain disapproval, because of my Irish background. I also noticed it in Philadelphia. My husband's family was a prominent Philadelphia family, and my father-in-law was not pleased initially that his son was seeing someone with the name of Ryan who had a Catholic background. The law school social clubs at the University of Pennsylvania were based upon religion and social background. It didn't bother me; I never really thought much about it, but I knew at the time that I would never be in that circle because I was not a WASP; I was Irish.

In Philadelphia, the Irish were definitely second-class citizens socially at that time. These impressions, I suppose, had a certain impact on my later life. I learned that the way that the Irish achieved positions of power and influence was through politics. In the city of Philadelphia, where I ultimately entered the political arena, my heroes were the Irish leaders, not only in Philadelphia but in Delaware County, where the Irish still reign supreme to this day.

Q: Do they?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, in Republican politics.

Q: Republican politics?

WHITTLESEY: Republican politics.

Q: That's unusual, isn't it?

WHITTLESEY: No, these are staunch Republicans.

I had no childhood illnesses to speak of. I was very healthy other than bad vision which

was always a handicap.

Q: Short-sightedness?

WHITTLESEY: Near-sighted astigmatism. Having to wear glasses. I started wearing contact lenses at the age of 18; it was always a bother. I broke my leg and knocked out my front teeth when I was three living in Teaneck, New Jersey. Because I refused to stay in bed for the required healing process, my right leg is slightly crooked because never healed properly. As a result of not having my front teeth I had to have braces later on. I had to have major dental realignment.

Q: May I ask how you broke your leg?

WHITTLESEY: An older child me down some stairs playing. I broke my leg and knocked out my front teeth.

I have been told that I was very active as a child. I remember being very athletic and extremely active. I started playing the piano at a very young age. I started piano lessons. I think I started when I was about four. I remember trudging through the snow by myself to go to my piano lessons. My mother and father were very supportive and instilled in me a feeling that I could do anything. There was never any implications that certain things were closed to me because I was a woman.

At that time women who desired careers usually planned to be nurses or teachers. Those were my goals and those were the goals of my mother for me. In terms of my becoming an accomplished young woman, my mother encouraged me to read - and my brother as well - our house was filled with books. I didn't read as many as my brother did. My brother read every book in the house. In fact, I noticed that our house was unique because in the middle class social strata in which we lived, nobody else had so many books in the house. We had books in every corner. We had bookcases filled with books. My father, although he was uneducated, read the newspaper completely every day and read a lot. My mother read all the time. My mother was a highly disciplined person, getting up every morning at five a.m. She got me up shortly thereafter. I never had to do any housework. My parents did everything in our little house. They wanted me to read and play the piano. So from the age of seven or eight I got up every morning and practiced the piano from six until seven a.m.

Q: Did you hate it?

WHITTLESEY: No. I remember having to practice not only from six until seven, but in the afternoon when I came home from school. I remember screaming temper tantrums with my mother, wanting to go out to play and she insisted that I practice the piano. She did not relent. There was no discussion. I had to do it. She remained firm.

Q: Was the piano their choice or your choice?

WHITTLESEY: No, it was their choice. It was the only musical instrument we had. My mother believed musical training was very important. My brother, unfortunately, had the same temper tantrums and my mother, I think, had lost her energy by the time he was about thirteen. She allowed him to quit the piano. But she never gave up with me. They got me up; I had a hot breakfast; hot cereal and egg and then to play the piano. It was very loving. I never had to make my bed. I knew I was supposed to read and play the piano.

The early discipline of those years, I think, had a great impact on my life. Also the example of my parents. We had no household help. My father never made more than \$100 a week. My mother worked. They were very proud that we owned our own home. My mother and father wanted to pay off the mortgage, as soon as possible so as not to have any debt. They never had any debt. They paid everything else in cash. They lived very modestly spending hardly any money for clothes. We never had butter, only margarine. My mother cooked everything, canned everything, did it all alone. Washed the clothes alone. Worked eight hours a day. I have a memory of seeing her walking down the driveway to go to work. She first worked as a teacher; later as a nurse's aide. I remember seeing her go down the driveway in the cold of Buffalo, New York, freezing cold. She had to take two buses and work a full day, sometimes overtime, then come home and take care of us, and take care of my father. My father helped in the house. They did everything together. They had virtually no social life. They were totally committed to the care and nurturing of my brother and me and to their married life.

Q: As a family did you go to church together?

WHITTLESEY: As a family we went to church every Sunday. We went to the Methodist church. I went to Sunday school. I sang in the choir. I always wanted to take tap dancing lessons, but my mother thought that was frivolous, so I was never permitted to take tap dancing lessons. We did not have television. Even when other people in the neighborhood had television, we did not. My mother thought it was a corrupting influence. We did not discuss politics. I didn't know anything about politics. They weren't interested in politics. Actually they're very taciturn people. They believe in very hard work. And the work was hard. There were not so many labor saving devices for households then as there are today. My father built the garage for our house himself. My mother helped him.

They were totally supportive of me. We lived in a community in which there were many wealthy children. We were not wealthy. That always was difficult for me, because I didn't have the clothes, but I had other things that the other children didn't have that I only came to appreciate later on. The love of learning, which was a part of our home, and travel and education, because of my mother. I always thought of my mother as being a lady in the traditional sense. She always believed it was important to conduct oneself in a certain way and she taught me by example. She was a very modest woman. Never spent any money on clothes or make-up. The lesson was always "beauty is as beauty does." I can't remember it exactly, but "pretty is as pretty does." comes close. Physical characteristics and physical beauty were downplayed. Qualities of spirit, mind and

character were stressed.

And my father just showered us with love. It was a very tight-knit, close-knit family unit. My father did all kinds of things for us. They took us out west on car trips. We went up to northern New York every summer with my mother to live in the area where she grew up. Her father sold the farm, but they maintained a little lake-front property where we lived in a cabin in the summer. There was no running water, no electricity. We fished and played outside. We had no entertainment. We had no radio. I think we had a wind-up victrola. My mother had to walk up to the farm to get milk from the barn. It was a very wholesome childhood.

Q: Indeed.

[June 17, 1989]

The last time we were talking about your nuclear family and your very wholesome, happy childhood, and I wonder if we can pick up from there. First of all would you give me your father's name and when he was born, if you can remember it.

WHITTLESEY: My father's name is Martin Roy Ryan and he was born in, I think, Hoboken, New Jersey, and he was born in 1907. My mother is Amy Jerush Covell.

Q: Could you spell that?

WHITTLESEY: It's the old biblical name Jerush - J-E-R-U-S-H. Covell is C-O-V-E-L-L. My mother was born in 1906 in northern New York, Macomb, New York.

Q: And you have just the one brother?

WHITTLESEY: I have one brother, Thomas Martin Ryan, who is a graduate of Yale and is in business now in Haverford, Pennsylvania.

Q: He lives in Haverford.

WHITTLESEY: He never got his Ph.D. but he was a professor of Chinese literature at the University of Alabama, working on his Ph.D. when he left to go into business, and has been in business ever since, very successfully.

Q: Good. Can you recall, just for fun, any books that you used to enjoy reading?

WHITTLESEY: I don't remember.

Q: I know you were an avid reader.

WHITTLESEY: I read but I wasn't as avid a reader as my brother. My mother, who had been a schoolteacher, had the house filled with books, the classics. And frankly I didn't read so much. I read the popular books of the time. I remember that my brother went through every book in the house and read constantly. I was very active doing other things as well as reading. I practiced the piano at least an hour, sometimes two hours every day from a very early age. I practiced an hour before I went to school and then usually an hour afterward. I was also active in sports. In water ballet I was the soloist in the high school. We put on very elaborate water ballet performances which required me to be in the water swimming at least two hours a day. I sang popular songs, show tunes and traditional American folk tunes.

Q: I didn't know that was one of your skills.

WHITTLESEY: During my high school. I also played the clarinet in the school band. I was first clarinet, first chair in a band of 26 clarinets. So that required practice. I also gave piano lessons. I had 16 pupils from the age of 16 - no, 21 pupils - every Saturday. I started giving lessons to make money, but it was an excellent experience for me. I was also involved in singing and dancing. I was involved in school musical productions. I sang and tap-danced in various musicals. Sang solos. I was involved in elocution contests. I won the elocution contest my junior year in high school. And I had a very active social life. I went to lots of parties and dances. I gave parties in our home. I had lots of boyfriends and had a wonderful, normal, healthy girlhood. I wasn't a closet intellectual by any means.

Q: Not a bit, no. And also a very heavy interest in music. I see you have a piano. Do you still play?

WHITTLESEY: I still play and my children play, yes.

Q: Did you have any idea of becoming a concert pianist?

WHITTLESEY: No, but I did play recitals when I was in college. I played classical music. All through my college years I practiced two hours a day. I had to adjust my college schedule to do that. But I really stopped practicing when I went to law school at the University of Pennsylvania, mainly because there was no piano available. I continue to play. I played in Switzerland. I played for the Swiss people in my residence and sometimes in theirs. We had lots of sing-alongs. I learned the Swiss folk songs. I taught them American folk songs. We had numerous evenings around the piano in the residence. In fact, after dinner we would frequently have singing.

Q: That must be a very useful skill for an ambassador.

WHITTLESEY: It was very useful.

Q: The way to reach the people very quickly.

WHITTLESEY: Exactly. They sometimes would invite me to come into their homes and play. They loved the fact that I knew their Swiss songs. On some occasions I would have all the top bankers and diplomats in Switzerland, and the generals, standing around the piano in the embassy residence yodeling and singing.

Q: You've evidence of tremendous vitality. You must have terrific energy.

WHITTLESEY: My mother taught me to use my time efficiently. She set an example. She got up every morning at five and worked and had a very rigorous schedule. She had to do all the housework, then she had to go to work and work an eight-hour day. I followed her example. She encouraged me in my activities, especially me in my music. My mother played a little bit. My father loved my music. They were very supportive. They insisted that I do no housework, which always made me feel uncomfortable around my friends because my friends were always required to do household tasks, rake leaves and make beds and do laundry and that sort of thing. My parents refused to allow me to do any of those things, even though we had no help. They did all those things. They wanted me to play the piano and do my singing, dancing, reading and swimming and the other sports that took an enormous amount of time and energy. They believed that I could learn those other household tasks at any time in my later life.

Q: So you had this parental backing, indeed guidance, or perhaps even maybe...

WHITTLESEY: Direction.

Q: ...direction, certainly a very strong direction to succeed. The message was that everything you do you try to come in first.

WHITTLESEY: I had very strong parental support and love. I always knew that if I ever got into any difficulty of any kind, that my parents were there and their love was unconditional. That has been a great help to me in my life.

Q: Did you feel pressure?

WHITTLESEY: I suppose yes. As I got older, I got the feeling that nothing that I ever did completely satisfied my mother. As I reflect back on it, I was trying to please her. She really did encourage me. For example, when I went to Europe on the American Field Service Program when I was 16, I remember not wanting to fill out the application. It was a very long application and required an essay and lots of questions that had to be answered thoughtfully. I was tired. I didn't want to take the time. She insisted that I do it. Of course, as a result of her insistence, I ended up being in Europe at the age of 16 living with a German family, which sparked my interest in international affairs. My mother lost her energy, however, with my brother. I could see that she pushed me hard and she pushed him hard too because he was more talented than I was, but he, being a boy and a big boy, fought back. I remember he refused to play the piano and used to lock himself in his room and refuse to practice anymore. She finally just gave up with him. He was allowed to quit, which I think he regrets.

Q: Did you envy him because he could quit?

WHITTLESEY: No. No. I didn't envy him. We've always been very close.

Q: Yes, you've said that.

WHITTLESEY: But my mother is quite a remarkable woman. She wanted me to be first. She wanted my brother to be first. It was clear. She wanted me to get the highest grades and do everything and be the best. She led me to believe that I could, so therefore why not?

Q: Your father whom you described as such a gentleman and had the lovely sense of humor and care for other people, he sort of rounded out the other part of your character?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, he was very loving and very kind. From him I feel that I have learned whatever political skills I possess, and I did have a success for a time in politics. Not that he had any interest in politics, he didn't, but he had a lovely approach to the world and to people. He's always optimistic. He always sees the best in people. He's always trying to help people, even in the smallest things. In a restaurant, I don't know if I told you this, he doesn't even like to see a woman lift a chair to a table. He will get up before he would allow a woman waitress to lift a chair.

Q: That Irish compassion.

WHITTLESEY: Yes, that feeling that every woman should be treated with utmost respect. He very much loved my mother. He still does.

Q: They pull together?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, they're very different, but... and of course his wit was ever present. He's a very good dancer. He loves jokes. My mother is not very humorous.

Q: Your mother sees life as a serious proposition.

WHITTLESEY: Yes, very serious, in the old Calvinist tradition. The absence of pain is pleasure. (Laughter)

Q: So in the final analysis would you say your mother's influence was stronger than your father's?

WHITTLESEY: Probably, yes. If I had to pick a favorite parent, I would pick my father. Because my mother is a difficult woman, very critical as she gets older, even more critical. She's a truly extraordinary woman. Like the pioneer women of old who surmounted great obstacles to settle the wilderness, that's what she resembles in my mind.

Q: Yes.

WHITTLESEY: Conquering almost insurmountable odds in her own life and wishing the best for her children and ensuring they had every opportunity that she could possibly provide.

Q: As far as school goes, did you go through the regular public school?

WHITTLESEY: I went through public schools, yes. I went to church every Sunday. I sang in the choir. I went to Sunday school. I went to the Methodist church. It was a very small public school. There was no thought of my going to private school. It was out of the question financially. My brother was first in his class in the public school. He was younger than I was I encouraged my parents to try to send him to private school. We really didn't know anything about private schools so he went to a military school in Manlius, New York. He was first in his class at the The Manlius School which subsequently closed. Then he went on to Yale. Yes, there was no thought of private school for me.

Q: Not parochial either, because of your mother's religious beliefs?

WHITTLESEY: No. I was raised as a Methodist, a Protestant. I would never have gone to the Catholic schools.

Q: And then you went away to...

WHITTLESEY: I got a full-tuition scholarship to Wells College in Aurora, New York and a New York state scholarship. I knew that college was a financial burden for my parents. I heard shortly after I arrived at Wells College that for every "B" I got, my scholarship would be reduced by a significant amount. As a result, I think I had what was probably a psycho-somatic illness Shortly after I entered as a freshman triggered by a grade of "D" I received on a paper, I had to spend time in the infirmary and believed I wouldn't make it.

I applied there because my mother had a friend of a friend who knew about Wells College, but there was no such thing as a guidance counselor in those days. I applied to Elmira College in New York state and to Barnard College in New York City, because my mother knew about Barnard. But I got a full-tuition scholarship to Wells College and so there was no question that's where I would go. I think I got lesser amounts at the other places.

I was very happy at Wells. I played the piano two hours a day, I had a wonderful piano teacher. I majored in history. I started out going to Wells thinking that I would be a nurse. In fact, that was my goal, because in those days young women became nurses or teachers. My mother had been a teacher and didn't want me to be a teacher. She thought nursing was a very glamorous profession. (Laughter) So she thought I should be a nurse. I remember my very solemnly telling my Wells counselor who was an English professor

that I wanted to be a nurse, and would probably leave after the second year to go to nursing school.

Q: But you soon found out that wasn't what...

WHITTLESEY: I was intellectually challenged and I found the academic work really exciting. I was inspired by the professors. I took German, of course, because of my stay in Germany in the summer of 1955. The idea of being a nurse just faded away. I was involved in music. Wells had a big student musical production every year. The junior class put it on. It contained original music. When I was a junior, I directed the whole production. It was a big success. We made a record. I didn't swim any more. I really didn't continue any of my activities other than the music. I played the piano, classical music, very intensively throughout those four years.

Q: Did you study music, too?

WHITTLESEY: I studied music history, yes, and theory. Because I don't have perfect pitch, I found theory to be difficult because my classmates in the music theory classes had perfect pitch. It's a tremendous disadvantage when you don't have perfect pitch. They could all hear a chord and say that's an E flat chord or a G minor. I couldn't. I had to figure it out. Let's see, history, what did I do? I also had a very active social life. I discovered boys at Cornell and Hamilton College and Colgate, but mainly Cornell. And football games, and so I spent most of my weekends at Cornell.

Q: To return to the psychosomatic illness which you had. What was done for you?

WHITTLESEY: It was a terrible cold. I got better.

Q: Was it recognized?

WHITTLESEY: No, it was a real illness, but on reflection I think it probably was brought on by stress. Going to Wells College was a great cultural shock for me. Most of the girls there, a large number of the girls, had come from private schools. They were socially much more sophisticated than I was. I had never been inside a country club, for example. My clothes weren't like the clothes of these other girls. They were much more socially poised than I was. What brought on the illness was that I got a "D" in my first English paper. That was a terrible shock. I thought, Oh, I'm not going to be able to make it here. This is going to be a disaster.

Q: Sure.

WHITTLESEY: In the first year, I really struggled, because even then the education received as American public high schools at that time was not comparable to the education one received at a private school. I was behind. I simply had not had the classical fundamentals that these other girls had had, which enabled them to do well the first year. For me it was a real struggle. But then I caught up and I would say by the middle of the second year, at the end of second year, I was fully caught up and even

ahead. I graduated fourth in my class.

Q: Did you really? Good for you.

WHITTLESEY: There were some very bright girls there. There were also girls who were more inclined to get married. In fact, large numbers of them were sporting engagement rings by their senior year. In those days it was quite common to get married at the end of your senior year of college.

Q: And it was a success symbol.

WHITTLESEY: It was a success symbol, yes. I had absolutely no interest in getting married, because of my mother's constant discussions that women must postpone marriage. She married at 28 or 29, I guess 29, so I had no inclination to seek to get married. I could have. I had proposals, but I wasn't interested.

Q: You had other priorities. But what I was getting at with this illness of yours, did you have to just work through this yourself?

WHITTLESEY: There were doctors.

Q: It wasn't recognized as stress?

WHITTLESEY: It was just the fact that I was staying up late trying to succeed in my academic work. No it wasn't recognized as stress. The infirmary was filled with girls with colds. At the time I didn't recognize it for what it was. I remember the feelings of panic when I was told in the infirmary by other girls that, oh, yes, you have a scholarship but it gets reduced every year. And I knew that my parents were struggling to send me there and they simply couldn't make it if I had had my scholarship reduced. So I thought because I had gotten this "D" that there was no hope of my keeping the scholarship and remaining in college.

Q: You were able to - you have that inner strength. That's terrible pressure for a young girl, seventeen or eighteen.

WHITTLESEY: Yes.

Q: Now it would be recognized, I think.

WHITTLESEY: Yes. At the end of my sophomore year or junior year I wanted to go on the Experiment in International Living. I wanted to go back to Europe. The only way that I could find out as to how to go was to go on the Experiment. That cost some money. I can't remember how much, but it was a considerable sum. Not nearly as much as it would cost today. I think I got a scholarship for that program too. Then there was a discussion at the college that because I was going to Europe on this program and my parents were providing some money for this program, that my scholarship should be reduced. I

remember making the argument (this was the beginning of my training as a lawyer) that my mother worked, which was unusual at that time, and the other girls' mothers on scholarships did not work. That my parents drove a very modest car, whereas other girls' families were coming up in Cadillacs and Chryslers. We always had a kind of run-down Dodge or a Chevy, and lived very, very modestly. It was very important to my parents to be able to give me these opportunities. I made the argument to the person in charge of this program that it was unfair not to take these factors into account. That a lifestyle should also be considered. [Also] the fact that my mother was willing to go out and work at a job that wasn't pleasant and that the other mothers were enjoying being at home full time. My mother would have liked to have been at home too, but she wanted more advantages for us and so she chose to work to earn money to use to give my brother and me certain opportunities.

Q: Did they accept that?

WHITTLESEY: They accepted it.

Q: Good for you.

WHITTLESEY: Yes, they accepted the argument.

Q: Tell me about your times overseas. Where did you go this second time?

WHITTLESEY: The first time I went to Flensburg, Germany, with the American Field Service. We traveled around in Scandinavia, Denmark, Sweden.

Q: For how long a period?

WHITTLESEY: That was the summer. I was sixteen. I remember being struck by the evidence of the war damage that was still visible in Hamburg especially. The second time I went to Austria. My German was better. I made a point to learn German. I lived with a family that spoke hardly any English, so I had to manage in German. It was right on the Yugoslav border. The father of the family was a doctor and spent a lot of time talking to me about his experiences in the war. He was enlisted with the Nazis to go into the Russian front. They had the constant struggles with the Yugoslav partisans after the war. I maintain my friendship with that family. In fact, the father died but I correspond to the mother to this day. Frau Koroschetz. I spent the summer there with them. Then we went into Yugoslavia. I met people in my group that gradually brought me out of my small town environment. A girl from Bennington College and a young man who was a student at Dartmouth and another one who was a page in the U.S. Senate. We four traveled around Yugoslavia together.

Q: So your world began to really open up.

WHITTLESEY: My world began to open up. We went to Yugoslavia and then back into Austria and to Trieste. I developed during those trips an interest in the international scene. I wanted to expand my horizons. I continued to work on my German. By the time I

came back from that trip, my German was reasonably good.

Q: All of these things, too, helped you in the school setting of course, especially with your other friends, because you had interesting things to report on.

WHITTLESEY: Yes. Well it was a girls' school. In those days it was a more sheltered environment. I was never interested in the politics of Wells College. I had certain professors who really inspired me and I spent a lot of time with those professors, and I studied. I had a very rigorous schedule. I got up very early, practiced the piano, usually before breakfast. I went over to the practice rooms very early. I drove myself hard during the week. Before lunch, in the half an hour when everybody else was chatting, I went over to read the New York Times every day in the library. After dinner, when everyone else came back to play bridge, I went to practice the piano. Same just before dinner. I studied in the library so as not to be distracted by the card games and the chatting in the dorms. I had good friends but I suppose I realized at that point that I had to excel and if I wanted to have my social life on the weekends I had to really use every minute during the week to produce good grades.

Q: Remarkable self-discipline.

WHITTLESEY: I stayed in the library every night until 11 - then came back and went to sleep. And I also didn't stay up late. I knew in my life that I cannot stay up late and function effectively. I was then practicing the piano two hours a day and I had to fit that requirement into everything else. I did not go out on dates during the week. But I did usually Friday and Saturday.

Q: Let me ask you about this music, the practicing every day. If you had no intention of making a career of it, why were you so insistent...

WHITTLESEY: I loved it and I had a teacher who inspired me.

Q: Let's talk about some of your teachers. You said that some of them you really enjoyed and learned a lot from. Could we discuss some of your influential teachers and role models?

WHITTLESEY: My piano teacher, I guess. My earliest piano teacher was encouraging and thought I had some talent. I remember going to her house, riding my bike there. It was always a happy experience. My mother forced me to practice. When I got to college, I had quite an unusual woman, I think, as a piano teacher. She taught me theory. She taught me to really love music and gave me a much deeper understanding of it as an art form. She frowned upon my playing any kind of jazz music or show tunes, which I like to do. In fact I didn't dare even tell her that I possessed non-classical music or played it. By her faith in me... she never suggested that I become a concert pianist, but she always gave me the feeling that I had ability to interpret classical music and had reasonably good technical skills. She liked me. I lost track of her and I was very sad to read recently that she died. She was a maiden lady. She never married. Her name was Jean Wilder. She was not involved in the hoopla of Wells College. In a girls' college they had all these

intramural sports. She was a very cerebral person that I very much admired.

I had several history professors that really inspired me. One in particular was a visiting professor from Connecticut College. She was the one who believed that I had ability and encouraged me to write. I knew she liked me and spent extra time with me. I also had an English professor of Shakespeare, a brilliant man... and a philosophy professor. Because it was a small college, we had interaction with these professors, in social situations. Also the classes were small. They introduced me to the life of the mind.

My history professors were liberal Democrats and I was essentially propagandized by these professors. My parents were Republicans although we never discussed politics very much. I never recall any conversations at home about politics. But I knew they were conservative in their approach to the world. In college, therefore, I was, I suppose, gullible. There was one political science professor, Helen Notting in particular, who was obviously political. She adored Jimmy Reston and she praised him and his columns. She was a liberal Democrat. The college, by the way, has since turned into a bastion of feminism. Regrettably. She taught political science and history. I didn't realize what was happening, but I was definitely influenced. When I graduated I was a card-carrying liberal. I was a full-fledged liberal Democrat. It had taken, primarily because I hadn't heard anything else. Of course, 1960 was the election of John Kennedy. I was just starting law school then. I remember cheering the election of John Kennedy in the fall of 1960.

Q: You didn't work for his campaign.

WHITTLESEY: No, I didn't. The same was true in law school in terms of the political orientation. Definitely liberal Democrat.

Q: And that was the University of Pennsylvania?

WHITTLESEY: University of Pennsylvania. Which is true to this day. And of course, when I got out I found that in the real world that something was wrong, that these theories didn't seem to work in real life, these ideas. Or the real life that I was encountering.

Q: Sure. Now when you graduated from the University of Pennsylvania...

WHITTLESEY: Yes, I graduated from Wells College. I wanted to do graduate work in history because I really loved history, but I knew I had to get a scholarship. So I applied to Stanford, I think, and I got a partial scholarship to do graduate work in history at Stanford, but it wasn't enough, especially counting the cost of traveling. We had no such thing as guidance counselors then. Most of the girls got married. I was unique in wanting to go to law school anyway. I remember one of my history professors telling me that it was really crazy that I would even apply to law school, because so few lawyers ever had the chance to do work on constitutional law which is what would determine the great issues of the day. I applied to law school almost as an afterthought. My parents urged me

to apply to law school. I applied to the University of Virginia and was quite annoyed when they sent me back a letter saying that because I was a woman, they wanted more information about my motivations for going to law school. This was after I had filled out a very long application. I was really annoyed. I should have saved that letter.

Q: Yes.

WHITTLESEY: But then I applied to the University of Pennsylvania. I never heard of it, I didn't know where it was, but it had a short application form. I was tired of answering all these questions about my life and writing all these essays, so I applied to the University of Pennsylvania law school. Lo and behold, my parents came down to visit me later and told me that they had received in the mail news that I had been given a full tuition scholarship to the University of Pennsylvania law school. They made it clear that I had no choice but to go there, if I wanted to go to graduate school. Not knowing what else to do with my life, I went to the University of Pennsylvania Law School.

The year I graduated I went up to Cambridge, Massachusetts, to work in a summer job at Harvard School of Social Work and live in a apartment with a friend from my Wells class. I got a job there because I knew somebody that had a friend, etc. So I spent that summer in Cambridge, Mass. Joan Baez was there to perform. She was nobody then. I remember hearing her perform at Harvard and being struck by the ability she had to mesmerize an audience.

Let's see... I guess also after my junior year at Wells I had gone out to Lake Tahoe in Nevada to work. My mother's brother lived there - in California - and they had a summer home at Lake Tahoe. I went out there to work in a restaurant or a hotel with numerous other college students. I got sick and had to quit the restaurant job. I got a sunburn that was so bad that I was really ill. I'm so fair. I was high in the mountains and didn't realize that the sun burned with great intensity at that altitude.

After I lost the restaurant job and my sunburn healed, I got a job in a gambling casino. I was only 19 but I got a card saying I was 24. Someone told me you had to pay and go to a certain place to get this card. I got the card and I worked that summer in a gambling casino, making change. I lived in a trailer with two other college girls from California who went to San Jose State. That was quite an experience. But I made a lot of money for those days. I remember calling up after two weeks and telling my mother that I wanted to come home because I was frightened and everything wasn't going well. Her attitude was, "No, you went out there, you stay there and make it work." That was a real shock, because most friends I know if they would say they wanted to come home, the mother would say, "Oh, well, of course come home, dear, right away." My mother said, "No, you went there, you made the decision to go there. You make it work." And of course her concern was that they had paid money to send me out there and that I had to make a go of it. So I had to make a go of it and I did.

Then the next year I got the job at Harvard. I wasn't afraid of traveling. I learned from my traveling when I was sixteen, to go to different places and to somehow turn a setback

into an opportunity. I learned how to adjust in strange environments. After my first year at law school, I went back to Buffalo, New York to work in a law firm as a runner. I didn't know anybody there anymore. At the end of my sophomore year at Wells I went to Europe again, and then after the next year I went out to Lake Tahoe, Nevada, and then the next year I went up to Boston for the summer. Then I came back to go to Penn law school.

I was frightened when I first arrived at Penn law school. Again I had the thought I could not make it. There were only six girls in the class. There were a lot of Jewish people. I never knew any Jewish people before. I think I knew one or two in my whole life. They spoke in an accent that was almost incomprehensible to me. They were also sophisticated in ways that were totally unknown. I also thought that I can't do the work academically. I came home at the end of the first year, I remember, crying, and said I wanted to quit. My mother, again, my parents both said... my father was very sympathetic whenever he saw me cry but he said, "It's out of the question. It's absolutely out of the question. You're going back. You're not quitting." So I went back.

I had a job, I guess, that summer in Buffalo, New York, in a law firm.

Q: This because you had friends in Buffalo?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, someone helped me get a job somehow. I went back to Penn and graduated. Also, I was constantly afraid of losing my scholarship. I had to be in the top half of my class to keep my scholarship. I really didn't like the study of law. I didn't enjoy the work the way I enjoyed the work at Wells College. It didn't appeal to me. It was so technical and in the classes the professors humiliated the students. That was part of the technique. The women were called Portia one, two, three, and four. Whenever I was called on I couldn't even speak. I was frightened... frightened into total silence. I couldn't utter a word. It was a very rough experience.

Q: It must have been.

WHITTLESEY: Then there were social clubs. Of course I learned about the Main line and the social divergences among the student body. Then, again, I didn't have the right clothes. I didn't know the difference between Jews and WASPs and I had to learn all that. And had to learn the rigid social hierarchy of Philadelphia society.

Q: It was very rigid I gather?

WHITTLESEY: Well, there were definite social groups. The WASPs, the Catholics, the Jews, the Italians, and the Irish reflecting life in the Philadelphia area.

Q: I see.

WHITTLESEY: And they don't really mix. They have their own social groups. Even to this day. There are certain major social functions in which they get together. But that, again, was good training for the later world of politics which I entered.

I wasn't really accepted. My name was Ryan and I was Irish, and of course the WASPs and Philadelphia society and their sons and daughters in my law school class would automatically, in those days, reject the Irish. In Boston I encountered the same thing when I was up there at Harvard. Some of my friends from Wells College were part of that WASP establishment, and I moved in those circles for a time. But I felt, and maybe I was imagining it, but I don't think so, certain reservations because of my Irish origins. And they were shanty Irish origins. They weren't lace curtain. My father's family is still involved in, well was involved, in politics in Jersey City.

Let's see, my law school experiences. I didn't like the work, so I figured out what I had to do to stay in the top half of my class. I knew that I had to do a certain amount to keep that scholarship. But I wasn't really intellectually inspired at any point in my law school years. It was good technical training in logic and critical thinking.

Q: It must have been very difficult.

WHITTLESEY: The intense competition of the law school was a real shock to me, especially among the men. Of course for them it was the beginning of professional competition. I saw the absolutely cutthroat competition for grades, for the law review, for the good will of the professors.

Q: How did the women manage to keep up, or not? Did some drop out?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, some dropped out. I had one very good friend who was my roommate. Let's see, the first year I lived alone. My second year we lived together, then she got married. She had gone to Vassar, and so she was socially more sophisticated. She was a very cerebral person but didn't really like the work either and so didn't do anything. She was not on scholarship. She had low grades and hardly even bought the books. Then in the end would get absolutely panicked that she couldn't pass the exams and would take pills, uppers and downers, so she could study. She's a very bright girl and has since become an excellent lawyer and a prominent environmental activist.

The other women in my class... there was one that later I tried to persuade her to become a federal circuit court judge in Philadelphia when I was involved in helping choose circuit and district judges in the Reagan administration, without success. I had a boyfriend who introduced me to the world of the city and the race track. He was the son of a labor leader in south Jersey, and that again was another world. We used to cut classes and go to the race track. He had grown up literally on the streets of southern Jersey. But he was very bright. He was in law school and he didn't do much work either. He turned out to be a very good lawyer in the end.

None of us was involved in politics at all. The work, just to stay current, took an enormous amount of time.

Q: Is there a lot of memorizing?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. Reading. Lots of reading and writing. The schedule... and of course I had an apartment so I had to take care of my apartment. I think it was an overwhelming experience for most of the students.

Q: The men as well as the women?

WHITTLESEY: The men as well as the women. Some of the men didn't make it. I remember the engineers. Writing skills were very important. Some of the students who had been admitted as engineers hadn't had the experience in writing and couldn't do the writing. Some dropped out.

I had a boyfriend at Cornell. I was going up there to see him occasionally, much to my mother's chagrin. Oh, I started going to the theater in Philadelphia. I would go by myself because at that time I didn't know anybody else who was interested in going. I started going to the opera and would get cheap tickets. I spent a fair amount of time in the theaters because there were first run shows that came to Philadelphia, and of course they had two opera companies then. I developed a love for the opera. I tried to play the piano when I could. I always needed money. One of these street-smart law students told me that one way to make money was to be a substitute teacher in the Philadelphia school district. So I signed up as a substitute teacher in my first year. I did it all through law school. I figured out what classes I could cut on certain days that wouldn't result in my dropping into the bottom half of my class. This other person did it too. He explained how to do it. We could substitute teach on, say, Tuesdays and Thursdays. I would say I could cut those classes and still keep my scholarship. We got paid \$27 a day, and that was considered a goldmine. That money really helped with my expenses.

That experience introduced me to the world of blackboard jungle Philadelphia, because I was teaching inner city schools. That's when I started questioning some of the liberal ideas with which I had been indoctrinated.

Q: I see. Now, you say that you were not active in politics at law school, but this was just...

WHITTLESEY: No, it was the perceived wisdom that Kennedy... that it was the liberal school of thought that we should have a larger and bigger government, more taxes, more bureaucrats. The government knew best. It was the source of enlightened wisdom about the way the world worked. And that the problems of the inner cities were caused by insufficient funding for various programs. In other words, it was not the fault of the individuals, but the fault of society. We were at fault as a nation. It was the beginning of the feeling that continued into the sixties, the moral authority of the United States was being undermined with its own students and people. That the system was somehow at fault in dealing with all these problems. There were mistakes, clearly, that were made, but when I got into these classrooms and I saw the breakdown of the family, I began to see other possible causes which were being totally omitted from the discussion in the other forums.

My mother at this point was working as a social worker. She blamed the whole thing on the breakdown of the family. She wasn't very intellectual about it, but she was constantly telling me about the abuses of the administrators and the system, and how the recipients of welfare were clever in manipulating the system to their advantage, to the detriment of the middle class values which were the bulwark of the strength of the nation. I really dismissed my mother's ideas as being really primitive, but then when I started seeing it firsthand, I began to realize that she had a point. It was a gradual process of change.

I graduated from law school barely in the top half of my class. I met my husband at the beginning of my last year of law school. Oh, I went to Europe between my second and third years. I got a Ford Foundation grant. I kept wanting to go back to Europe. I tried hard to figure out ways to go back.

Q: When was this?

WHITTLESEY: The end of my second year of law school I saw on the bulletin board an announcement of Ford Foundation grants. You had to apply and write a long paper, but I had done this before. So I decided to apply. Very few other people applied. And lo and behold, I won.

Q: Good for you.

WHITTLESEY: I got a Ford Foundation grant to go to the Academy of International Law at the Hague for the summer. But again, I needed some extra money, so I had to go to my parents again, my long-suffering parents. They knew that this was again an educational opportunity, so they gave me, I think, at that time \$300. I figured out that I could leave in May and I could live on \$5 a day in Europe, as one could then, and I traveled all through Europe until I came to the Hague. Went to Greece and all through Italy; I hitchhiked.

Q: This was to begin in July?

WHITTLESEY: No, in May. The course began in July, but I left as soon as my classes were out in May. I lived on \$5 a day, traveling around Europe meeting people. One I met was Dr. Robert Jastrow, who was at that time the director of the Goddard Space Institute and professor at Columbia. And he's been a friend to this day. He's one of the big SDI advocates. A famous physicist.

Then I went to visit my brother, who at that point was studying at the University of Munich. He was a junior at Yale. Then I went to the Hague. Again the people there were fascinating. They were from the East bloc, from all over Europe. I learned more from the people than I did from the courses, and of course Holland is a goldmine of museums and art. We went to the beaches. It was cold and rainy, so we spent a lot of time in the museums and traveling to Amsterdam from the Hague. My interest in art and culture and music, but mainly art because... I would go to concerts whenever I could. I loved the theater and going to the opera. Then in the end, with another student, we hitchhiked. We

decided to go to Spain. Neither one of us had gone to Spain, and we didn't have any money, so we got a train to Paris and then hitchhiked from Paris to Spain, all around Spain. Literally all around. Seville...

Q: Really? You weren't frightened at all?

WHITTLESEY: Not then. I was with a male law student. A man. He was at Columbia Law School.

Q: So you had a little protection.

WHITTLESEY: The two of us were together. I would never have hitchhiked alone. In those days it was easier. There was only one time when I was with another girl, I remember her name was Harriet Turteltaub, she went to Bennington College.

Q: Harriet what?

WHITTLESEY: Turteltaub. She went to Bennington. She was much more sophisticated than I was then, especially in the world of men. I looked up to her. I was very modest and she'd led a much less restricted life than I had.

Q: She went with you?

WHITTLESEY: The only time I remember being at all frightened was once in Greece. But it wasn't really anything serious. I hitchhiked all around Spain. I had hitchhiked in Italy and Greece and I learned to make it on my own. Even to go from one place to another and to find somebody if I couldn't get a bus, I would figure out I could meet somebody in the bus station, another student usually and we could go hitchhiking to the next town. That's what I did. It was really safer then.

Q: Did you find any difference in different countries in the way the men of the country treated you? Some of these countries are very macho, such as Greece.

WHITTLESEY: In Greece, no. I was hitchhiking then with another American boy I met in the bus station, who was blond and wore lederhosen. He was from the Midwest. He was a very nice boy, but the Greeks thought he was German and spat at him. That was a real shock to me, seeing the reaction to him wearing his lederhosen, thinking that he was German. I guess I was then learning to be street smart a little bit. I knew in Greece... there were times when I walked into situations that were very risky when I think back on it. People were always warning me, Don't do this. Be careful. I'm sure my mother if she knew some of the escapades... I guess my mother let me go because she really didn't know what the dangers were.

The other thing that had happened I didn't tell you. I worked in summer stock company for two years. I said I worked in that law firm after my first year of college. I didn't. After my senior year of high school and my first year of college I worked in a summer stock

company near Niagara Falls. It was a professional theater company. At that point I was very much involved in singing and dancing. I actually worked in props. I had two minor roles. Later I used the joke that I had played the role of the maid in Call Me Madam never dreaming that one day I would be the Madam. And of course Call Me Madam is the story of the ambassador to Luxembourg, Perle Mesta [Perle Mesta was minister to Luxembourg from 1949 to 1953. The post was elevated to an embassy headed by an ambassador in the term of her successor.]. I guess my mother again let me do that not knowing what it was like with theater companies. I lived at home but I worked in that theater company all summer for two summers.

Q: It paid well, did it?

WHITTLESEY: No. It paid, but it didn't pay well. But I learned the theater which experience was invaluable to me both as a courtroom lawyer, and in politics... and also as an ambassador. Being an ambassador means being on stage. The ceremonial role and the symbolic role that one plays as the head of mission in the country to which you are assigned is very important. The experience in the theater, my own performing, and then later seeing how theater productions were put together, was of enormous help to me. And also knowing the performers. That theater experience was a very significant experience in my youth. I had long since given up any thought of making a career of it.

Q: This time in the sixties were you influenced at all by what was going on in Vietnam?

WHITTLESEY: No, absolutely not. I was totally out of it. I had no role. I was not interested in it. I was not touched by it in any way. I was too busy with my own career. When I got out of law school, I couldn't get a job. I didn't know anybody. I got married. Let me see, I got married - I didn't even go to my own graduation - well, I attended my own graduation but I didn't walk in the procession. We went on our honeymoon to Bermuda and just got back in time that so that I could attend, but I didn't walk in the procession.

Q: So that was just before?

WHITTLESEY: I married my husband, Roger, who was a Philadelphia native.

Q: Where did you meet him?

WHITTLESEY: I met him in Philadelphia. He was a native of Philadelphia. He was a very flamboyant, funny, polished, volatile person - very handsome, very sociable. He'd gone to Bowdoin College and then gone business. He went to graduate school in economics for a little while. He was an entrepreneur in the advertising business. He came from an old Philadelphia family. He had two sisters. His grandparents had been missionaries in China. They were Presbyterians. He was very persistent in wooing me. I only knew him nine months when we were married.

Q: You had met him socially, I gather, not through school?

WHITTLESEY: I actually literally met him on the street. I was baby-sitting the dog of my law school friend, Joanne, who was going to the wedding of a friend of hers in Pittsburgh. She had just gotten married and they asked me to baby-sit their little puppy for the weekend that they had in their new father, son, and holy ghost house in center city Philadelphia. I went there for the weekend to baby-sit their dog. It's a little narrow street and I was walking the dog up and down the little narrow street. There I met my future husband who had just purchased a house on the same street and was renovating it.

Q: Oh, I see.

WHITTLESEY: It was the house in which we subsequently lived. We were married in Philadelphia. I was very happily married for eleven years to him and had three children.

Q: Now, after you married and you began to have your children, did you become the typical wife in the house while your husband went out working, or did you continue [with your career]?

WHITTLESEY: With my first job, I wanted to get a job in Philadelphia but I didn't know anybody and I didn't really want to ask my husband's family. In the end, that's what I did. It was through my husband's family that I got my first job as a lawyer. I might add that in the beginning I'd gone around on my own. I got appointments at the Philadelphia District Attorney's office which was then a Democratic stronghold. I was a Democrat at that time. I thought that I could go there and get a job. It didn't occur to me then that one has to have political connections. I was completely naive and of course I got nowhere.

It was very hard then for women to get jobs as lawyers. In fact my last year of law school we were advised by the law school administration not to even come to the interviews because we would not be hired.

Q: Really? They were that blunt about it?

WHITTLESEY: They were blunt. It was a completely different world. There was no help offered from the law school in getting a job. I really didn't know where to go. I knew there was a district attorney's office and I thought I would go there and a few other governmental agencies, and of course I didn't understand anything about politics, so I didn't get anywhere.

Having no job, I continued to teach school. The school kept wanting me to come back. They were desperate for teachers, and of course long-term substitutes, because at this time in these blackboard jungle high schools it was very difficult to get teachers. So I taught for five months in a vocational high school in south Philadelphia, Bok Technical High School. That's where I was when Kennedy was assassinated. I was life threatened. I had all kinds of uproars in the classroom. There were 45 kids in each class, five classes a day. I taught English. That experience further shaped my world view. There were some very bright kids that I tried to encourage and inspire, but I saw the breakdown of middle

class values and the wreckage of the welfare system, which my mother had been telling me about, in these kids. Some of them I had to send down to get showers. They had absolutely no middle-class morality, for example, that we didn't tell untruths. I would see them destroy textbooks, brand new textbooks, right in front of my eyes. They would then turn around and say to me that "I didn't do it." In other words telling a lie right to my face when it was clear that I had seen them destroy these brand new books. It was such a shock to me that they had no shame at all in telling me this lie. I knew then that there was something seriously wrong with the system that had produced such reactions. But obviously pouring money into this welfare system in its present structure was not productive, for the society or even for these kids. I later got a job as a research assistant on the banking code revision project. I was told by the judge whose son was a friend of my husband's, who put me in touch with the judge who hired me that I had to change my party registration from Democrat to Republican. I had to register Republican because I would be working for the state instead of the city.

Q: I'm sorry, you were a research assistant where?

WHITTLESEY: In the revision of the Pennsylvania Banking Code. I was told that I had to become a Republican, tactfully, by a judge, for this job. And I did. I wasn't really political. And anyway, my views were gradually changing. So I did become Republican, in 1964, which was exactly the time when Ronald Reagan became a Republican.

Q: Is that so?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. So I became a Republican and then got that job as a research assistant on the Pennsylvania Banking Revision Project. As it turned out, I did banking law for a year, and of course when I got to the embassy in Switzerland banking was our most serious problem. As it turned out, I was the only lawyer in the embassy.

Q: Of course.

WHITTLESEY: So I worked on that project for a year. Then I got a job... let's see, what did I do then? Then I got a job as a law clerk to a federal district judge who was also a friend of my husband's family.

Q: Just for the record, your husband's family is Republican?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. They were horrified by my Democratic... they were horrified by the fact that I was Irish and that I was a Democrat. Yes, they were Republican, although not really active. Just conservative. My father-in-law was very conservative, I would say.

Then I got a job as a law clerk to a federal judge. Then I became pregnant with our first child. I worked, I guess, until I was about seven months. I remember sleeping in the afternoon. I was so drowsy that I would just go to sleep at my desk. Then I stopped, I guess, before the baby was born. I stopped a few months before or maybe a month before. My first child was born, a boy. I had a very bad birth. Very painful, long. But he

was a great joy. My son, Henry.

That was 1965. Henry was born on December 18, 1965. In 1966 my husband decided to run for the Pennsylvania legislature in a Republican primary in Center City Philadelphia against the Republican machine. I had a baby. I was not working, but I worked full time at home in my husband's campaign. We had sold our Panama St. house, that house that my husband had renovated for a profit of \$10,000 or \$12,000. At that time, \$12,000 was a lot of money, and we spent that entire sum, \$12,000, in the 1966 political campaign. So Roger didn't have to raise money. He ran against the organization initially. Later, he persuaded the organization to support him, and then he became the Republican candidate in a traditionally Democratic district that was gerrymandered for a safe Democratic seat. He wanted to run and he thought he could win. I worked on that campaign with him for about ten months. He rang doorbells and I wrote cards thanking people. Every person he saw, he kept track of. It was a silk stocking district in Center City Philadelphia, plus, to make it safe for the Democrats, the black ward to the south. Roger went into the black wards and did all kinds of things for the people there. I don't think he got one vote. That was a hard lesson in machine politics. We learned about Philadelphia city machine politics on both sides, with Republicans and Democrats. It was real hard-ball politics. We spent our own money. But it was very instructive - so money well spent.

What did we do after that? The Republican candidate for governor, Raymond Shafer, had won. Actually my husband ran 20% ahead of the overall Republican ticket, but he lost anyway. It wasn't enough in that overwhelmingly Democratic gerrymandered district. There was a Republican governor, so I got a job in the Republican administration as a lawyer in the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare assigned to Philadelphia. I was assigned to the work that none of the men lawyers would do. I was sent to family court. Shortly after I became pregnant with our second child, our daughter Amy. I worked up until the day she was born. Most of the time I was in the family court trying to obtain reimbursement from the fathers of illegitimate children who were on welfare, and from adult children who chose not to support their elderly indigent parents. I got a first-hand look at the way society really works and how the welfare system worked. The experience profoundly affected my view of the world, and my political views. I saw before my eyes the transfer of responsibilities of families to the state and the taxpayers at large.

My husband worked for Barry Goldwater, in 1964. I was not involved in that campaign, although at that point I was a Republican. I was not very active. My husband thought politics was an interesting hobby. Then we went... let's see. Then Goldwater lost. The next year, 1965, Arlen Specter ran for district attorney. My husband then was in the advertising business and helped Arlen with his political advertising. He was fascinated by the advertising aspects of political activity - the new techniques re the marketing of political candidates were emerging. He was fascinated by the creation of slogans, making innovative campaign brochures and advertising gimmicks of all kinds used in political campaigns. So he did that and then I continued with the children. I had the second child, Amy. We moved. Then he was involved... let's see... was that sixty... I don't know - '66, '65, '67. Oh, '68. Was Nixon '68?

Q: Nixon was '68, yes.

WHITTLESEY: Nixon '68. Roger was executive director of Nixon in Pennsylvania, Nixon '68. That was our first exposure to national politics. The Republican governor, then Raymond Shafer, was for Rockefeller. My job was threatened. My husband was working for Nixon, and I was, of course, a political employee of the state Republican patronage organization, working as a lawyer in the Department of Public Welfare. It was considered a political appointment. They made it very clear that my job was in jeopardy because of my husband's work for Nixon. I might add when I worked for the Pa. Department of Public Welfare I had all kinds of bright ideas and I wanted to change things. I made the mistake of writing memos. I found out that these bureaucrats simply had no interest in changing anything. I developed, I would say, a rather low opinion of them. I found that neither were they particularly compassionate nor industrious. They were just enjoying the perks of these nice middle-class welfare office jobs. They were part of the poverty establishment.

Q: I see.

WHITTLESEY: I became very disillusioned with the system. I saw the size of the checks going out to these welfare mothers and I knew how hard my own mother, for example, had to work. I saw the whole poverty industry first hand. I saw it from both sides. I worked for the recipients in family court. Everyday I had contact with welfare recipients. I had 28 cases every day in family court.

Q: Really?

WHITTLESEY: I worked for them within a system.

Q: You found a lot of cynicism?

WHITTLESEY: No, cynicism... the system was corrupt. It was absolutely corrupt. It wasn't producing the claimed results and it was destroying the moral fabric of our society. I had started reading magazines like National Review and Human Events. National Review had a big impact. I didn't know any conservatives, but I did read those magazines. I started to think more and compare my own experiences. Gradually I became a conservative. I didn't know any other conservatives, even among my husband's friends. They were practical politicians. They liked the give and take of politics, the excitement and the fanfare, but the world of ideas was not discussed at Philadelphia cocktail parties or dinner parties. I was really alone in my intense interest in these publications and in conservative ideas.

Q: Did your husband share your views?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, he did, but he was not an intellectual. He was very much a practical politician. He was interested in his coin collection. He loved his gardens and playing squash. We were very happy. We had a very active social life. I like to be around intellectuals. As I get older I find I enjoy it even more.

In '68 he ran the Nixon campaign. Then was asked, after they won, to go with John Eisenhower - we were friendly with John Eisenhower - to go to Belgium with him for NATO. My husband's business at that point was just getting started and he couldn't go. Leaving Philadelphia out of the question. He had his business and we had the children, so we didn't even consider moving to Washington, although I had many friends in the Nixon White House. I was down there the day after Chappaquidick and I remember thinking "this is the end of Kennedy." My husband called me that night to say "Kennedy is finished." A book on the subject of Ted Kennedy's action at that time, has just come out, Senatorial Privilege, which is on the best seller list.

Q: Yes, yes indeed. Wasn't that shocking?

WHITTLESEY: The Kopechne family has just spoken out too, have you seen that? Twenty years later.

Q: No, I haven't. Have they really?

WHITTLESEY: Mr. Kopechne said, "My daughter did not die in vain. We prevented him from becoming president."

Q: Certainly did.

WHITTLESEY: Just this week. On the twentieth anniversary of Chappaquidick. I met Nixon and I met the people around Nixon because we were unique in Pennsylvania, being Nixon supporters. Everybody else was for Rockefeller. I got to know a number of the people in the Nixon group.

Q: You say you had a friendship with the John Eisenhowers?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, John and Barbara Eisenhower. They have since divorced. I think Barbara remarried recently. In '68 I can't remember what I did. Anyway, '68, '69, I guess I worked in that state job in '69. In '70 I got a job in the U.S. Attorney's office as an assistant United States attorney. This was during the Vietnam war. I was prosecuting draft dodgers. Then I was a conservative - a closet conservative. My husband continued to be involved in politics as a hobby. We were not involved in Nixon '72 because the people were different. I was in the U.S. attorney's office. There were only fourteen attorneys there then. There are eighty-some lawyers in the U.S. attorney's office now.

Q: The Watergate business hadn't started yet?

WHITTLESEY: No. This was the Vietnam war. During the Vietnam war, I was in the U.S. attorney's office, so I had access to all of the information about the activities of these so-called peace groups, like trading with the North Vietnamese and the like. The Quakers around Philadelphia were deeply involved. I also saw the tremendous efforts that were made by the FBI to persuade these young men not to avoid the draft. In other words

we didn't indict immediately, as soon as a young man failed to step forward for the draft. They made an effort to explain, "Do you realize what this will do to your record and your life?" I could see that the children of the upper classes were getting deferments. The boys that were over there fighting, were in the eyes of many, "suckers." They were the ones that couldn't figure out how not to go. I would see them because I used to ride the train into Philadelphia and the Valley Forge military hospital was not too far away. I would see the boys coming in minus arms, legs, eyes, and I agonized whether this war was worth the life or leg of one American boy? When you see them, it's very hard to come to the conclusion that it was. But I saw the people who were on the other side, and I really was repulsed by them. They used to come in - the flower children. Many didn't take baths. They would go down to the place where the boys had to step forward and like ambulance chasers, these lawyers would say, "Don't step forward. I'll represent you. You won't have to pay anything. The government will pay it all. We'll claim you're indigent." I used to fight their claims of indigency, often successfully. I did it because I felt that the boys over there should not be seen as complete "suckers." They were there fighting for their country. Why should these people, why, when they were chosen in a fair way, not take their place as their country required. I knew that their actions weren't based on opposition to all war, it was just this war. I felt that the people opposing the war were cheering America's defeat. I had the sense that they didn't like the United States at all.

Q: These flower children, you mean?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, and they were criticizing a country that had been very good to me. Their activities were quite deleterious to the country as a whole. They were blind. It's interesting when I see them now. One of my friends, Peter Benoliel, was president of the Business Executives Against the Vietnam War. Of course, then it was a moral crusade. The war was wrong; it was evil; we were evil. Now he's very embarrassed about he did and he's a great supporter of the contras.

Q: Oh, really?

WHITTLESEY: Yes.

Q: Why the Contras?

WHITTLESEY: He said, "I was only against the Vietnam war because we weren't prepared to win it." Now this is what he says. He leaves out the moral dimension of his objections then. He sees the error of his ways today, just like many others. After we left it got much worse and now we have the Soviets in Vietnam and the boat people. We were there to prevent a people who had very little freedom from losing that freedom entirely. After we left they lost it entirely. We've had similar episodes and mistakes in judgments in other parts of the world. After Vietnam, we paid a price in our national prestige, and [with] the people around the world in our ability to deter communist aggression. During the seventies, we lost ten countries to the Soviets. Now my old friend, Peter Benoliel supports the contras because it's communist aggression very close to our southern border. But it's interesting how he himself has rationalized his role then by saying that he opposed the war only because we weren't prepared to win it."

I remember stopping my contributions to Wells College during that time because they suspended classes during the Cambodian bombing. I used to go to church also, but every time I would go to church I would hear a sermon against the Vietnam war. I stopped going to church. I didn't want to hear it. I lived in a Quaker neighborhood with the Quakers [who] are a very self-righteous people. They are themselves personally prejudiced also. They have a big resort in the Poconos known as Buckhill Falls. Not only did they not allow Jews to come in but even Catholics or Italians... I knew this from living in a Quaker world. They were to me terrible hypocrites. They were trading with the enemy; they were wrapping bandages for the North Vietnamese. These left-wing Quakers. There are some fighting Quakers.

Q: Fighting Quakers?

WHITTLESEY: There are some yes. Nixon was one.

Q: Of course, that's true, but you never think of a Quaker... I mean they all become conscientious objectors.

WHITTLESEY: No, no, no. They don't all. No, there are fighting Quakers. We had a judge in the eastern district when I used to prosecute these cases, Judge Van Ardeshalon. He was a Quaker. He had joined in the second world war at the age of 17, joined the Canadian army, so he could fight Hitler.

Q: So Vietnam was really your first experience of the ferment that goes on in a society during a war. You were much too young for the second World War and Korea...

WHITTLESEY: Yes. Of course it was the first war that America lost. It was lost in the United States, not on the battlefield, although I am aware that there is a colonel who has just written a book saying that we really lost it in the battlefield.

Q: Yes, I've read the reviews of that.

WHITTLESEY: It was lost through political activity here at home. Ronald Reagan just said on the news this weekend, or several days ago in London, when asked, that when he was governor and he had police intelligence reports [of] the activities [of] the American communist party in stirring up demonstrations during the Vietnam war. Of course, it was obvious to me that enemies of the United States were using our free society to influence, to steer us from within. The Soviets learned the lessons of Vietnam very well. They learned these techniques which they continue to use against whatever country they want to target, be it South Africa, Korea, the Philippines, the Turks or the contras. There was another woman lawyer in the office. The two of us were given the draft dodger cases because the men thought they were beneath their dignity and didn't want to handle the cases. She was a liberal Democrat, but she also was aware of the involvement of the communists in the so-called peace movement, the movement against the Vietnam war, because of the FBI reports. She would not allow her son to go to any Quaker schools as a

result of it. She was Jewish and very liberal, but she was very disillusioned with the activities of the Quakers in particular. She later became a judge and died of cancer within six months. It was very sad. She was a great influence on my life. She taught me a lot. All those lawyers that were there with us in the U.S. attorney's office have all gone on to success.

Q: Would you give me her name?

WHITTLESEY: Her name was Myrna Marshall. She became a judge in Philadelphia.

Q: You say she was a great influence because of the way she handled the cases?

WHITTLESEY: She was a very experienced trial lawyer and a fair-minded person. She was a hold-over from the previous Democratic administration. They kept her on because she was so good, in a Republican administration. At that time in a U.S. attorney's office the personnel changed with the administration. As a woman, she wasn't a feminist. Quite the contrary, she loved men. She was married twice. She wasn't particularly attractive, but she was very popular with the men. She was funny and I suppose non-threatening, but very successful. She didn't have to be strident. She wasn't demanding her rights all the time. She won respect of her peers by the job she did. She was the one who gave me the advice in jury trials that whenever I got a big jury panel, to strike all the women from the panel to use my peremptory strikes in this way - the strikes that I was given as a matter of law as a trial lawyer. I didn't have to give any reason for striking that person from the panel. She urged me to strike as many women as I could, because, she said, "They will vote against you every time. It's my experience."

Q: Is that so?

WHITTLESEY: She said, "It's my experience that they will vote against you every time, so get them off."

Q: That's because you're a woman?

WHITTLESEY: Yes.

Q: Isn't that interesting.

WHITTLESEY: I followed her advice. So then the men, the defense lawyers, would do the same thing. They would strike the women, thinking the women would be sympathetic to me, so we would end up with a panel of all men, which for me was ideal. Based upon her advice and her trials, she said, "I can tell you if I've had a hung jury, in every case its been a woman, because they look at me and they think I'm out there trying cases. I'm a humdrum housewife or I'm a secretary or whatever, an insurance adjuster, and you're life is so much more glamorous than mine and I'm going to vote against you." Women are not generally sympathetic to other women.

Q: Fascinating.

WHITTLESEY: We were very good friends. We went down to the women's prison... when I think today of all the quaint things. We made a trip to the women's prison down in West Virginia because we weren't allowed to go visit the men's prison. We weren't allowed inside. It was considered too inflammatory to have two relatively young women inside. Also we were not allowed to handle bank robbery cases, because it was considered dangerous for women. We didn't argue, we had more than enough work to do, but the bank robbery cases then were considered to be the cream of the criminal trial practice. It didn't bother me. Only once in the courtroom was I afraid at all. It was at a sentencing of a bank robber. I looked around and all the bailiffs seemed to be asleep and the defendant I could see was, I believed, ready to make a jump of some kind. I was standing very close to him and he was arguing with the judge, The bailiffs and the court personnel were dozing off. I never believed that I encountered any discrimination. I never saw it. I just went ahead and did my job. I was too busy doing my job and taking care of my children to ever to be involved in any kinds of women's organizations. In fact I had no time for anything other than my family and my job, my husband and my children.

Q: It sounds to me like a full-time program.

WHITTLESEY: And a big house. We had moved to Haverford and I had a big house and a huge garden.

Q: How did you manage? Did you have a housekeeper?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. We had some help off and on. It was always uncertain. Only half adequate. We juggled. The juggling act alone was very difficult. The men would come home, for example, they would bring their briefcases home from the U.S. Attorney's office for their trials the next day, whereas I could bring my briefcase home, but frequently it wouldn't get open because I would have to, not cook dinner, but certainly supervise the cooking of dinner, supervise the children, spend time with my husband, read to them, do whatever I had to do, and then collapse, sometimes in my clothes. I never had the time to prepare that the men had for the trials. So sometimes I would go into the trials having to do what we call "winging" it. I would just do it without preparation, kind of by the seat of my pants, making it up as I went along. I felt I was hobbled in all of my career with the men against whom I was competing because I never had the time to devote to my job that they had. They had wives at home to do these other things and I had a husband who was very active himself. He certainly did a minimal amount with the children. He took very good care of his children, he loved his children, but household chores absolutely not. Nothing. He would do the yard, the gardens, sometimes. I always thought of him as the primary breadwinner, so his activities took precedence. We were involved in politics and led very, very busy lives. I had a closet full of evening dresses. We went out. Philadelphia was a very social place. We were invited everywhere. When he took his life in 1974, we were on the front page. His picture was on the left and mine on the right, front page, eight columns across the top. I was then in the Pennsylvania legislature. He had gotten me elected. He'd encouraged me to run.

Q: You were in the legislature at that time?

WHITTLESEY: I had run for the legislature. I left the U.S. attorney's office in 1972. My friend Myrna left to run for judge, and I left a few months later to run in a primary for the Pennsylvania legislature. I ran against six men. I got almost 50% of the vote. I was pregnant at the time with our third child, William. Nobody knew I was pregnant, although they were whispering it. It was a Catholic district. I ran against the organization in the primary. We spent our own money. We spent a lot of money.

Q: And you got what percent of the vote?

WHITTLESEY: Fifty percent in a field of seven.

Q: Wow.

WHITTLESEY: About fifty. I rang doorbells for five months straight. I went out in the cold. My husband would call me up in the morning and ask, "Have you gone out yet?" I was pregnant. I was five months pregnant at the time of the primary. Roger was convinced when the Republican organization turned me down for the party endorsement that it was the best thing. He said, "We'll beat them, don't worry about it." I was crying because I really wanted the Republican organization to endorse me. They didn't and I was humiliated and shocked. "How could they not endorse me?" I was the best candidate. He said, "Don't worry, it will make you even stronger. Forget about it. We'll win." Then he used all his advertising gimmicks. By the way, this was the biggest and most powerful Republican machine in the state and probably the last remaining Republican machine in the nation. We had moved into the county in 1972 with the idea that my husband would run for the Pennsylvania state legislature there. He had traveled the state for Nixon. He wanted to be in the legislature and he decided that this was the seat that he wanted. So we moved into that district with the idea that he would run. Then his business started to take off and he had no interest in running. Then the incumbent, strangely enough, decided that he wasn't going to seek re-election. I guess he had a problem with alcoholism and had been caught driving under the influence. So he decided not to run, so the seat was open. I sought the endorsement. They came to my husband and asked would he run? He said no, and I said to him, "You might not be interested, but I am." Roger had to think about that for a few days, because he hadn't really thought of me as a candidate. Then he said, "Yes, that's what we'll do." Then I sought the party endorsement, was turned down and I ran. I won in the general election. That was '72, Nixon-McGovern. In that district, winning the primary was tantamount to winning the general election. There were lots of dirty tricks played against Nixon then. I remember all our telephone wires into the Nixon headquarters were cut. Of course nobody pressed any criminal charges. I had seen hardball politics in both the city of Philadelphia and in Delaware county. For me the whole Watergate episode seemed to be something manufactured to destroy a very popular Republican president. We went through it; it was sad. We had had no part in Nixon's '72, even though I was running for the legislature, because the people around Nixon then were different. We had nothing much in common with them.

[June 18, 1989]

...and also a Jewish section that consistently voted Democratic, but that voted for me. I was in the hospital ten days before William was born because I had some complications in my pregnancy. I thought I might lose the baby. I did give birth to William, my third child, about three weeks or two weeks before the general election. He was a healthy, almost a ten pound baby. I recovered quickly. I wanted to go around to every polling place on election day, which I did, even though I had given birth only two weeks before. I think people were quite surprised that I made the rounds to every single polling place in my legislative district the day of the election, which became my practice. I visited polling places every election day all day long from that point on throughout my years in politics.

I went to Harrisburg as one of six women in the Pennsylvania legislature at that time. There was one other woman from Chester county, Pat Crawford. I can't remember all of them. There was a Democratic woman whose husband had died and who had taken the seat of her husband. I entered the delegation of Delaware County which was one of the largest. It was the largest Republican county in the state in terms of numbers of registered voters. Delaware County is one of the larger suburban counties surrounding Philadelphia. Because of our large population in the county, some 600,000, which is larger than five states of the Union, I might add, we were a major force in the Commonwealth. I was the only woman in the Delaware county delegation. Initially I was received with some skepticism because the others had seen me very pregnant as a candidate. Most of them were Roman Catholic and were quite distressed, I would say, at the idea that a woman who was pregnant and who was about to become a mother for the third time was going to join them in the Pennsylvania legislature. As a matter of fact, the then speaker of the house, by the name of Ken Lee, from upstate Pennsylvania said to me during the fall campaign when I was pregnant at a party at the home of Herbert Barnes in Bucks county, a leading fund-raiser in Pennsylvania, "How could I spoil it for them to win the seat by getting pregnant?" His comment stung me very much in view of the fact that he was the speaker of the House. As it turned out, he received me warmly after I arrived there. I think they really believed that because I was pregnant I was going to lose the election. The leader, the "boss" of the county organization at that point, was Harry McNichol. He and his wife were not particularly cordial. I had not received organization endorsement and I came to prominence without the blessing of the organization. It was a very strong Republican organization that was probably the last remaining Republican machine in the nation, certainly the strongest in the state. My husband and I, who had come from Philadelphia under the tutelage of the Republican leader of Philadelphia, William Meehan, were outsiders in Delaware County. We were newcomers. We hadn't lived in the district very long. I remember my opponent that year going up and down my street. He was a very nice young man by the name of William Murray - a Liberal Democrat. He spent a lot of time on my street. I guess he thought he was going to demoralize me by campaigning on my street. He made a comment one time that was revealing. I was out on my lawn helping my husband with the garden, and he said, "Even

all the people on your street are going to vote for me and I'm going to win if even the people on your street are going to vote for me." I remember my husband just muttered "You stupid-" a four-letter word, under his breath because we lived in a Quaker neighborhood and they were all liberal Democrats on my street. So they were all voting for George McGovern for president. I knew that and I was actually happy that he was spending so much time on my street because very liberal neighbors weren't going to vote for me anyway as a conservative Republican. Those were some of the incidents I remember. I campaigned vigorously right up until the end. I won in a large landslide.

Q: Did it bother you, having all of this criticism coming at you from all quarters?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, it hurts. It's very hard. My husband went away, I remember on a trip to the Far East; a three week trip just before the baby was born, leaving me to run the campaign and to take care of the two children. Then of course the birth of our third child was coming any moment. I had to debate my opponent. During the last debate I had to sit down because I was so enormous. It was the evening before I picked up my husband at the airport when he returned from the Far East. Just before the previous debate [those debates lasted at least three hours and were very intense] I got a call from my daughter's teacher at her school telling me that she was doing poorly in school, she appeared to be preoccupied and seemed to be in some kind of emotional distress. This shattered me right before I had to go and debate. But these things, I have learned, always happen in life. You never can count on a problem-free world, especially if you have children. You never know when some crisis is going to come upon you which means you have to drop everything. I went to Harrisburg in very good spirits. I was excited and looking forward to my service there and doing a good job for the people of the district, for whom I had great affection. I learned a lot about them having walked into their homes for so many months, ringing the doorbells. I was bitten by five dogs during those months of door-to-door campaigning.

Q: Really?

WHITTLESEY: It was basically a middle class district. I could empathize with the people because of my own background. I'm Irish and my father's family is from Hoboken. I used my maiden name, Ryan, in my official name because there were so many Irish people in the district.

Q: Used the three names?

WHITTLESEY: I used the three names because I needed to highlighted the Ryan. I wanted to make it clear that I identified with my Irish heritage. I went to Harrisburg determined to do a good job. I worked with the Delaware County delegation. They received me very graciously. Never in my life have I been on the lookout for slights or discrimination. I assumed that I would be accepted as an equal and I tried to conduct myself accordingly. I did not seek out issues that would identify me as a woman. In fact, I tried to avoid them because I thought the way to be accepted was to compete with men on their issues and be accepted as their intellectual equal on the major issues of the day. I

think women, and I used to speak about this then, and I have spoken about this since, make a terrible mistake when they ghettoize themselves on the subject of “women’s issues,” such as social welfare issues, family issues, abortion, women’s rights and that sort of thing. Men seemed to like to relegate women to discussions of those issue which they consider secondary and then they handle the big issues, which are the fiscal issues at the state and local level, and then of course in the international arena and on the national scene, the foreign policy and defense issues. In reaction against being ghettoized, I always focused my attention on what I considered to be the major issues of the day, which were in the state legislature always fiscal issues and regulatory issues.

Q: Were you able to ask for positions on these various committees?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. My superior educational background stood me in very good stead, in comparison to some of the other women who did not have law degrees. I believe I was the only woman with a law degree. Many of the members then were lawyers, the male members. So I could be accepted as an equal as a trained lawyer. So I served on the judiciary committee and the consumer protection committee. I believe I was accepted. I enjoyed my time in the Legislature because I spent time with the brightest lights of the Legislature. The speaker, the majority leader, the majority whip, some of the brightest minds. They always invited me to join them for dinner. I thrived. We had lively discussions every night at dinner. It was fun and highly stimulating.

Q: You didn’t find that your presence at these things inhibited the men at all?

WHITTLESEY: No, I’ve always lived in a world of men and I’m very comfortable with them. When I was growing up boys were my best friends. Not that I don’t have women friends; I do, but I’ve always been very comfortable in a world of men. I wasn’t a strident feminist. I learned that from Myrna Marshall, my colleague in the U.S. attorney’s office. I observed that the men really liked her. She wasn’t particularly attractive, but they really enjoyed her company. She was bright and she always had good insights. She read a lot and laughed easily. She was fully accepted and was not a strident feminist. In fact she was very feminine. One of the women members in the legislature approached me. They wanted to have meetings of the women in the legislature. I didn’t want to join. I just wasn’t interested in forming a women’s caucus. I thought that it would be counter-productive. I don’t want to be a snob, but I wanted to be with the people who were really the leaders and making the major decisions as to what bills would come up and what were the major political decisions that would guide the course of the legislature. I had a chance to do that being around the leadership, and so I took advantage of it. I learned a lot from my contacts with the leadership. First of all, I really discovered my Irish heritage. Growing up, I suppose I developed, not a certain embarrassment about my Irish background but my mother’s family looked down on my father because he was Irish. I knew when I graduated from Wells and I went up to Boston to work some people clearly were a little bit reserved because I was Irish. The same thing in the University of Pennsylvania law school. I wasn’t invited into the elite clubs because my name was Ryan and presumably Catholic. When I got in politics I met men who had been educated by the Jesuits who were very Irish, who had powerful intellects and good wits. I relished those

discussions and cherished those friendships. Some of them have continued to this day. One of my very favorites died of cancer shortly after I left the legislature - Pat Gleason from Johnstown.

Q: The fact that you were not a Catholic did not impede these friendships?

WHITTLESEY: No, absolutely not. I was Irish. They knew that, and I liked to laugh too. It wasn't because I drank. I don't drink. I didn't drink then, I don't drink now. Many of them did drink. I never drank and I don't to this day. I used to sip on wine but now I don't even sip. It gives me a headache.

They were the ethnic politicians, the leaders of their cultural and ethnic groups who had made it to the top. They were very street smart and were the people who had, in the city of Philadelphia, challenged the WASP elite. They were running the governments. Of course, I got to know many of them on the Democratic side as well. I was friendly with - not a lot, but I had some good friends on the Democratic side, friendships which have continued to this day. I greatly admired the oratorical skills of the then Democratic speaker, who later went to jail. His name was Herbert Fineman. On a couple of occasions [I] challenged him on the floor and I think my colleagues respected my willingness to stand up and debate him as a freshman legislator. He was superb. I watched him and listened. There were some really good orators at that time in the Pennsylvania legislature. One of them was my mentor, Matthew Ryan, who was the then majority, minority whip. He was so quick-witted that he could stand up and shoot down a Democratic move on the floor with his razor sharp mind and find the weak points very quickly in their arguments. I enjoyed the excitement of action on the floor. In those days we sometimes stayed in session until late at night, sometimes two or three in the morning. I remember falling asleep at my desk. The man next to me, Jonathan Vipond from Scranton, said, "You wake me up this time, I'll wake you up the next time when we have to vote."

Q: So you went and stayed in Harrisburg while the session was on?

WHITTLESEY: I usually stayed one night, Monday night, when the legislature was in session. I enjoyed the work. I plunged into it and involved myself in all the issues. I also had some special issues that I was interested in.

Q: How long a session is it in Pennsylvania?

WHITTLESEY: It wasn't all year. I forget now how many weeks during the year.

Q: So many months?

WHITTLESEY: A few months, it was sporadic. But then, of course, when I got back to the district, I had to do constituent work. I had to take care of people who wanted their beauty licenses renewed. People would call me up, "Why wasn't my trash picked up?" It was a constant stream of requests. "My driver's license is lost." "The state authority it rude to my son, will you please do something about it." It was constant. I did have a staff

person who was invaluable to me, a lady by the name of Sally Rogers, who handled these calls with enormous grace and compassion. I made a lot of speeches. I had my phone switched so there was one phone line that rang in her house, so she handled all the problems that she could handle herself when the citizens called me up. I also had the political work. I had to maintain my political base. I had to deal with all the Republican committee people in a very powerful Republican organization which I was trying to rebuild, by the way. The township Republican organization at that point was in a weakened state, a township of about 60,000 people. It had been a Republican bastion. The Democrats had taken it over because the old Delaware County Republican machine was weak and corrupt. I embarked upon a campaign to rebuild my own local community, that is the Republican party there. I brought in the numerous volunteers I had attracted, people who wanted good government. I would ring doorbells and would sit down and would find somebody in some neighborhood who was interested in politics and interested in the local community and say, "Why don't you join us and help me?" I built up a huge cadre of people who were... weren't looking for jobs or patronage, they were just interested in good government. I tried to make it fun for everybody. We built up an organization that later resulted in our taking back the town from the Democrats. It is Republican today.

Q: Did you really?

WHITTLESEY: The people that I brought in to my organization are still on the scene, most of them. Some of them moved away. They are still running Haverford township.

Q: And it's still Republican?

WHITTLESEY: Still Republican.

Q: One final question. To what do you attribute the landslide victory you had in '72?

WHITTLESEY: It was partly Nixon '72. It was a landslide for all Republicans at that time. I also had worked the district very hard. We had sent out mailings. My husband liked to experiment with new techniques in advertising, so he used all his best innovative skills in developing campaign literature for me and campaign techniques.

Q: Is it true you sent out potholders?

WHITTLESEY: I used potholders.

Q: Clever.

WHITTLESEY: At that time they were very cheap. We got them made in North Carolina somewhere. I handed out potholders with my name and the date, that's all. That was in the primary election. People kept those potholders in their kitchens for years. At that time in politics it was not uncommon to hand out some kind of gimmick. People would hand out combs or nail files or whatever. But potholders were unique. They were a little more

expensive, but they were such a good political investment because they weren't immediately discarded. People would keep them and use them. It never occurred to me that some feminist would object that it was disparaging to women for a woman candidate to use a potholder. To this day that would never occur to me. I would hand out potholders if I were running for governor today. It's something that people use. Both men and women cook. They were very successful.

My time in the Pennsylvania legislature was a very good training ground for me. I ran in '72 and then was re-elected in '74. My husband died in March of '74. He took his own life, which was a terrible shock and a tragedy. The Pennsylvania legislature taught me how the American political system works at the local level and at the state level. Before this time I had been an employee. I had been in appointive positions at the federal level as a law clerk, and as a special assistant attorney general at the state level. But I had not been in elected positions.

Q: You find it's totally different?

WHITTLESEY: It's totally different. I was my own boss. I was answerable only to the voters. I could make my own future. If I did a bad job I wouldn't get such a good vote. I might lose. It was a perfect job for a woman with children because I could make my own hours. I wasn't accountable to anybody, and in the end it was up to me. No one could tell me to come in or go or whatever. I could miss votes. I could miss meetings. No one was there to call me to account except the press and the fact that when the next election came I knew that that my record would have an impact. It was a highly flexible kind of a job.

[June 21, 1989]

Q: At the last meeting you were telling me what you learned as a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature and how you rediscovered your Irish heritage and you were elected in 1972 and then you were re-elected in 1974. Now the first time you were elected by a very large majority. Did that hold true in '74?

WHITTLESEY: Well, '74 was the Watergate year. I won, I believe, by a larger margin than any other member of the Delaware County delegation. I continued to work very hard. I remember my campaign workers expressing concern that there was something wrong out there on the streets. They obviously were getting feedback, not about me, but in general, that there was a certain unease among the voters that was troubling to the campaign workers. They wanted me to redouble efforts and that sort of thing. As it turned out, they were right because, of the ten members of the house in Delaware county that we had then, nine were Republicans and I think at that time there was one Democrat, we lost half. Half of the seats were lost. And we lost the congressman that year. We had had a Republican in the congressional seat for years and years. It was a Republican stronghold. We lost the congressional seat; we lost half the house delegation, and we lost the state senator from the county. So large numbers of Republican voters voted Democratic in the

aftermath of Watergate.

Q: I see.

WHITTLESEY: It was a real shock to everyone. Shortly after that election, I was approached to run for county commissioner in Delaware county which would have meant that I would give up my house seat and come home to the county. I was flattered but did not express interest because I was very happy in the Pennsylvania Legislature. Also my husband had died and I thought that any kind of further change would be a disruption in my family. I had figured out how to manage my life in the Pennsylvania Legislature. Change in and of itself was another burden. So I did not at that time express interest. Milton Shapp, then governor, said, after that election victory for the Democrats, on election night he said, "This year the governorship." (Milton Shapp was elected governor as a Democrat) "Next year the Delaware county courthouse." Which meant that the Democrats were so euphoric about their victories in Delaware county, which had traditionally been a Republican stronghold in the state, that they were going to dislodge the Republican party from control of the Delaware county courthouse. In Pennsylvania the courthouses were the most powerful political institutions in the governmental structure. Through the courthouses passed the patronage and the political control that allowed the political parties in the state to maintain their strength. So it was very, very important. To hold the Delaware County courthouse.

Q: That was in November. And your husband had died in March.

WHITTLESEY: He died in March 1974.

Q: Now without going into it, that must have been a tremendous shock; the shock and everything else must have been tremendous, and I wonder if you could tell me about the impact on your goals and your lifestyle and your living by something so unexpected and tragic.

WHITTLESEY: First of all, let me say that my husband was an entrepreneur. He started out in the advertising business working for other people. I should backtrack. Before he started working for other people in the advertising business, he and his father were in a very small business together. An outdoor advertising business. They had signs, smaller outdoor advertising signs which they owned in townships all over southeastern Pennsylvania and Philadelphia. In getting approval for these signs he had to go around as a young man and deal with local government officials to get approvals. He was exposed to the mentality of local officials and their strengths and weaknesses, to state it euphemistically.

He left the sign business. They sold the company, actually. Then he worked for someone else and then he started his own business again. His own advertising agency. It was a big struggle because for a while there was no money coming in. I was in effect the breadwinner for the family because my checks were regular. My income was constant and his was uncertain. Then the business took off and did very well. He had two large

clients, both million dollar accounts, and both were suddenly adversely affected by two market conditions which developed, which resulted in the decision of the leadership of those companies to discontinue their advertising. One was an oil company and as a result of the oil crisis of that period, they decided... In fact, oil companies were discouraged and even prohibited from advertising. And the other one was a mail order insurance firm which was adversely affected by the equity funding scandal of that time and the stock in which he was invested, heavily invested, came out at I believe at 4. It went up to 6 then went up to 14, and the scandal hit, which affected all of the companies in the field even though this company was not directly affected. But my husband was heavily invested in the stock of this company. The stock plummeted to, I think, back down to 5 and 4. It was about 4 that he took his life, feeling that he could not face the humiliation. He was devastated by the fact that both of these things had happened in a period of months. His mental condition worsened dramatically in the summer, in August of the preceding year. That would have been August of '73 when the stock price plunged. From that time, from August of '73 until he took his life in March, he was very seriously affected. I had to go through my activities. We were invited everywhere. He didn't want to accept any invitation. I had to make constant excuses. I couldn't explain why we couldn't go. Some people understood or tried to understand or were understanding that I couldn't give an explanation, and others were not and became annoyed. It was interesting to see people's reactions. He became increasingly introspective. He did go to the office, but he stayed in bed a lot. He was very depressed. He became very pale and wouldn't talk. He was seeing a psychiatrist, but that didn't seem to help. He started threatening to take his life then, in August. I didn't really take him seriously. Even if I had, there was very little I could have done about it because unless someone is...

Q: There's nothing you could do.

WHITTLESEY: I couldn't have had him committed because he would make these threats in jest. Otherwise he seemed normal, other than being very depressed. I had three little children to take care of, and I frankly didn't know what to do and I didn't want to discuss it with too many people because he was very proud and didn't want me to. We discussed it with a few close friends, very few, maybe two. But his personality changed. He used to be very gregarious and outgoing. Whenever we did go to social gatherings, if we ever did go, he would sit and stare and not talk. People would react to him as they had in the past - women, especially, because he was very attractive to women. He didn't respond at all. He used to be full of jokes and funny stories. It was a dramatic change. He still loved his children dearly and they gave him enormous pleasure.

He took his life in March. I remember that day. I left for the legislature. I was picked up that morning. He was again threatening to take his life. I was concerned. He wanted me to go visit the insurance company, which I did at his request. On my way, I was picked up by another member of the House. I stopped at the insurance company and delivered some papers. He was all right when I left, but then he was also drinking, more than he should, although he was not an alcoholic by any stretch of the imagination. But because he had threatened it again, I remember calling his mother to say that I was worried about him because he was threatening it again. She dismissed it. She said, "Well, he's

threatened this before, but I don't really think..." She didn't think he would ever do such a thing. I was worried during the course of the day, and I had a hearing on some bill and was preoccupied. In the evening I went to a dinner up in Harrisburg. I was calling and continued calling... he was going to drop off the children at the home of a friend of mine for dinner where they were going to have dinner together... a very good friend of mine. She was going to feed them all dinner. She wanted to see them. She knew that I was in the legislature and that he was not very good at cooking. He was not a modern husband at all. She invited him, too. He dropped off the children there and said he had to go out for a business appointment. And of course he never came back to pick them up. Then he apparently took the car and drove into the driveway of another friend of ours, and saw that she was occupied with somebody else and he drove away. She went down the driveway to try to call to him and he had already gone. That was the last anybody saw of him until he was dead.

I kept calling that night and I kept calling and calling and calling. There was no answer at home. I couldn't understand it because he was supposed to go there, pick up the children and come home and put them to bed. I couldn't understand why the phone didn't ring, I mean, why nobody answered the telephone. The next morning, very early, the lady who had invited us for dinner the previous evening, came over to the house. She thought she should go over to our house. She was worried. She kept the children overnight. She looked in the window of the garage and saw a car and saw his body, but she didn't know who it was, slumped in the seat. She called me up to say - this was very early in the morning - that "I went over to the house and the car's in the garage and there's someone slumped down in the seat." I just gasped. I knew what it was and I knew what he had done. So they got the police and I was driven down. It was on the news very quickly. I was driven down from Harrisburg. When I got there, fortunately my friends in the legislature had called to get the children out of school, because the two older children - because they were afraid they would hear it from a schoolmate, because it was already on the news. I had to tell the children. They burst into tears - the older children, the youngest one was a baby. I had to tell my mother, my father.

He had taken a half a bottle of vodka to boost his courage. He went into the garage and turned on the ignition and was dead in 20 minutes. The vodka wasn't even digested which indicated that he had done it...

He wrote me a love note, a suicide note, which the police took. The contents of that note apparently later appeared in a story in the Philadelphia Inquirer, which gives you an idea of the type of indignities to which public officials are subjected.

It was of great interest to the news media. They came immediately to the house and wanted to talk to me. The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin paper has since gone out of business, but it was particularly offensive. Their reporter insisted on talking to me that day. I said no. As a result they did a front page story, eight columns across the top, my picture on the left, his picture on the right. The story was full of inaccuracies and untruths, but of course that's the price again you pay for being a public official when you don't talk to newspaper reporters. You run the risk. So that occurred. The family gathered

and we had a funeral service. He was cremated. His remains are buried in Vermont in the family plot there, where his parents have a family home. They did then. They've sold it now. My mother-in-law bought another home there. His remains are buried there in a cemetery in Vermont, which is a place he loved. He, by the way, was a native of Meadowbrook, Pennsylvania. His father was president of Abingdon Hospital and senior vice president of the First Pennsylvania Bank. His mother came from an old Philadelphia family and her name was Barbara Weaver. They were from Jenkintown, Pennsylvania. They had purchased this property in Vermont as a summer home and so he spent many happy hours at that home in Vermont, and also in the winter because we were skiers. He was buried there.

Afterward I was numb. I lost a lot of weight. But I knew that I had to resume for the sake of my children. I didn't have the luxury of having a nervous breakdown because I had to care for these children. I called in a psychiatrist, a friend who was a psychiatrist. I knew that I had to try to limit the damage to them. The psychiatrist talked to my older son for about two days. He urged me to get married right away... as soon as possible to get married again. He talked to my daughter but my older son, Henry, expressed a lot of emotion.

Q: He was what, seven?

WHITTLESEY: Seven. I thought the psychiatrist was helpful to him because I simply couldn't cope with it. Having a boy lose his father was a terrible trauma. I think that was a wise move to make. But I had to go on with my life. Frankly, political involvement was a kind of refuge because it was such a full-time involvement that it didn't allow me any time to feel sorry for myself. Other women who lost their husbands ended up in the Haverford State Psychiatric Hospital. It was simply too much for them to cope with family, children, house and the like. I had a big house to handle, to manage by myself, a big yard, all the problems of a house, leaves, snow, electricity, storm windows, everything. It was a large house, worrying about taking care of it and cleaning it. The children went to school and I went ahead with my political activities, knowing that I had an election in the fall. I just plunged into it. I was numb for quite a long time. I missed him very much. I had a very happy marriage, the years that we were married. He was a very volatile personality, very different from me, but he taught me about Philadelphia and how Philadelphia worked, and the relationship between money and politics and the different ethnic groups in the city. He gave me a certain confidence because he came from a higher social class than I did. I suppose you could put it that way delicately, or indelicately. He was socially supremely confident, which I was not. He gave me courage to take risks, which he was accustomed to doing. I was not. And whenever he encouraged me to take risks and to do certain things, his advice had turned out to be correct. He actually was my mentor. He had a lot of what we call street smarts. He was not an intellectual, but he was a very clever person and had a very fine-tuned sense of relationships between people. He could figure out hidden agendas. He taught me some of those things. I think I was a quick learner, but I learned a lot from him, and we were very close. We were happiest when we could do these things together. He managed political campaigns as a hobby in the advertising area. I learned a lot from him, for example, in

1968 when he was Executive Director of Nixon for President of Pennsylvania, and his work with Arlen Specter. He was close to Bill Meehan, the Republican leader of Philadelphia. When we came out to Delaware County, he went to the then boss, Harry McNichol, in the county courthouse, and said, "I'm here now, we've moved into Delaware County. I would like to volunteer. I'm in Haverford township. I would like to help you." He was spurned.

Q: Oh, really?

WHITTLESEY: It was interesting because the next move was that I ended up sitting in Harry McNichol's chair. [Laughter] Ultimately I ended up, not too long after he was spurned. Harry McNichol was out and I was sitting in his chair. Roger was the one that maneuvered that. He essentially marketed me. He was an advertising genius and he decided that it would be fun to market me and use all his innovative techniques. The problems of dealing with the political structure in the county, which I had to do, were enormous, but I learned a lot from my husband as to who was powerful and why, and what the connections were and how politics really worked. That knowledge has proved to be invaluable to me in my later life. Not only in government and the diplomatic service but in business.

One other anecdote that I would like to tell you [is] what it's like to be a mother and a public servant. I remember one time when my husband was still alive, that we had gone to Florida for vacation to visit my parents with three children - no, no, there were two children then, William was not yet born - from there we went to - no, no, I guess William was born, that's right. William was born and he was a baby, maybe three or four or five months old. We went from Florida to Puerto Rico with the two older children, leaving William in the care of my parents as had been agreed. Less than 24 hours after we arrived in Puerto Rico, with Roger and myself and Amy and Henry, the two older children, I got a call from my parents saying that they simply could not take care of William. It was too much, they were too old and they couldn't cope. I had to get on the plane, leave the rest of the family in Puerto Rico and go back and pick up William. I decided then to go back to Philadelphia, not to go back to Puerto Rico, because we were only going to spend another day or so there, so I decided to go back. I had to go back going through - the only way I could get back was to go through Atlanta. I had a big heavy baby. I had to carry him. I had to carry all the luggage, the bottles and everything, plus worry about my suitcase and his belongings and come back to Philadelphia, get myself home with this baby. I think he was about five months. A great big boy. A very happy baby and easy-going but heavy. Then I had to go to Harrisburg. I got back to Haverford, our home, only to find that the lady who was taking care of the house and the children and with whom I had planned to leave William, so I could go to Harrisburg for one night, had had a tragedy in her family and had to go home. So there was no one to care for William and I had to go to Harrisburg. I packed up William and took him to Harrisburg, so that was the only time, I guess, in all my career that I packed up the bottles, the food, everything, and go to Harrisburg with this baby, with my son. I think I took him on the floor that time, the floor of the house. That was the only time I did that. But that was something that sticks in my mind because it was just one crisis after another. But I just had to cope along the way and do what was necessary. I was always worried about my voting record, because if I

were absent... that's why I decided to go to Harrisburg, because I knew I was accountable to the voters and they were very much conscious of absences in the voting sessions. I wanted to be there so I could maintain my 97% voting record, or attendance record. I was able to do that and bring William home. Then my husband came home from Puerto Rico with the two older children. Things like that happened constantly. There would be some crisis with the children. I would have to drop everything with one or other of the children. Drop everything in the middle of everything, come home, or go to pick one of them up and just improvise from that point on. That happened throughout my career and my life. I knew that it was coming. That it could come at any given time and I would have to adjust. So my schedules were always very uncertain. That, of course happened, before my husband died. So that was '74.

After the election of '74 I was approached to run for County Commissioner in Delaware county. I declined at that point. I said no, I wasn't interested and I didn't even regard it as a serious request. But I knew that Milton Shapp was determined to win the county courthouse, and Harry McNichol and Nick Catania who had been the previous commissioners were pleasant fellows, but they were less than fully competent to deal with the problems the county faced. As a result, the standing of the Republican leadership in Delaware county in terms of running the county government was at an all-time low. Had they run again they would have been defeated, and the loss of the county to the Republican party would have been overwhelming. So the party was looking for new candidates. I knew that as they looked around they simply didn't have anybody because the old Delaware county Republican organization did not encourage any new people to enter because the new people would threaten the old guard control. For example, my husband was spurned when he came and offered his services to help. He was turned away. He wasn't the only one. Any new, bright, young face was turned away as a possible threat to their total control. I knew, looking around, that they were having a very hard time coming up with any candidates. I suspected they would come back to me. One day, just before the close of filing in early 1975, I was in Harrisburg in the office of the then majority whip, Matthew Ryan, and I got a call. "We are very close to a decision. We don't have any candidates. Will you please reconsider and run in the county to save the county?" from Milton Shapp essentially. I said, "No, no, we've got to find someone else. Why don't you try someone like John Dupont?" Then majority whip, Matt Ryan, or minority whip, I can't remember what he was then... I said, "We'll call you back." So I think we even tried John Dupont and he made a funny joke and he said, "Well, if I wanted Delaware county, I would buy it," or something like that. But Matt said no and there were no candidates.

Finally I reluctantly said yes, and Matt Ryan drove me back from Harrisburg. I was crying all the way down in the car, because I knew what it meant to run in the county that was in very serious difficulties, in a very tough campaign. It was a big county, bigger than five states of the Union in population. Very complicated, with an old line Republican machine that was one of the oldest surviving machines in the nation. Machine, that's a pejorative term. It was a Republican organization that produced big victories and was a strong political team. But it had fallen on hard times and had frozen out new talent, was withering away, losing strength and losing elections.

I said yes, and we launched a political campaign. I ran with Charlie Keeler, who was an outstanding lawyer and man of unquestioned integrity but rather shy and reserved. He had run as an official in a small town, but had not really been exposed to much political activity as a candidate. He had long-time involvement in the Republican party but had not been a member of the legislature. Frank Hazel ran for district attorney, so we were a team of Keeler, Whittlesey and Hazel. We were the new team, we were called the “new look.” We were young. We were incorruptible. We won in a landslide and proceeded, over the next six years, to clean up the county and restore its vigor and its reputation. We brought in a lot of new people. We let people go in the county government who were not producing. I was blamed for that of course.

Q: Because you had the highest profile?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, I had the highest profile. But I was not afraid. I didn't like to fire people, but I knew it was either make big changes or fail. We had to bring in new people. We simply had to get some new faces, some new ideas. There was a price to be paid. We could not do it with the same old crew. First of all, they were very suspicious of us. Their allegiances were to the old guard, the old regime. You had to have your own team to be successful so we brought them in. I also wanted to make sure that my local power base in Haverford township was secure. We wanted to win it back from the Democrats, so I asked the Republican leader, who was a county employee, to resign his position as Haverford township leader for which he never forgave me. His name was Steve Campetti. I brought in my own team in my own township because I knew that to succeed in politics you've got to maintain your local base. Over the period of six years Haverford township developed a very strong, powerful Republican team. that won election after election and is still Republican to this day. The strength of the party was restored. We won back the house seats We won back the congressional seats over time, and the county today produces big Republican victories. We were successful, but not completely. After we left, some of the old practices crept back, unfortunately. We got a lot of publicity. I believed in good government. I thought good government was good politics. But I wanted a powerful Republican organization, too, and I thought Delaware county should play a role in the state.

In 1976 we had a presidential election. Ronald Reagan was challenging Gerald Ford for the Republican nomination. Drew Lewis, who was then the Ford chairman in Pennsylvania was dealing with our predecessors, the old guard in Delaware County. They had a meeting in which Drew Lewis stampeded the Pennsylvania delegation for a Ford endorsement. I was not too happy about that because I thought Ford was weak, and I liked Ronald Reagan. I thought it was a premature endorsement. Also, I didn't like the fact that Drew Lewis hadn't consulted Charlie Keeler and me. There was a tradition then in Delaware county that the county commissioners were the de facto leaders of the party, as well as the leaders of the government. We did have a party chairman on paper. The same structure exists in Philadelphia. The real leader is behind the scenes. The man who is the leader on paper is not the real leader in fact. The same thing exists in Delaware county today. Long after I left, the real leader is John McNichol. The person who appears

on paper as the leader is a man by the name of Thomas Judge, who was a fine man, but he's not the real leader. John McNichol is the real leader. That occurred then. The county commissioners were in a strong leadership position. We intended to exert our - I did, I would say - our role in statewide politics because of our size and ability to produce victories. I wanted to send a message to these gentlemen that even though I was a woman and we were all very friendly, (Drew Lewis was a dear friend and still is, and he had been a very good friend of my husband) that he should have consulted with me and with Charlie Keeler before he directed the Delaware county delegation, in cahoots with our predecessors who were out of office, to endorse Ford over Reagan.

Consequently, I took an interest in the delegates who were selected for the Republican convention that year. I made sure that they were delegates that I could speak to and I could influence, and were essentially loyal to me and to Charlie, and not to the old guard. The reason we were able to do that is because the old guard in the county didn't pay attention to national politics. They were caught up in local politics and in the townships and matters of parking tickets and local arrests and they had no interest, hardly any interest in anything outside the borders of the county, much less the state or the nation. They didn't care about who went to the Republican convention. Therefore, I was able to influence the choice of the delegates.

Q: Who does choose?

WHITTLESEY: In Pennsylvania they run. But you see, we had such a strong party organization that the candidates the party endorsed would automatically be elected. The candidates that were endorsed were decided upon in the offices of the county commissioners after discussions with various political leaders.

We put together a slate of candidates for the convention. I went to the convention as an alternate delegate. Drew Lewis made me an alternate delegate in 1976. Just before the convention I got a call from Schweiker and Charlie Black, who was working for Schweiker, that they wanted our support and the support of our delegates for Ronald Reagan. I had questions about Ford's campaign abilities. I saw him come into Philadelphia and go to the wrong places and campaign in the city of Philadelphia when there weren't enough Republican votes to warrant those trips to the city of Philadelphia. He should have been out in the suburbs where he could have won a big vote. I first met Jim Baker there in that meeting. Jim Baker was working with Ford.

I remember sitting at the meeting with Jim Baker and William Coleman. I made my arguments about why Ford should not be wasting his time in the city and he should be going out where the votes were. I got the feeling they didn't take me too seriously. I did meet Jim Baker then. That was my first acquaintance with him.

I was involved in this presidential effort. During the convention, if you recall, there was a big struggle between Ford and Reagan. The Pennsylvania delegation was headed by Drew Lewis. Senator Schweiker, who was Drew Lewis' good friend, was chosen as the vice presidential candidate by Reagan, I believe, because they thought that Schweiker

could pull the Pennsylvania delegation away from Drew Lewis who was for Ford. But, unfortunately, the people working for Reagan then, Frank Donatelli, did not do his political homework. At that time Schweiker was not popular in Pennsylvania. At that time he was such a far-out liberal Republican that he was virtually booed out of the Republican caucus in the Pennsylvania legislature when he came to speak because he had flip-flopped on so many issues. He was so liberal that he was out of touch with the views of most of the other Republicans in the state. By naming Schweiker as his vice presidential candidate, Reagan didn't get anything in Pennsylvania.

Q: And Schweiker?

WHITTLESEY: Was not able to split the delegation away from the control of Drew Lewis, who was solidly for Ford. Drew is a masterful politician. To this day. I, however, was a conservative and a strong supporter of Ronald Reagan. I was a little bit annoyed at Drew for what he had done. But, more importantly, I really believed in Ronald Reagan. For what Drew had done in terms of manipulating the Pennsylvania delegation for Ford very early, I admired his skill but I believed that my views were more closely identified with Ronald Reagan than with Gerald Ford. So I held out for Ronald Reagan. The delegates that were there, five of them from Delaware county, looked to me for leadership. They too held out for Ronald Reagan which infuriated Drew Lewis. I was working with the Schweiker-Reagan people. I knew that Schweiker couldn't get anymore delegates from Delaware County than mine. I was for Reagan for reasons apart from Schweiker. In fact, I was dismayed that Schweiker was selected in view of his very liberal record. Schweiker changed back and became a conservative later on. Now we're very good friends. But at that time he was a far-out Republican liberal.

The Delaware county delegates held out for Reagan through the fight over Rule 16C. Now Drew was very, very upset with me. I was an embarrassment to him. He knew these delegates were looking to me for leadership. He was being embarrassed nationally because Pennsylvania was not unanimous for Ford. The delegates received certain indirect incentives to use a polite word, to change their votes. They played very hard ball with those delegates. Bill Meehan, my old mentor from the city of Philadelphia, the famous Republican leader in Philadelphia, spoke to me very seriously.

[Break in tape]

Drew was very, very angry and sent various people to talk to me. I held out with the delegates. They were all terrific. We were for Ronald Reagan. We held out through 16C which was really the end of the fight. After the vote on 16C, which was a procedural vote, Ronald Reagan knew that he had lost although he came very, very close. He admitted defeat. Then we threw in the towel and supported the team and worked for Ford. And worked very hard. We went all out as team players and worked in the Ford campaign.

I tried to get Ford to come out to the suburbs. He lost Pennsylvania by 125,000 votes. He should have spent more time in the Philadelphia suburbs where he could have harvested a

big Republican vote. He could have won Pennsylvania but his campaign strategy was wrong in Pennsylvania. We had one big event at the Valley Forge Theater in the Round. Three thousand people. I introduced Ford. It's this picture right here. I'll show you.

Q: Oh, yes. Isn't that great. And that's during the actual introduction?

WHITTLESEY: That's the introduction.

Q: Oh, for heaven's sakes, that's a wonderful picture, isn't it?

WHITTLESEY: Ford was terrific that night. It was the best impromptu performance he gave. He just walked around the stage without notes, answering the questions of people and talking to them informally. Usually he came across as being rather wooden, stiff and clumsy. He was very graceful and eloquent that evening. He looks so tired. My heart went out to him. People were badgering him, asking him to sign programs. He was exhausted. But it was a great success for him and it was an important event in the campaign in Pennsylvania. But he lost the state.

That was '76. After the presidential campaign we went on with our efforts in the county to rebuild the Republican party, to run the government in a way that won the respect of the people. We had candidates running every year. I had three full-time jobs. I had to be a mother and run my home and family. I was the de facto behind the scenes leader in Haverford township, my home base. We had to raise all the money. I had to deal with all the committee people, identify the candidates, figure out to win, deal with all their problems. That was a full-time job. I was a de facto leader in the county. That took an enormous amount of time. Then, of course, I had my elected job, running the county government, helping Charlie Keeler who was really a skilled, superb administrator. He relieved me of many of the day-to-day details. The major strategy we devised together. We worked closely together and I respected him enormously. It was a huge budget. Three thousand employees. Bigger than five states of the union. With a hostile press. We had the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin to deal with on a daily basis, an aggressive Democratic newspaper. They had a mission to tarnish our reputations. We had a minority Democratic commissioner. They always gave him a lot of ink. His name was William Spingler. They ran the Democratic party in the county out of his office. It was hot and heavy.

Spingler was always going after me. We had strikes of county employees when we downsized staff. We had to cut down. We tried to reduce spending. I was portrayed as being Mrs. Ebenezer Scrooge. Because my father never made more than \$100 a week in his life, I was very conscious of what was being provided for indigent children as compared to what families could afford for their own children, families in a county where the median income for a family of four at that time was \$11,000 a year. It was basically a blue-collar county. We had one dispute over piano lessons for children on welfare I made the point it was unfair for taxpayers, families who couldn't afford piano lessons for their own children, to have to provide for piano lessons for children who were in the care of the county. We were struggling with the whole concept of the social welfare system and the tax burden it imposed on the middle class. Middle class morale and support for the

welfare system were eroding because they sensed there were gross inequities in what they were being asked to pay in taxes and the benefits afforded to those who did not work and were viewed as “undeserving” poor. We had these challenges. The social workers wore black armbands and picketed the county buildings. We had to cross picket lines. We had strikes, for example when social worker case loads were increased from 20 to 50. My mother was a social worker. She had a case load of 200. But these people picketed and wore armbands when their case loads were increased from 20 to 50!.

Of course, ideally, every social worker would have a case load of five. But we simply could not balance the needs of all the people and allow that to occur. We had to make some hard decisions. And we had to let people go. We had to do all the things that executives have to do which take courage. There is always an adverse reaction. The county employees union was stirred up by the old guard. They were against us and they blamed me. I was the dragon lady, the one responsible. Actually the decisions were reached together, but I was the target. I also had to deal with the other powerful political leader in the county who was John McNichol then. He represented the old regime. He’s a very bright, Irish politician about my age. Very well-educated. But strictly local in outlook. He was content to deal with his little municipalities and their problems and didn’t have much of an interest in national politics, although he’s probably conservative if pressed. I used to meet with him every morning in my office. Every single morning. He would come and sit and we would discuss the affairs of the day and of the week and how to steer the county and the Republican party of the county through the shoals of the hostile press and the Democratic opposition.

Q: And his position was?

WHITTLESEY: He had no official position.

Q: He had no official position.

WHITTLESEY: He was a department head. He was head of the computer office in the county.

Q: I see.

WHITTLESEY: The reason he had no official position was because I don’t think he wanted to file a financial disclosure report. He never wanted to be an elected official or a high-level appointed official because he never wanted to be in a position to have to file a financial disclosure. We never imposed it on him. We didn’t require the department heads in the county to file financial disclosures. That probably was a mistake.

After my husband died, his estate was bankrupt and the litigation involving the estate went on for seven years. There were big tax bills owed and he had made some transfers to our children before he died which became the subject of litigation. In the end it was settled. There were years that he had made substantial amounts of money so that there were tax bills for those years. The biggest creditor turned out to be the IRS, during the

years when he had made a lot of money speculating in the silver market and in gold coins. He was a coin collector. He was the one who first took me to Zurich. After I won the primary for my Pennsylvania house seat in 1972, we went on a trip to Europe. He was doing very well then in his business and he took me on a trip to London and Zurich. I was five months pregnant. He went to Zurich for the purposes of his coin collection. When I came back I was sprouting. Before that during the primary, I was hiding the fact that I was pregnant because I didn't want the voters to know it. Afterwards it was impossible, I'd gained so much weight. I was really showing.

Q: That was your big baby, the ten-pounder.

WHITTLESEY: Yes, the big one. Almost ten pounds. In 1978 I decided to run for Lieutenant Governor. I had a clear field. There was no real opposition that had surfaced and I was getting a lot of favorable publicity. I was ambitious. Why not? However, Drew Lewis was still very angry with me, not only for embarrassing him with the Ford-Reagan effort in '76 but also because in the preceding year, Charlie Keeler and I had displaced the long-time chairman of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority in a coup. The person we deposed was a very close friend of Drew Lewis. His name was James McConnen. He had held the chairman of the authority for ten years. Charlie Keeler and I came in as county commissioners and we were not pleased with the administration of the authority. Our county was a major contributor to it. The jurisdiction of the authority included the city of Philadelphia and the four suburban counties. We spoke to Mr. McConnen; and asked him to come out to our offices to discuss changes. He refused even to consider the possibility that we had anything constructive to say to him. He was quite arrogant. So we made an alliance with the city of Philadelphia, the Democrats in the city of Philadelphia, and got the votes to depose Mr. McConnen. He was one of the most powerful figures in the region. The person who was elected to replace him was my ward leader, from the fifth ward of Haverford township. He was duly elected chairman of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority which made major headlines all over the region McConnen had an iron grip on this authority for ten years. He was voted out. John McMurray who came in as chairman was then working for the telephone company. His job was threatened. He was frightened, scared to death because he was put under all kinds of pressure through his employers. He stayed a little over a year, but he did a good job and tried to make some changes. A steering committee was put together of the member governments to reform SEPTA. I was elected chairman of it. We prepared a report. It was called the Member Government Steering Committee for the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority. It was made up of representatives of all the county governments surrounding the city and the city itself.

These events made a lot of people in the city of Philadelphia very unhappy because I had taken on the establishment. They were not pleased. They were friends of my husband's father and my mother-in-law's family. For example, the legal counsel to this Authority was a very good friend of my mother-in-law's brother. Lucrative contracts that they had had year after year were now in jeopardy. Now all of these contracts were thrown into a state of confusion. They no longer had solid control of this authority and the non-bid contracts that were dispensed by the chairman and the board. They blamed me. And it

was true. I took the risk and did it with Charlie Keeler. I'm not sorry to this day. I think the authority is much improved. But I incurred the wrath of many important people in the city of Philadelphia and surrounding areas.

When I decided to run for Lieutenant Governor, they got nervous so they went over to Switzerland and found young Bill Scranton, who at that time had a pony tail and a beard and was married to a lady whom he met living with a guru in a transcendental meditation group in Switzerland. They fixed him up, young Bill Scranton, and put him in the race against me, knowing that with the name of Scranton and a state like Pennsylvania that it was likely people would vote for Scranton thinking that they were voting for the father, not knowing it was the son. I had a very tough race for Lieutenant Governor against this young man who was then about thirty years old. I didn't handle it very well because it was the first time in my life that I had been confronted by something which for me didn't seem to be fair. That someone could be successful not based upon his achievements or skill, but on his family name alone. It seemed to me to be so unfair and I was very bitter about it. He and I were the principal contenders in the race even though there were other candidates. He called me "the Duchess from Delaware;" I called him "Son of Father." We were not too friendly. I did some research about his background, my campaign workers did, and found out that his father had purchased a newspaper for him at some point in his career after he graduated from Yale. The newspaper advocated such things as the legalization of marijuana. He had been a McGovern Democrat - a McGovern liberal. I tried to expose all these things about his background at that time. But I was running for lieutenant governor and there was an important gubernatorial race taking place at the same time. The newspapers were not so much interested in our race. However to jump forward in time, all of it came out again when Scranton ran for governor in 1986, which race he lost largely because of this information which came out about his past during the lieutenant governor race. His feelings about the Vietnam war, his transcendental meditation, unusual lifestyle and the fact that he was a very liberal Republican didn't help.

I had tried to bring it all out in 1978. There were other candidates - about seven - but most of them were far behind., I campaigned all over the state, spent a lot of money, raised money. Pennsylvania is a very large state. Going to every little town, I was so bored hearing myself give the same speeches over and over again. Every little radio station and every dinner. It was a good learning experience. I went all over the state into almost every county. There are 67 counties in Pennsylvania. Some of them have more cows than people. I learned about the vastness of the state and its richness. Of course I'd seen that diversity in the Pennsylvania legislature, but I hadn't traveled the state so extensively.

Q: The final outcome?

WHITTLESEY: The final outcome was that the top vote-getter in the two races for governor and lieutenant governor was young Bill Scranton because people thought they were voting for his father, the former governor. The second highest vote-getter was Dick Thornburg who was running for governor. So young Scranton got more votes even than the candidate running for governor. I was third in a field of 14 in the Republican primary.

Q: Very good.

WHITTLESEY: I was third. Then came Arlen Specter who is the U.S. senator now. He was running for governor against Thornburg. And Bob Butera, the majority leader of the Pennsylvania house, was another very popular candidate running for governor. I was third highest vote getter after Scranton and Thornburg. Drew Lewis supported Scranton and of course “the establishment” supported Scranton. My Irish friends supported me, that is, the Republican leader of Philadelphia and, of course, Delaware county.

I was bitter because it seemed that young Bill Scranton had not done anything on his own in his life. I didn't behave very well the night of the election. I didn't call him up and offer congratulations. I should have but I didn't. Later I did, but I didn't that night. I was not a gracious loser, which I regret. Fortunately I had a good friend, another member of the county council who came to me afterward and engineered a reconciliation between young Bill Scranton and me. And I then congratulated him. We did become friends after that. Thornburg was elected governor, young Bill Scranton was elected lieutenant governor and he served as lieutenant governor for eight years. Then when his time came to run for governor, he lost, because he really didn't have a “fire in the belly” and all the information about his past came out. Then he left the state and took off for California.

Q: Did he?

WHITTLESEY: Now he's in California. Many people have come up to me since to say that had I been lieutenant governor and had I been running instead of Scranton, we would not have lost the state to the Democrats which happened of course in '86 when Bob Casey became governor. As things come full circle now I'm getting numerous calls from various friends and supporters to run for governor next year because Casey will be running for second term and the Republicans do not have a strong candidate. Scranton is apparently no longer interested in politics. There were many people who were very nervous about his candidacy when he was being nominated to run for governor and tried to get Drew Lewis to run. Drew Lewis came close to entering the race. I encouraged Drew to run, but he chose not to upset the Scranton applecart. Drew withdrew and did not seek the nomination. Scranton thus became the candidate and lost, which was devastating for the Republican party, for the county party leaders because in Pennsylvania the governor is the most important political position.

Q: You made the comment that you didn't run it as well as you should have?

WHITTLESEY: No I didn't. I wasn't gracious in defeat. I think I did everything that I could have for a statewide campaign. But I just wasn't very gracious in defeat. Then I had some nasty liberal reporters that kept dogging my steps because they wanted to help bring about my defeat.

By the way young Bill Scranton came to my swearing in as ambassador. He was then lieutenant governor.

Q: Did he?

WHITTLESEY: He made a very nice speech in my behalf. We had been reconciled at that point for some time. He made a funny comment. He said, "Faith ran against me for lieutenant governor and now she's going off to Switzerland and I'm on the chicken dinner circuit in Pennsylvania. And I'm not sure who really won that race after all."

Q: That's cute.

WHITTLESEY: I don't think he ever really wanted to be governor. I believe he was encouraged by various people to enter the race but I don't think he had it in his heart to campaign hard enough for it.

In the meantime, I was building up the county Republican organization. In '79 we had another successful county election. I was re-elected to the county government in '79. Shortly after Thornburgh and Scranton were elected, Drew Lewis approached me and wanted to have a reconciliation. He said, "I'm now for Ronald Reagan and we need to get together." I remember being sick with a terrible cold at home in bed. I got a call from Schweiker again. Dick Schweiker. Would I consider joining the Pennsylvania Reagan for President effort? Would I consider being one of the leaders of the Reagan for President campaign in Pennsylvania? I said, "Of course, yes, I'm a Reagan supporter."

I believe my quick acceptance was a surprise to him. Drew Lewis and I thus affected reconciliation and formed the Reagan for President Committee in Pennsylvania. It was very small. Dick Schweiker, Drew Lewis, Dave Christopher who's now here in New York and Tom Gola. I think that's about it. Maybe five of us. I remember taking the train to Washington by myself to go down to a press conference to announce the formation of the Pennsylvania Reagan for President Committee. There was Scheiker, Drew Lewis, me, Tom Gola, the former basketball star and Dave Christopher. That's all.

Q: How do you spell Gola?

WHITTLESEY: G-O-L-A. He was a former basketball star from Philadelphia. Hardly anybody came to the press conference. I went back and started enlisting support for Ronald Reagan. I remember I got all kinds of excuses. It was too early, and he's too old. He's a movie actor and not going to win, and we're for Bush, we're for Connally. He's from California, we don't know anybody there. All kinds of reasons. People wrote me letters why they couldn't support Ronald Reagan. Unfortunately my local county leaders again were not interested in the national contest. They were interested in the local township school board races and other local matters which were very important to the people in those communities. They were content to leave the state and national politics to me. Meanwhile we had built up a very powerful Republican organization. What I had been doing all these years was to build a powerful Republican organization which as it turned out could be delivered in the old traditional political sense to Ronald Reagan which is what I did. The other leaders in the county didn't care. They thought it would

keep me busy I suppose worrying about national politics, and so if I said we were for Ronald Reagan that's okay. They'll be for Ronald Reagan. So they were. The county political leaders used to come in to my office, some from the other municipalities. He was from California, they were a little bit nervous. I said, don't worry, trust me, it's going to be okay. I remember after Iowa's they all came in with very long faces. He Iowa. They thought you've gotten us backing the wrong horse. We like to be with the winner, and they wanted to jump off the bandwagon. I said, "Oh, no, you can't do that. Trust me. Everything is going to be okay."

Q: By this time did you know Reagan personally?

WHITTLESEY: I met him in '76. I tried to get Charlie Keeler to be a Reagan supporter. He was cautious. He didn't want to take the leap of faith. Lots of other people weren't ready. I tried to persuade them. I said "Believe me, he's going to win. Don't you want to be with the winner?" Many of these people were not interested in philosophy, but they were interested in being with the winner which motivates most people in politics. There are only a very small number motivated by ideals and philosophy. Those people are very committed, but they're a very small number.

So again we had the problem of choosing delegates. Again, in the county machine - organization, (machine is a pejorative word, but I don't think of it in the pejorative sense) we were in the position that the delegates that we chose to endorse would win. We picked our delegates. They were all people I knew were privately pledged to Ronald Reagan, mainly because I had asked them to be pledged and they really didn't care. But they were for Ronald Reagan. Drew, meanwhile, was going around the state as was I, getting delegates to run who were pledged to Ronald Reagan. Privately pledged. We sought people who were powerful. If the particular county didn't have a big machine like we had that could elect candidates, then we got people who were well-known, who would be supporters of Ronald Reagan, but who could win in their own right on their own.

Bush, Reagan's principal opponent, meanwhile was coming into the state, spending a lot of money. He didn't have a very adept political team. So his money was largely wasted. As it turned out he won what is called the popularity contest. In the preferential presidential primary you vote for the candidate you would like. Reagan was not well-known. Pennsylvania is a very liberal state, so Bush spent a million dollars and won the preference primary; but the rules of Pennsylvania are such that those presidential preference primaries don't mean anything. They're not binding on the selection of delegates. Meanwhile Drew Lewis, Schweiker and I knew the rules knew delegates didn't have to announce their allegiance in advance and so we got Reagan delegates elected. When the primary election was over, Reagan had won all the delegates; Bush had won the popularity contest after spending a million dollars. Reagan had spent hardly any money. Drew Lewis was a master. His team had outsmarted George Bush. He won the presidential primary but we had all the delegates at the convention for Ronald Reagan.

Q: Isn't that interesting.

WHITTLESEY: So that result catapulted Drew Lewis immediately into national attention in Reagan's eyes. It showed what a masterful politician he was. Schweicker, by the way, had receded into the background. He was not really so interested and active any more. He was not interested in the knock-down, drag-out political struggles. I think he was tired. Also he had decided not to run for the Senate. I remember trying to persuade him to run again for the Senate. By this time, he was a conservative again. He said, "No, I'm too tired. I simply can't do it. I can't face campaigning this big state again." So we had another problem in addition to getting Reagan elected; we didn't have a candidate for the U.S. Senate.

Drew Lewis and I were working very closely together so we had Pennsylvania in the Reagan camp. The delegates going to the Republican convention were primarily Reagan delegates. Pennsylvania was the first large industrial state in the east for Reagan. It was a major prize. Nobody could figure out how Reagan got it. Because all the other liberal states were for George Bush, the moderate, or Connally or somebody else, but not Ronald Reagan the conservative. It was a master stroke and as a result of the convention, we were in a very strong position.

Then another sidelight. Drew Lewis tried to persuade me to run for the Senate seat. We had no candidate. I tried to persuade him to run. The then governor with whom Drew Lewis didn't get along so well, Dick Thornburgh, had his own candidate. A man on the Delaware County Council by the name of Bud Haberstad who was Thornburgh's fair-haired boy at the time. He was going to support Bud Haberstad. I had recruited Bud Haberstad to be candidate for the Delaware County Council. He then decided he could by-pass me and go on to win the favor of the governor which he did. I was determined that nobody was going to do that to me in politics. If I allowed it, I would have lost credibility as a political leader. Therefore Drew and I were going to find another candidate to oppose Mr. Haberstad. We were quite sure we could win. Many people said Haberstad is going to do it. The governor will win and his candidate will win. I remember saying to my good friend, Matt Ryan, just you watch. I don't take kindly to people in politics who used and abused and were not loyal. He was one of those.

He was like many businessmen, Bud Haberstad, who entered the political arena and thought. gee this is easy; I can do this. He was very talented but he didn't understand the intense loyalty that is such an important part of the political life. You simply don't do that to someone who - and I was responsible for bringing him in in the first place. I recruited him, I sold him to the others. Anyway, Haberstad was defeated. Drew tried to persuade me to run; I said no I'm too tired. I can't do it. We've been working in this county for lo these many years and I've been running myself as a candidate, as a delegate, or running candidates for almost how many years now? '72, almost ten years. I was tired. I just didn't have the stomach for it. Drew, you run. No. All right then we'll go and find Arlen Specter. We'll get Arlen Specter to run. So we got Arlen Specter to run. He defeated Haberstad in the primary. He's now the U.S. Senator.

Actually on reflection, Haberstad would have been more conservative. Maybe I let personal feelings interfere. However, I was a woman in politics and I was a political leader and you simply can't allow people to walk all over you or else more and more of

them do it. As a woman who wielded some political power which I did, I had to maintain my power base.

Q: Yes, I can understand that.

WHITTLESEY: I was one of very few women who wielded political power and I believe I understood how to do it. I learned from watching other people. I certainly made a lot of mistakes but I knew that to hold on to political power you couldn't let a young upstart defeat you.

Q: And this would be true of a man or a woman?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. A man or a woman.

Q: That is to say, you have to defend your territory.

WHITTLESEY: You have to defend your territory and your prerogatives. I helped a lot of bright young people along the way. I supported them and encouraged them and of all the people that I helped and encouraged and sponsored in politics, a very very small number disappointed me, I would say. Those disappointments were big. One was Haberstad, and the other one was the man that I sponsored to take my seat in the Pennsylvania Legislature. He was a young representative by the name of Steven Friend, I was so very impressed by that young man. He was so bright and able. He had been a Democrat, but he had switched like many at that time; I had been a Democrat too. He became a Republican. I wanted someone of ability. I thought he could win, but the big problem was getting him nominated. He was a newcomer. I used my political power, which I had accumulated at tremendous cost to myself and over time with tremendous investment in time and energy, to push his nomination through. But for my pushing it through he would never, ever to this day, have that seat. But I did it. In a special endorsement meeting, I just muscled it through in the old political jargon. I told them this is the best for our community. He should be our state representative. Now on reflection, I think I probably made a mistake because even though he's very bright; he has certain personal qualities of character that are certainly troubling.

His name is Stephen Friend. He has written a book. He was also a writer. He wrote a book called God's Children about his experiences in politics. He is still a member of the Pennsylvania House. He is the leading proponent of the pro-life position in the Pennsylvania House. He's very well known all over the state. But, he will never in my opinion rise above the House because he's made so many enemies along the way that people simply don't trust him and are so afraid that he will turn around and put a knife in their back if they so much as turn aside for a moment. You may run across a copy of his book. I am in the book with another name, and so are various other people who worked with him over this time. Many people today, I suppose, blame me for creating him. But he is very able and he does represent his district well, but he is not personally loyal to his friends. It's interesting. I was warned against him by two of my very close friends in the Pennsylvania Legislature. The leaders of the legislature warned about his character; I

disregarded their advice and did it anyway.

I don't mean that he's dishonest or that he drinks or gambles or whatever. He's not. He's a model family man and a devoted father and husband, but in political relationships he's just not trustworthy. And he's not liked. But he does an outstanding job as an advocate for the pro-life position most of the time. Sometimes he gets carried away but he's a very formidable advocate. He's a brilliant lawyer and a brilliant debater. We are very lucky, because I am pro-life also. We are very lucky to have him as an advocate. But he was one who disappointed me. He became the state legislator as a result of my efforts and shortly thereafter tried to displace my position, as leader in my local community and put in one of his own. I had to spend enormous energy beating back his takeover attempts, which I did. Then he ran another candidate against one of my candidates in my home ward for township commissioner, and of course there was a lot of publicity because people knew about the falling out that we had had. He claimed he was going to win. He didn't win; he lost.

Q: Did he?

WHITTLESEY: His candidate lost. My candidate won. It was tough because he was an Italian candidate in an Irish district running against an Irish candidate. I was on the phone up to the last minute during the election. My brother didn't even help me. They had no idea of the significance of this little contest. I was on the phone myself calling voters the last four hours and urging them to come to the polls and please vote. We won by 32 votes.

Q: Is that so?

WHITTLESEY: That was a big contest. I had to do all of this to maintain my power base, because there were always insurrections. It happens in politics. It would happen with a man too, although I think less so. They used to call us "the skirts" because the lady I installed as the political leader in Haverford township was the mother of three Eagle Scouts. She was a lady. She was there and I was the behind-the-scenes leader. She was the leader on paper and she did most of the work - all of the work. The men used to call us "the skirts." They were always devising plots to overthrow us. But they didn't succeed. She finally moved out of the township. But she was interested only in good government. She wasn't interested in jobs or anything. Part of the responsibility in being a politician in Delaware County was the involvement in what is called political patronage. It was a political patronage operation. People who were involved in the party were placed in jobs depending on their qualifications. I was scrupulous. I tried to make sure that we didn't put someone who was a hairdresser in a job as a computer operator. We insisted on not abusing the system. At the same time if there were two candidates and one had worked in the political campaign or whose family had and another who had done nothing, we would of course choose the one who had. I felt I was running a constant employment agency. People would approach me at cocktail parties and ask to be considered for contracts, for jobs. It got to the point where I really didn't like to go out so much any more. When I was married to my husband, when he was alive, we went to lots of social events in the city. I

had a whole closetful of evening gowns. After he died, (he was part of the old Philadelphia establishment), I was not invited so much any more. Also I was involved in Delaware County Republican politics and there was a certain stigma associated with being involved with the Delaware County political machine. It was called the "war board." It had been called the "war board" in the old days before we came into office. Main Line people at cocktail parties used to laugh about it and make snide remarks. Of course they benefited from the tremendous Republican majorities that Delaware County provided. Nonetheless they loved to ridicule it. I was definitely a part of it. I was Irish. I felt that I was in a sense returning to my own roots because it was a blue-collar county even though I lived on the Main Line and my husband's family was part of that world. Not that I was happier, but I felt very much at ease in the community of the blue-collar constituency. When I campaigned in the county or around the state I think people felt I was not to the manner born myself, they knew that they could somehow feel comfortable with me. Even though I was a graduate of Penn Law School and Wells College, I could associate with them.

It was interesting that socially I was not quite acceptable in Philadelphia. Of course, my husband, during the time my husband was still alive, I was, but afterward it didn't continue. I knew that I had a purpose to rebuild this Republican organization which could then... I had a feeling that I understood political power. I knew what it was. I didn't know quite how I would use it in the future, but I knew that there would be an opportunity to use it. And I did use it. I used it to help elect Ronald Reagan. But I didn't know that when I started building it. It was my goal to accumulate political power, which I would then use, not for personal aggrandizement, because I really didn't care about money or buying apartment houses or controlling zoning boards for my personal enrichment. That I never did. I, at that point, was a conservative and I knew that the way to implement ideas is to have political power. But the process of building up political power is painstaking, slow work. And most people are not willing to do it. I hear a lot of women candidates today complaining they don't get money - that's baloney. I don't believe it. Money will come to any candidate who has a reasonable chance of winning. Women for the most part have not entered the world of political power wielding. I have brought a lot of women into my effort. In fact my greatest supporter - not greatest, I would say women and men, greatest supporters. But I had some very amusing experiences. I would ask women to go to polling places in very tough elections of various kinds. Not necessarily in ghetto areas, in middle-class areas, but where the men were very rough and tough. On election day it's very much hard-ball. They would sometimes come back in tears after two hours. "The committeeman took away my signs, he used bad language, they were rude to me." They would wear these women down so they would end up in tears. I remember asking these women in a polite Republican women's group in the city of Philadelphia, "We really need you in certain polling places in the city to make sure that everything runs smoothly, that there are no improprieties. "Oh, my dear, we don't do that sort of thing," was the response.

There was a disinclination to get hands dirty. I lived through all of this. This was a man's world. I lived in a man's world. I was accepted as an equal, not because I was smarter or for any other reason but because I knew what the rules were. And I could play according

to their rules. I remember someone once told me how I was described during this period. They said, "She looks like a woman, she thinks like a man, and she fights like a dog."
[Laughter]

Q: That's very good.

WHITTLESEY: Someone else said, "You may get into political battle with Faith Whittlesey but it's unlikely that you'll get into a second one." You may win the first time but it's unlikely that you'll get into a second one. And over the years some I've won and some I've lost, but mostly I won. It required an enormous investment of energy and time. But what I was doing was building up, accumulating political power. At this point I was the highest elected woman in the state of either party, because I was in a majority government in a county larger than five states of the union. We had both executive and legislative power and I was the behind-the-scenes political leader with Charlie Keeler. We wielded a lot of power.

We wielded it in the county, because we chose to use it in certain areas. We chose to invest our capital. You see, sometimes people have political power to influence the course of election but they choose not to use it. We didn't use it every time, but when we chose to invest it, invest that capital, we wanted to win. In every election night we would go in and see the tallies in the county. I would take such enormous pride when the county would turn in huge majorities for any statewide candidate. We'd see the numbers go up and up and up and up. It was the result of tremendous work. Year round. It's very day. Just taking care of the needs of people. "My garbage isn't picked up" and "My dog is dead and my neighbor poisoned my dog." Just endless. But of course what you learn in that effort, first of all, is an understanding of the system. You learn what motivates the American people. This was a microcosm. I read a lot. I concentrated mostly on fiscal issues, local issues. I liked international affairs. I tried to read when I could. I had to read so much just to be current with what I was doing. I knew I wanted to play a role in the state and on the national scene. I had to have something to offer them. There were countless other people, why would they pay attention to me? But they came to me, essentially, because they knew I had something that they needed. That was essentially how it worked during those years.

That campaign catapulted me into the national political scene. Had I not had that experience in the Delaware County courthouse and the state house, I never would have survived in the White House. Because I was really from the provinces when I got to Washington. It was a completely different ball game. But my experiences in the past stood me in good stead.

I used to be a liberal Democrat as I told you. I had become a conservative. I read and I became a supporter of the ideas of Ronald Reagan. I didn't know any other conservatives. Charlie Keeler was a conservative. He read National Review. I didn't know any intellectuals. We didn't know any conservative intellectuals. We didn't even know any other conservatives. I used to read Human Events and National Review, mainly. I really didn't have anybody to talk to about it. There were none, as far as I knew. There were

people I admired in the legislature, William Hutchinson, who's now a judge on the Third Circuit, thanks largely to my efforts to promote him for that position. He was a serious thinker. Pat Gleason, who died, was a member of the legislature. They were quick minds and had good intellects, which I respected, but we never discussed the same things I discuss today with my friends from the Reagan administration. Such subjects were really beyond their ken at that time.

We were worried about the state of the world. I remember thinking where would we go if the U.S. fell apart? Would we go to New Zealand? No, that was no place to go. Canada? We had to make do here. We used to have long talks about where we were headed as a nation based upon what we observed in our own environment.

In the Reagan campaign... first of all, at the convention, I was elected a delegate. One other thing that happened: In 1979, as a result of my efforts for Reagan in '76 I was known to the national conservative movement. I was somebody they had heard of before. The American Council of Young Political Leaders invited me to go on a trip to China to be one of the delegates. So I went in '79 - the summer of '79 - for three weeks.

In our group were two future U.S. senators, Senator Chuck Robb and Kit Bond. They were not senators then. Also Peter McPherson, the deputy secretary of the treasury, former director of AID. Also Bernie Aronson, who is now assistant secretary of state for Latin America. I, myself. Various others. Joe Grandmaison, who was one of Mondale's speechwriters and worked in the Carter White House, I believe. A member of the California legislature. But the two leading figures were Chuck Robb and with whom I'm proudly [a friend] to this day. I think very highly of him. I could sleep more or less peacefully at night if he were president.

Q: Really?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. And I noted that he voted for John Gregg as ambassador to Korea against the line of his own party. I just heard it on the news. And Kit Bond, who has been governor but who was out of office then. And Peter.

Peter McPherson then was a Reagan supporter. I was also, and we worked the Republican members of the that delegation to support Ronald Reagan. We were alone. The others were for somebody else. Kit Bond certainly wasn't for Reagan. It was a very eye-opening experience. I'm musical. We bought a guitar in China. I played the guitar until my fingers bled, literally. I looked down at my hands when I was playing and there was blood on my dress. I didn't realize while I was playing. But we sang and sang American songs and had a really interesting time. Long talks. A wonderful group. And we were able to entertain the Chinese. And ourselves.

I also became acquainted with Pete Dupont during this period. He was then governor of Delaware, a neighboring state. I used to see a fair amount of him. We're still very good friends. Although I didn't support him when he ran for president. I supported Jack Kemp, because my previous stronger allegiance was to Jack Kemp. I met Jack along the way. I

brought these people to Delaware County to speak.

I went to the Republican convention in 1979. I was preparing to go and got a call asking me to - I guess it was from John Tower - asking me to serve as co-chairman of the platform subcommittee on foreign policy and defense with Jack Kemp, which I said I would do. I know the reason I was asked. I was asked because they thought I was reasonably intelligent and that I wasn't a wild woman, that I was a known Reagan supporter and I could be counted on to do the right thing for Ronald Reagan in this area of the platform that was very important to him. So I went out early and said yes, I'd be delighted. So I went out and got to know John Tower. That friendship has lasted to this day.

John Tower and Jack Kemp, and Bud McFarland was the top staff person to the committee. John Lehman was another staff person, former secretary of the Navy. Bud McFarland sat next to me for two weeks, every day. He was very quiet. He was definitely a staff person. He did not assert himself. But very decent and kind and good. And, of course, Jesse Helms was on that committee and a few other congressmen. We had some big issues.

We listened to all the testimony and developed a platform. Then they decided who was going to deliver this. I made the argument to John Tower, which I've made since, that we need to have women as spokesmen on defense policy. We don't want overweight middle-aged men who look like they belong in the Veterans of Foreign Wars. We need to have women. I made that argument successfully and of course he decided he wanted me to deliver the defense plank. I was asked and I saw it as a tremendous opportunity. So I delivered it to the convention. It was not prime time, but I brought the convention to its feet many times.

Q: Did you?

WHITTLESEY: Because there was a lot of what we call "red meat" in that platform section. It had to do with the CIA, basically attacking the Carter defense policy, and setting forth what the changes would be in a Reagan administration. This was, of course, one of the most important aspects of his overall efforts.

Q: Oh, yes.

WHITTLESEY: It was fun. Then we launched into the campaign. Of course I saw all these people, Ed Meese, Mike Deaver. I went around and I did what I had to do. We campaigned around the state. We worked for Ronald Reagan. I got very nervous. I always prefer to think "We're going to lose." I was very nervous about Pennsylvania because it's not a Republican state. The night before the election I was up in the middle of the coal country with a congressman up there. I didn't think he was going to win. He was so discouraged. He was so tired at the end of the campaign. I was very nervous because the coal country are democrats. Going around the tables the people were complaining about Thornburg because he didn't believe much in helping Republican politicians. His

constituency was the media. The Republican party people were quite disillusioned with him. There was a lot of criticism of Thornburg. I was very nervous until the end, preferring to be surprised rather than to be disappointed.

I couldn't believe it the next morning. I woke up and the congressman who had not the foggiest idea that he would ever win had won. Of course Reagan won the state by, I think, over 300,000 votes.

Then I was deluged by people who came out of the woodwork from nowhere wanting to have jobs. I was amazed, because when we were trying to man phone banks and get people to help as volunteers they were nowhere to be seen. I could not believe the arrogance of people. I got so many letters you couldn't believe. We had to devise a system of justifying people who wanted jobs and thought they were entitled because of their brilliance and their experience and whatever. It was a real shock.

But I had no intention of going to Washington. Drew Lewis kept asking me during the course of the campaign "What do you want?" I said, "Don't ask me that question." In fact they even shouted at me once because I was saying we were losing. I was saying to the national campaign staff that things weren't going well. I always run scared. I always prefer to find what we're doing wrong in the campaign and correct it and fix it rather than wake up after the election and find we didn't do enough. But Ronald Reagan was a charmer. For example, in Pennsylvania one day the speaker system broke. He was supposed to give a speech outside and there was a platform and there was some music being piped in. Anyway something didn't work - the microphone didn't work. But you could hear the piped music. So he was up there on the platform and it was very awkward. There were a couple of hundred people or a thousand people, I forget. So he just took Nancy by the hand up on the stage and started dancing. Everybody cheered. He was good dancer.

Q: He has the touch.

WHITTLESEY: He knew what to do to make everybody relax. So what if the system doesn't work?. Let them fix it. We'll dance up here until it's fixed.

But I also saw Nancy, I remember one occasion on a bus, specifically. I was sitting in front of them and they were just in the regular seats of the bus. He was sitting by the window and she was sitting next to him. He was waving to the people who were waving at him. He was putting up his hand by the window to wave at the people. And Nancy very quickly, very gently, put her hand on his arm, took down the window hand and pushed up the other hand, so that he would wave with the other hand. So as not to block the view of his face. I saw it with my own eyes. [Laughter] The day after he announced that he was running for president, his first stop was in Delaware County, Pennsylvania. He came to Folcroft, Pennsylvania, which was a blue-collar town, a median income of \$11,000 a year. It was a factory town. I had arranged it there. He was in a fire hall. I have all the pictures. It was his first campaign stop. It was symbolic of where he was going to go, and we discussed this with the campaign staff. I said, "No he's not going to go to Bryn Mawr, the Main Line! He should go to Folcroft or a place like Folcroft because these are the

people that will support Ronald Reagan. They will make the difference in the election, not the Main Line.”

It was interesting to me how the people on the Main Line changed. After Ronald Reagan got nominated they were all for Ronald Reagan, except that on the Main Line we had very big difficulty getting our phone banks manned. They wouldn't come out and help, whereas we didn't have any trouble over in the blue-collar areas. We had hundreds of volunteers. People were anxious to come, but we had a lot of trouble in the upper middle class areas because Ronald Reagan didn't go to Princeton. He wasn't exactly one of their soulmates.

Q: “Not one of us.”

WHITTLESEY: “Not one of us.” It always amused me, therefore, later on, when they said he was the candidate of the rich. He wasn't. He was the candidate of the middle class. From them he drew his strength, his political strength, not from the traditional Republican establishment, who were against him.

Q: Yes, they were.

WHITTLESEY: I brought him out to the Delaware County courthouse. In fact here are the pictures. I remember that occasion. Nobody was really overjoyed to have him. That was in '79.

Q: How things change.

WHITTLESEY: But I was amazed, I guess, by the reaction of the older women. The then older women. They remembered him as a movie star. I didn't remember him as a movie star. He was a heartthrob as a movie star. I was embarrassed that day because he didn't give a very good speech. He got some things mixed up. Some days he gives great speeches and other days he doesn't. He's like anybody else. But that day he didn't really give a very good speech.

Carla Hills was there, and I remember thinking then she was not an outstanding public speaker. She wasn't there then. She came for Ford. That's right. I remember thinking then that she came to campaign for Ford. She was not there with Ronald Reagan. But I remember my impression of her then.

We took him around. He came into that area because I insisted that whenever he came into the region he should go where the votes were, not waste his time in the city of Philadelphia which was primarily Democratic.

Q: And he listened to you?

WHITTLESEY: He listened, they listened. The whole campaign staff was more attuned then to our suggestions. We had our headquarters in the city of Philadelphia and Dick

Fox was the chairman in the state. He was a friend of Drew Lewis's and a conservative. I was a co-chairman. Dick had not been involved in politics for a long time. He was kind of a citizen-chairman. But he was good. Drew Lewis and I were co-chairmen.

The night before he went back to California at the end of the campaign, he also came to Delaware County, so first and last in 1980. I remember then trying to get a band. We couldn't get anybody to play. We expected 3,000 people at Upper Darby High School. Then it was pretty clear that he was going to win. Finally, we persuaded a Catholic high school band, Cardinal Dougherty band, to play. All the other teachers had all kinds of excuses. It was partisan, they didn't want to involve themselves. We got Cardinal Dougherty to play, Reagan was late so they had to play for a long time. The kids got very tired. I was really grateful because it was the last night, almost, before the election.

There's an interesting sidelight to this, too. Later on, after he won, and we were putting together the inaugural parade, Pennsylvania got to choose two bands to play. Drew Lewis, of course, asked me what did I think? Of course we had the Mummers. "Yes, the Mummers are very important, but Drew, we simply have to remember our friends." So I urged that the Cardinal Dougherty band be allowed to march in the inaugural parade. It was accepted and we [also] had the Mummers band who are almost professionals. We're very proud of them. And I was sitting in the VIP box with the president and his party and Drew and others on inaugural day parade. All of a sudden, down the street, Pennsylvania Avenue, I saw a band coming, walking not in very straight lines, obviously tired, not very professional in appearance. I thought, "Oh, no, what is this?" It was the Cardinal Dougherty band. The kids, whatever they were, were tired. They played all right but they simply... I remember thinking, "Oh, I'm sorry." They had these high-stepping Texas A & M bands that could have done a Broadway show. Then we had the Cardinal Dougherty band weaving on the streets, looking really pathetic. It was an embarrassment. I remember hearing someone saying in the audience, "Who picked this band?" [Laughter] I looked down at the floor. Cardinal Dougherty is a great high school in Pennsylvania. The kids, I think had been out late. They were overtired and they simply were not prepared, as perhaps they should have been, for this competition, which is what it was, a national competition.

Through the campaign with Ronald Reagan... I'm trying to think, I wrote op-ed pieces in the newspaper. On election night I did a TV commentary, I was asked to do it on one of the major networks with Ed Rendell representing Carter. It was over very quickly. The night of the debates I was in the television studios too. I think I did a commentary after the debate, too. I remember seeing the people in the studio saying that it was over after ten minutes of the debate. That Ronald Reagan had won.

In the campaign we had to deal with all the ethnic groups. I didn't really know Helene von Damm. (U.S. Ambassador to Austria 1983-85) I didn't get to know her. Somehow our paths never crossed.

Anyway, after the election, I was determined to go back and practice law at Wolf, Bloch, Shor which I had joined. I'd joined this large Philadelphia law firm (Wolf, Bloch, Shor,

and Solis Cohen) on a very part-time basis because I wanted to make some money and go back to the practice of law. I was going to withdraw from politics, not run for the Delaware County Council again. Really get out of politics and make some money, which I needed for my children. I stayed in that law firm for a year. It was one of the biggest law firms in Philadelphia. It was known as a Democratic law firm. I was the house Republican. But I worked there only on a very part-time basis because I had my full-time elected job., It wasn't legally full-time but it took a lot of time. I had everything else, plus the Reagan campaign. I joined the firm because I wanted to preserve my professional credentials: I joined a year before. After the election, I really had no intention of joining the administration. Drew kept asking me. I didn't want anything. I wasn't interested. It was the furthest thing from my mind - joining the government. I wanted to get him elected. Then I was going to go back to Wolf, Bloch. In fact he got annoyed with me because I wouldn't tell him what I wanted. It made his life difficult. It was a blank on his list.

After the election that's what I did. Went back to my law office and was confronted with the huge deluge of resumes of people who wanted jobs. I was very happily engaged in trying to get people jobs who wanted to go down to Washington. I did what I could. People who were qualified I would recommend to Drew Lewis and others who were...

Maybe we should continue after the Reagan administration.

Q: Yes.

WHITTLESEY: When I joined and how I joined.

Q: I think that's a very good idea.

WHITTLESEY: My time in the Reagan administration. I'm trying to think if there's anything about the Reagan campaign. I would say we worked very well together. The people that were involved in that campaign effort I count as friends to this day. Mark Holtzman, Dick Schweiker, Drew, Rick Robb. Drew was the real political leader of Pennsylvania, behind the scenes. He never really had a title. He still is, by the way, despite the fact that we had a Republican governor and two Republican senators.

Arlen Specter won of course. We were very happy about that. The county government was in good shape. We had won big victories.

My children were... My older son had gone away to boarding school. He had gone to St. Paul's because he was getting physically big and he was a bit too much for me to handle. So I decided he needed to be with boys and men and have the opportunity to go to boarding school. So he did.

I was very busy. Politics, I guess, played the role of a spouse because it was so all-consuming. As I've said before, I didn't have time to feel sorry for myself, although I did have some romances. I was never remarried because I guess I found it very difficult with young children. Anyone that I might like, my children would not. Or one or the other

children would not. I thought it was nearly impossible to find someone who could be both a husband to me and a father to these grown children.

My brother lived nearby. When I ran for lieutenant governor my brother, who had been a professor at the University of Alabama, and his wife also, came up from Alabama, left their jobs and decided to settle in Philadelphia. I knew I couldn't run for lieutenant governor unless I had some family around me, so they did that. We found them a house and I co-signed the mortgage. They were poor college professors, but my brother got a job and they left the world of academe and went into the private sector. That's what they wanted to do anyway. They decided they didn't want to live as churchmice for the rest of their lives on college professors' salaries. Now they have a very successful business in Philadelphia.

Q: They sort of helped you with the children?

WHITTLESEY: They helped me. They had two boys of their own who were younger and about the same age as my youngest child, my son William. They were of great help to me. I neglected to include my parents. Whenever I ran for public office my parents would come up and...

Q: Your parents would come up...

WHITTLESEY: They would take care of the children and house. They did all the addressing of the envelopes and looking up the phone numbers. I think my father looked up 10,000 phone numbers, and addressed 10,000 envelopes - my mother, too. In the beginning they would do absolutely anything to enable me to win and help take care of the family. They were wonderful. They were enthusiastic about politics from the beginning.

However, as time went on, they became disillusioned with politics and my involvement in politics. They saw the tremendous cost and the sacrifices. They became highly critical of it, wanted me to get out of it, and were really not... they were generally supportive, but they didn't like it. As a matter of fact, when I was sworn in as ambassador, they didn't come.

Q: Oh, is that so?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, in the State Department. They thought that people were taking advantage of me, always asking me for things, and I was giving, giving, giving, and getting very little in return. They wanted me to have a more normal life and they simply... well they criticized. They saw what it was really like, but they, of course, were a tremendous comfort and support to me throughout all of this. Without them I never could have done it. I could not, because they cared for the children, they took care of the house, they did everything. They did the shopping, they took the kids to school.

Now they're old and feeble. They live in Florida. My mother always was a great

inspiration. She was a very strong person. But she's very opinionated. Even now, they're involved in politics. They work in their little polling place and they help various candidates. They came to Switzerland, I think, twice, and I was happy that they were able to enjoy a brief visit.

My father cried when he met the president because for him, he said, "My father was an Irish immigrant who had no education." My father only went to the eighth grade, himself. He was so moved that he started to weep. I have a picture of him weeping. His eyes were filled with tears.

The Whittlesey family was... despite the fact their son took his own life, very good to me, and supportive. Especially my mother-in-law. My father-in-law died when I was in Switzerland. He had been raised in China, as the son of a missionary, and his great dream in life was to go back China and see the places where he lived as a child and as a young teenager. He did that before he died. He invited me to go with him, but he took my oldest son, Henry, and a number of the other family members. They all went back. And then he came back and he died.

I'm very close to my mother-in-law. I'm very fond of her. I talk to her often. My husband had two sisters. We maintain close family ties.

I had the China connection on both sides. My brother was a Chinese scholar. His field was ancient Chinese poetry. He's fluent in Chinese and Japanese. He taught Chinese at the University of Alabama. My husband's family were missionaries and his uncle Henry was a member of the Dixie Mission, which was the American army intelligence unit attached to Mao Tze Tung. His picture is in the Barbara Tuchman book. He was the only member of the Dixie Mission who was killed. He was captured by the Japanese executed shortly before the end of the war, and executed as a spy, on the spot. His name was Henry Whittlesey. My son was named after him.

When I was in Zurich, I met a Chinese lady. I guess maybe I told you that?

Q: No.

WHITTLESEY: I was giving a speech for the Fourth of July once, in Zurich. I guess it was in '82. A Chinese lady came up to me, an older Chinese lady, and said, "Are you any relation to Henry Whittlesey?" And I said, "Yes, he was my husband's uncle," and she said, "I taught him. He was my pupil. He was the only one I lost." She trained the members of the Dixie Mission, and Henry was the only one who didn't come back.

Q: Is that so!

WHITTLESEY: We have certain mementos of China. These two little things are from the items Henry Whittlesey sent, from the family's collection of Chinese artifacts.

Q: Oh, they're delightful.

WHITTLESEY: [They're] from that period. He sent a lot of things back. He was there for quite a long time. Ah, the war!

The other thing that's interesting is here in New York. I gave a speech to the East Side Conservative Club. A lady came up afterward and said, "Are you any relation to Charles Whittlesey? I said, "Well, yes, he was one of my husband's great-uncles." He was the leader of the Lost Battalion. He was called "Charles go-to-hell Whittlesey." In the first World War, in the Ardennes Forest, he was surrounded. I think he was a major. He sent back the message "Go to hell" to a surrender demand. And most of the battalion was lost. He survived. then later took his own life, on a boat to Cuba. He jumped over the side, I guess. He was so despondent over losing all his men. He was from New York, so when I gave the speech, this lady came, and said, "I would like your two sons to have Charles Whittlesey's garment - the sweater that he wore in the Ardennes Forest." She said, "I have it because the Lost Battalion was a New York City battalion from Manhattan. They were Irish, primarily Irish and German immigrants. Charles Whittlesey was, of course, a gentleman, a lawyer from Williams College. He was the officer in charge." Those who survived, in New York somehow got the sweater that he wore. She had it and she wanted to make a presentation to my two boys of this sweater.

The Lost Battalion is one of the great tales of the First World War. There was, certainly, in my husband's family, a tradition of the U.S. Army service.

Q: Isn't that an interesting story!

WHITTLESEY: And then, there was another funny story in Zurich: At the same time I was giving a speech (it was a very patriotic speech about freedom and the Fourth of July and how we're the light, the beacon of the world} and I saw one of the members of the band (they had a rock band playing - there were a thousand people there). He had long hair and a black jacket with silver spikes, and boots. He was unshaven, and he looked like the most disreputable character, like a rock musician. Here I was, giving the speech. I thought he would be booing me because this type of person, usually has a political point of view often expressed in boos and heckling. I looked up and practically after every paragraph, he would cheer. It was "Yaaay." and "Right on." I was so puzzled he almost put me off. I couldn't believe it. Afterwards he came up to me, and as it turned out, he was a Hungarian refugee who had escaped in 1956 when he was very small, and made a career in the United States as a rock musician. He was back in Europe with his band, which was one of the best in Europe, I guess, an American rock band. They all were dressed in this garb, you know. Never let appearances deceive, I guess is the lesson. That was such a shock to see that man, and then afterwards to have him tell me the story of his escape. He was so grateful for the way that I had spoken. He was really inspired and appreciated my words. That's another anecdote about a speech. I think that's probably all I can remember.

[December 7, 1988]

Q: ...what you wanted.

WHITTLESEY: Yes. He was very conscious of what is known as political patronage. He realized there would be certain people in Pennsylvania who would be entitled to consideration based upon service in the Reagan campaign. Since I was one of the original group which started the Reagan movement in Pennsylvania, that I would be interested in a position. Actually, I wasn't particularly interested and kept putting him off because I had in mind that I would withdraw from politics and practice law and make more money. I was tired at that point, of the political life. And I didn't join the Reagan effort because I wanted a job in the government. That was the last thing on my mind.

I supported Ronald Reagan because I believed in what he stood for. I liked him personally but I was drawn to his ideals and his political courage as an example to others in articulating these ideals in a way that won supporters. I thought he was quite skilled being able to make these complicated concepts understandable to ordinary people. I believed in those ideals. Patronage was really the last thing on my mind in terms of a job that I had targeted. I guess Drew just assumed that I had this in mind because many other people apparently had told him already that they wanted such and such a job. He kept pressing me and I said finally, "Oh, well, all right, I'd be interested in U.S. treasurer." Well, that apparently had already been promised to Bay Buchanan and she did in fact become the U.S. treasurer. It's interesting, after she left I was called and asked when I was in Switzerland, if I would be interested in becoming the treasurer. At that point I said no. I was called by the White House personnel office, before Catherine Ortega became U.S. treasurer.

I didn't really have any job in mind and I wasn't so presumptuous as to suggest myself for anything. I didn't answer, and Drew was becoming irritated. Not really irritated but because he had a list you see, and he had names on the list. He was very efficient and he wanted to get things done and wanted to cross off the names on his list. I was a problem on his list because my name kept recurring. I guess quite near the top. He didn't have a slot for me.

So I went back to my law firm after the election and we were immediately deluged by resumés of people who were job seekers. I spent those months trying to sort out the resumés. There were people who were being considered for jobs. There were some capable people but those of us who had worked so hard in the Reagan effort were conscious of the fact that we had never heard of some of these people. When we were looking for people to support Ronald Reagan and to help get him elected, these people never appeared on the scene. They only appeared after the election. If they were so passionately committed to Ronald Reagan's ideals, where were they in the big struggle that was taking place to get him elected? I, in particular, was conscious of that fact because I was always involved in practical politics. We had to do things like maintain phone banks in various parts of the state and make sure they were staffed. And in my own area, especially on the Main Line which is the upper class area outside of Philadelphia, we had to close down our phone banks because we couldn't get volunteers to man the phone banks. It's an interesting commentary on Ronald Reagan. In the areas of the

county that were known as the blue collar areas, we were overflowing with volunteers. But the upper class areas were not enthusiastic about Ronald Reagan. I had known this phenomenon when I was trying to get support for him. The Main Liners were all for Bush or Connally. They were not for Ronald Reagan. They had all kinds of excuses. Either he was too old or he was an actor or he didn't belong to the right clubs or he didn't have the right background, whatever. It was interesting after the election, all these people who weren't around to help came to each of us who had leadership roles in the campaign with resumés stating how committed they had been to Ronald Reagan. This of course is the lesson of politics. It shouldn't have been a big surprise, but I was surprised by the volume of resumés.

We developed a coding system. I would have to respond to these requests and there were certain people that I believed, if they did want jobs in the Reagan administration and those jobs were available, they should be considered for those jobs. I would forward the letters to Drew. He was the person who was in Washington regularly. He was on the transition. He was down there with Ed Meese, living with Ed Meese at this point, until they both found residences for their families. To pass along these resumes and whether or not they were serious people. we should seriously consider. There were a number of people that we did place who had been active in the campaign, in the Reagan administration. One of them I'm particularly proud of. I think he still holds the position. He did an outstanding job. He became the regional director of GSA and has been praised and commended - a really outstanding individual by the name of George Cordes, C-O-R-D-E-S. He is someone that had started with me in politics in Delaware county. He had educated himself. He came from very modest beginnings and worked his way through school - was a devoted family man. He got his education; he loved politics and he was a committed conservative. He was in politics because he loved it, but also not just for the sport of it, but because he had certain ideals, He's the sort of person drawn to Ronald Reagan because he was originally of Polish-American descent, a devout Catholic. Just the kind of person that makes America great. He has done an outstanding job and risen and been recognized for his achievements.

Another person did not turn out quite so well. He was one of my mistakes of judgment. He did get a job. I think he still has a job somewhere in the administration. He has been saved repeatedly, but he shouldn't have been saved. He should have been let go.

But there were a number of people from Pennsylvania who went to Washington. Schweiker of course became the secretary of health and human services. Andrew Lewis became secretary of transportation. And I became the ambassador to Switzerland.

Q: Did you have any input into the actual decision of the country?

WHITTLESEY: I didn't go to Washington. During the transition period I was asked to come to Washington. I guess I went down a couple of times to see friends of mine, but I made no application for any job. I knew other people from the Reagan group and I wanted to see them. I'd met lots of people and had good friends, and so I went down there but was not at all involved in the job seeking, because in my own mind I wasn't

really interested. I thought it was a very unseemly scramble for positions. Various people kept saying to me, “What do you want, don’t you want something?” I said no, and finally one individual who later proved to be a disappointment in the Reagan administration in terms of his performance, had been down around the transition team and almost came to me with a train ticket. He said, “They want to talk to you down there and you have to go down” and he almost... he came to get me to go down. So I went down to talk to them... I don’t remember who it was... I think I saw Bud McFarlane in the State Department. He was the deputy secretary of state. No, no Bill Clark was deputy secretary of state and he was... I forget his first position. He was secretary... anyway, one of those top positions, whatever it is. He was there. I had known him, of course, from the platform committee. He sat next to me on the platform committee. He was a staff member to the platform subcommittee on foreign policy and defense, of which Jack Kemp was chairman and I was co-chairman. I had gotten to know Bud McFarlane. I’d also gotten to know Richard Allen and John Lehman, later to become secretary of the navy. It was Richard Allen and Bud McFarlane who wanted me to come down to Washington. I saw Bud McFarlane at the State Department and he said to me, “We’d like to you to become an ambassador. What country would you like?”

I was absolutely overwhelmed. First of all I thought, “They can’t be serious,” because these embassy posts when they go to political appointees, usually go to personal friends of the president. I was not a personal friend. I was a political ally but not a personal friend; nor was I large contributor. I knew that President Reagan had many contributors that he wanted to reward. I was not in that circle. I was really struck dumb. I said, “I really don’t know. I couldn’t possibly presume to name a country.” He said, “Well please go think about it and let me know. A country in Europe.”

So I did think about it and I guess I realized that they were serious and at that time I thought, “I know my law firm was not too enthusiastic about my continuing involvement in politics. They wanted me to stay there and practice law. If I were going to succeed there I would have to make a major commitment. Here I was again, off on a political tangent.” So I raised the subject gingerly with them and they said, “Well, if you’re going to do that, you should really pick a country that has some connection with future business, because otherwise we would not be so enthusiastic about it.” I was at that time wanting to stabilize my position in my profession and hold onto my job in the law firm. That was my primary goal. I was the sole provider for my three children. So I said, well, I wanted a German speaking country because when I was younger, twenty-five years ago, I had been reasonably fluent in German and I thought that would help. I wasn’t particularly interested in going to a Scandinavian country or Holland or Belgium. I knew Austria was taken and, of course, Germany was taken. Austria was taken by a friend of the Reagans. So I said “Switzerland.” I thought that Switzerland made sense from the point of view that if I went there, then my law firm would be interested in rehiring me after I returned, because the Swiss are big investors in the U.S. and that would at least give me some contacts that would be beneficial. I had traveled in Switzerland as a student, briefly, and of course I realized the great beauty of the country, and knew its long democratic tradition. I was not unfamiliar with the German-speaking world. I’d had a number of Swiss girls taking care of my children. My husband had been a coin collector so he had

taken me to Switzerland. But I didn't really have any great background in the country other than my general interest in the culture of the German-speaking peoples, which I had had from the time I studied German and European history as a student.

I communicated to Bud McFarlane that I would be interested in Switzerland. That was the end of it. I made no calls, I did nothing. I went back to Philadelphia. Various of my friends... I explained this procedure to various friends and they said, "You should go and contact such and such. You've got to lobby for this position because you there are lots of competitors and you won't get it unless you make an effort." I was not inclined to do that. I didn't do it because I didn't want it so much. I was very happy in my law firm. I thought, if it happens, it's such a long shot that it will happen and I'm not going to go down there and do what I saw other people doing, which was engage in a frantic scramble, because it was undignified. I was more concerned about my legal career at that time. I refused to join the unseemly scramble for jobs.

I got a call to come to the White House. I went saw Wendy Borchardt. She asked me whom I knew who might support my nomination. Were there any senators that would support me? I went through the list of senators. It was quite an impressive list. Over the years I had come to know many people, and because I had been involved in conservative politics I had gotten to know people in the Reagan effort. I knew Lyn Nofsiger from the Nixon days because he had known my husband from the Nixon campaign. I understand that at a critical moment when this post was being decided, Lyn Nofsiger did weigh in, remembering our service to President Nixon, my husband's in particular, during those days. I got quite a shock when I did call John Tower after Wendy Borchardt told me that I should tell these people that I was being considered and that I should say that they might be contacted and would they be so kind as to respond. John Tower said, "No I'm terribly sorry, I'm supporting somebody else." John Tower had been chairman of the platform committee and he was the one that had given me the job of delivering the platform plank on foreign policy and defense and asked me to be co-chairman of the foreign policy and defense platform subcommittee. His response was a real shock. Afterward I was informed that he was supporting Senator Jacob Javits for the job. I guess senators support one another.

Drew, I guess at this point, knew that I was being considered for this position. I really didn't do very much. I had an appointment with Eagleburger. Someone suggested that I go see Eagleburger and I did make an appointment and then for some reason he had to cancel it. It was suggested that I reschedule it and I said, "No, I'm not going to reschedule it. The heck with it." And I went back to Philadelphia. So I never saw Eagleburger.

Then I heard through various channels that it was moving along, and then I told my law firm that this was a possibility. No one really believed me, I guess, because in Philadelphia there was only one person who had ever been an ambassador. Freddy Mann had been ambassador, I believe, to Barbados. But no one had been ambassador in Europe. And, of course, the fact that I was a woman and a relatively young woman, I just don't think they took it seriously. Finally I kept hearing in the White House that this was moving along. I got a call from Peter McPherson, who was my old friend, who later

became the head of AID and with whom I had traveled to China with the American Council of Young Political Leaders, and later became deputy secretary of the treasury. Peter was the one that called and said “You’ve got it. Then I heard through normal channels. The president called and the process began.

Q: How did you feel when you answered the phone and it was the president?

WHITTLESEY: It was a happy moment. I had affection for the president as a human being but I never considered myself personally close to him, the way Mike Deaver did, or even Bill Clark. I was always wary of Nancy from the earliest, the first time I met her. Because I had the feeling that she was suspicious of other women who were close to him. Or who might be close to him. Very suspicious. Not in any sexual way, but there was a certain tension, almost jealousy, or I don’t know what it was, but especially a woman who might be in any way a competitor to her. I sensed that, because he had not a bone of malice in his body... was genuine and open to any one he happened to meet, from the elevator operator to a head of state. That was his natural gift. She did not have that quality. She rarely if ever expressed any appreciation for what people were doing for them. That was one thing that struck me from the very beginning of the times that I saw her, which continued, of course, throughout the administration, and was commented upon by almost everyone who worked for him. For them.

Q: Oh, really?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. In contrast to Barbara Bush, who spent her life writing thank you notes to people... and a real lady and was always saying “thank you” to everyone and was genuinely appreciative of what people...

Q: Nancy Reagan never sent notes?

WHITTLESEY: Never.

Q: Is that so?

WHITTLESEY: It was commented upon by all of us who worked in the White House. I don’t think she ever came up to the second floor... maybe I shouldn’t say not ever, maybe she came once when I wasn’t there. But we worked on the second floor of the west wing. I don’t think she ever set foot up there. The people who worked such long hours there never saw her.

Q: Curious.

WHITTLESEY: I was never invited into... I was invited by Barbara Bush. Even then. I wasn’t the only one who wasn’t invited. My successor wasn’t invited, Pat Buchanan wasn’t invited. They sought to make courtesy calls. She was a very difficult woman. However I sensed her influence. I don’t know if I told you this story about campaigning in Philadelphia once. I was sitting ahead of them on the bus - I don’t know where we

were going, back to the next event, and it was a campaign bus. There was a podium set up in front of the art museum and there was a huge rally there. I don't know if you know Philadelphia and know the art museum where Sylvester Stallone made the movie, Rocky. There was a huge crowd. Ronald Reagan and Nancy were on the platform and music was playing and something happened to the speaking system so that even though you could hear the music you couldn't hear the microphone so he couldn't make a speech. So what he did, he was so clever and so quick with the crowd and had such a sense of theater' the microphone was broken; the people were there; it was a beautiful sunny fall day. He started dancing on the platform with Nancy. He's a very good dancer. They made a beautiful couple. It was so quick, you know. Most people would have just waited and tried to walk around and appeared awkward. He was alone up there with her and in front of a huge crowd of people, maybe a thousand people. He started dancing. That's the kind of thing that he did and was able to do very quickly. Then they got back on the bus. I was sitting in front of them on the bus. The people were waiting. It was a huge crowd. We were somewhere in the back of the bus in normal seats. There was no special seat for him. He was sitting by the window. Nancy was sitting on the seat on the aisle. I was chatting with him and I was half turned around. He was waving to the crowd with his hand that was closest to the window, which I suppose would block his face. I saw Nancy take his hand down with her hand. She reached over took that hand down and put it in his lap and lifted up his other hand so that his hand would not be blocking his face when the cameras were on him.

Q: Always conscious of the public image.

WHITTLESEY: Always. The smallest thing she watched. She's masterful at that. Of course she was right. That was something he just didn't think about. If he's waving to the people and people were trying to take his picture, they couldn't see his face. She urged him to put up the other hand. She was aware of the smallest detail.

I had the feeling that the president was calling and making these calls. He knew who I was but there wasn't any great emotion in the call. He was making a call that was on his list. He had to make it. I started going through the procedure. It took a long, long time. I had a young lawyer - no, he was a paralegal then - helping me fill out the forms. My children each had trusts which were established when their father died. It made so much work for lawyers to have to go through every stock in the trust of my children. The rules had been changed during the Carter era. It wasn't a substantial portion of stock that made a difference in determining whether there was a conflict of interest, but if you had just one share of stock in any company that did business in the country, you had to divest. Because so many American companies did business in Switzerland, it took forever. It was a monumental task. Of course now it takes even longer. I was one of the first actually, I think. I was confirmed with relative ease. In fact, it was Senator Tsongas, I believe, or who was the senator from Massachusetts who had cancer? I can't remember.

Q: Tsongas.

WHITTLESEY: Tsongas, yes. He looked at my resumé and he said, "You have quite an

impressive resumé. You should have been a Democrat.” It was perfect timing and a perfect opening. He asked for it and I responded, “Senator Tsongas, I used to be a Democrat and saw the error of my ways.” There were quite a few people in the room and of course it brought down the house. He had given me a beautiful opening. I told him I changed and became a Republican at about the same time that Ronald Reagan had done so.

I was confirmed at the same time as David Funderburk - who went out as ambassador to Romania. David Funderburk, who later wrote the book *Pinstripes and Reds* and had battles with the State Department over U.S. policy towards Romania. I counseled David Funderburk because he had become a good friend. He had not been involved in politics. He was a professor. He made the argument from the very beginning that Nicolae Ceausescu was a sham, a fraud. The so-called differentiation from the Soviet Union on which the State Department policy was based David challenged. He was harassed, humiliated and persecuted by the State Department throughout his time as ambassador because he took a different point of view and tried to articulate this point of view within the system and to the president. I was very pleased to see that he was finally vindicated. He left after five years. Most-favored nation status was finally withdrawn from Romania. Now everyone realizes that Ceausescu was a fraud and a sham and his policy of differentiation was merely a ruse to obtain western technology and credits. He was not liberalizing Romania. Quite the contrary. He was more oppressive. We became very close political allies. I talked to him from time to time. I talked to him a few days ago. He’s now teaching and writing speeches and traveling around the country, speaking about the State Department, the U.S. State Department, and his own experiences. I also encouraged him to run for the U.S. Senate in North Carolina, which he did in a republican primary and lost. He’s a young man. I’m sure he’ll be around in the future.

We had our hearings at the same time. I think they attempted to hold him up because he was from North Carolina and a friend of Jesse Helms. But they couldn’t, really, because he had so many qualifications. He spoke Romanian and was an expert in Romanian studies. His experiences also confirmed my own experiences. We often talked about the ideological conformity of the State Department to an ideology of the Washington establishment. That ideology continues to be implemented by U.S. State Department regardless of elections. That’s the tragedy; that the system, the bureaucracy, is not responsive to the American electorate. They carry out the foreign policy that they think is right regardless of the wishes of the American people as expressed at the ballot box.

That happened my first day. Then I started off. I got a very good story in the New York Times. The New York Times came and took my picture and my younger son, William. The White House was pleased that I was getting such good press and it was in, after all, the New York Times! ”Big Bertha” as we called it. Not exactly a friend of people with our point of view. I went off to Switzerland.

Q: Before we take you to Switzerland, could you go a little bit over any preparations that you made to go, as far as the State Department goes.

WHITTLESEY: I went down. They had a seminar program

Q: One week?

WHITTLESEY: I don't remember. No, I don't think it was a week. I was with a group of ambassadors where they had a program. It was, I would say, minimal.

Q: This is the one, Shirley Temple and Dean Brown...

WHITTLESEY: Yes. I remember both of them. I liked Shirley Temple Black and Dean Brown. I remember I was with Dixie Walker, who went to Korea. I got to know him then. He was also a professor, and John Loeb, who went to Denmark. We were in the same position. We were the only two who didn't have spouses. They have a special program for spouses, of course. We laughed. We thought which program should we attend? We have to do both. We really need to tape-record the program for spouses so we could hear what was said. I didn't think it was too helpful.

Q: You didn't?

WHITTLESEY: No, I didn't. Looking back on it, I think it was even less helpful than I thought at the time.

Q: Where would you fault it, specifically? What should they have done that they didn't do to prepare you?

WHITTLESEY: Well, I guess what they did within the State Department was all they could do, I guess, given their own biases and determination to maintain control of the foreign policy establishment. They conducted the program in a way that would lead an ambassador to the conclusion that they knew best, and that we should really trust all of our people on the job in place and we should rely on them. We were all political appointees and they were the ones that were possessed of the great wisdom about what to do, and all the technical details were so complicated about running a mission that it was best to leave it to them.

There was no preparation for the difficulties that were faced by every American ambassador in Europe in dealing with a press, which was generally hostile and anti-American. The political classes in Europe today, as they were then, are anti-American. That was not even mentioned. Nor the reasons for it. There was no discussion of public diplomacy, hardly any. The need to go out and influence opinion in the country. There was lots of discussion about the embassy and how you deal with the administrative officer and how you deal with the political officer but not really very much about how you go out and make friends for the USA. In fact I didn't even think there was ever such a session. There was no opposition analysis, for example. No effort to say, well in these countries there will be people who are strong adversaries of the United States, and how do you deal with them? What do you do? How do you diffuse their criticism? How do you, first of all, identify them, diffuse their criticism and how do you build up supporters?

How do you identify supporters of the United States and give them the encouragement and support that they need? In these countries that are critical to us, how do we strengthen our friends and diminish the influence of our enemies. That's how I would run such a program. But that wasn't done.

Q: Do they go into how to help U.S. business, trade, at all?

WHITTLESEY: Very little. But that's not surprising either because that role was taken away from them and given to the Commerce Department. It was basically how to deal with the administrative officer and the political officer and how to send cables and that sort of thing.

Q: But not much about USIA, apparently, from what you say?

WHITTLESEY: Well, and also, even if USIA was mentioned, it was a very technical. It wasn't the broad picture, what is the purpose of USIA and how do we recognize that the image of the United States abroad is a major problem for us? How do we deal with indirect aggression through the manipulation of public opinion against us? Which in Europe, not only in Europe but around the world, was a major focus of our Soviet bloc adversaries.

When we had one of those meetings that we used to have during the first term of U.S. ambassadors in Europe, I went to one of them in London. We all sat there and they all said, "The biggest problem we have in Europe today - and these were the State Department officials - is Central America. I was the only woman ambassador in the group. I think I was probably the only politician, former politician, in the group. I was just dumbfounded.

Q: Helene wasn't at this meeting?

WHITTLESEY: No, she wasn't ambassador then. She didn't go out my first term. She went later. I was the only woman in Europe when I went out. The only woman ambassador assigned to a country. Jean Girard was at UNESCO, but that was to a multi-lateral organization, not a country. I was the only one in Europe. Central America was the biggest problem in Europe in terms of our image. It was a major focus of the Soviets and their bloc allies used to discredit the United States. They argued: Yes, the Soviets are in Afghanistan, but the United States is in Central America. It's used that way to this day. I heard it at a dinner party night before last from a Swiss diplomat at the Jordanian embassy. It really caught on. How do we diffuse such moral equivalence? Here they were sitting around, hanging their heads with no plan, no program, no public diplomacy, no recognition even that it was part of the strategy of the opposition.

When I got back to Washington, I realized that the views of the United States in Europe were driven by the adversary press in the United States. The opposition press. They got their material to use against us in Europe from the opposition press at home. So in order to figure out how we deal with the problem like Central America we first had to inform

public opinion in the United States. We had to diffuse the opposition at home. We had to deal with it somehow so that there could be a stronger case made in the American media for the president's policy. That information conveyed to the U.S. press would help us abroad.

That was the genesis of my Central American outreach group, which came into conflict with the State Department who were constantly trying to close it down. They thought public diplomacy was their responsibility. How dare someone in the White House take over foreign policy advocacy? I knew there were thirty-five people in the State Department who were supposedly doing this, but I knew from my own experience that they were totally... Well, I shouldn't say totally ineffectual, but virtually ineffectual. Jerry Holman headed it. The materials they put out were written for intellectuals, no, not even for intellectuals, for Councils on Foreign Relations clubs. They were not written in advocacy style. The print was so small; they were not presented attractively. They were totally ineffective. There were thirty-five people over there doing I don't know what.

The same with the defense department. Again, they had a large number of people doing the same things, supposedly. Jim Baker said it, and Mike Deaver. When we formed the Central America outreach group (it was formed at their request) at the president's request. Someone asked what about the defense department? what about the State Department? Mike Deaver and Jim Baker's comment was, "They're hopeless. They're not doing anything. We've got to do it ourselves, so please start doing it." As soon as I started doing it, I was called over to the State Department with great somber tones asked what was going on? The Secretary was very concerned about this," and "Tony Motley was very concerned," because they were losing turf. It was the same old bureaucratic battles. Of course. After I left it was closed down. They succeeded finally.

Q: Yes, I was reading about that.

WHITTLESEY: They succeeding in getting it closed down. It was a terrible shame because the White House must engage in advocacy of its policies. But that's jumping around a bit.

Q: That's all right.

WHITTLESEY: That was the preparation. On the personal side, I had to close down my house, rent my house, and pack up my children. My oldest boy, whom you met this morning, was in boarding school at St. Paul's in New Hampshire. He had just started so he decided to stay there. That was probably better. Although, in retrospect, I'm not so sure. My daughter came with me. My daughter, Amy, and my younger boy William. I had to do everything myself. I had to pack up the house. I had friends who helped me a little bit.

Q: How old were your children at this time, Faith?

WHITTLESEY: It's hard to remember. They were small. William was in the second

grade or third grade and Amy was in seventh grade, maybe.

Q: Oh, I see.

WHITTLESEY: Eighth grade. But my Delaware County friends gave me a great send-off. There were a series of parties in Philadelphia for me. They brought a little band to the airport that the people from Delaware County assembled to see me off. I was then physically so exhausted I was just absolutely at the end. I had to move, move furniture and put things into storage. I had a large house in the suburbs of Philadelphia. I'd been living there for eleven years with three children. To move everything out and close it down was an enormous job. Of course, I had to take care of everything else. Also my regular job and the press.

Q: Sure. You were one person to do it all. What about your swearing-in ceremony?

WHITTLESEY: I had a swearing-in ceremony. I decided that I wanted to have a big one, because I was so grateful to the people who had helped me and voted for me and supported me over the years. I wanted to invite them to a swearing-in ceremony. This was quite unusual, I guess, at the time. I think I invited six hundred people to my swearing-in ceremony. Six hundred people came. They came in buses from Delaware County. I wanted to invite all the committee people that had helped me in the Reagan campaign all the "little people." I mean that in quotes, I don't mean...

Q: No, no. I understand.

WHITTLESEY: The people that would never otherwise have a chance to go to such a thing. This would be one of the big events of their lives. They worked for this president. They weren't asking for jobs, but the thrill and excitement of being in Washington would mean so much to them. I guess it was kind of a surprise that we wanted to have such a large event. We served very simple things, but they had a chance to be on the seventh floor.

Q: Ben Franklin room?

WHITTLESEY: In the Ben Franklin room. There was a dinner for me the night before, with my good friends and supporters. I made a speech. Bill Scranton came, my old opponent from the lieutenant gubernatorial race and he said - young Bill Scranton - he stood up and he said, "Well, you know, I won the race for lieutenant governor and I'm on the circuit in Pennsylvania eating chicken dinners and Faith is about to go off to Switzerland. I'm really not sure who won this contest after all." He was very nice. His wife, Carol, came, too.

Bill Clark came. Andrew Lewis was there and Senator Specter, and Lee Annenberg swore me in. She is, of course, from Philadelphia.

Q: She was chief of protocol?

WHITTLESEY: She was chief of protocol. She mispronounced my name at the time

which is not unusual.

Q: Who held your Bible?

WHITTLESEY: I think the children. Amy or Henry did, I think. The children were there. Unfortunately my parents didn't come. It was too much for them. Large crowds, too long a trip, and too much standing, so they didn't come, which was a disappointment.

Q: I think your brother came?

WHITTLESEY: My brother came, yes, certainly. I don't know if my mother-in-law came or not. She might not have come. Then, of course, once I became ambassador, all sorts of people who didn't want to have much to do with me as a dirty old Delaware County politician, I use that term in jest, all of a sudden appeared out of the woodwork and reappeared in my life, and wanted to be remembered and wrote me letters and wanted to come visit me in Switzerland. It's interesting. It was quite a surprise for this boy especially, Henry, my oldest [Shows a photograph of son.] I was in a controversial position in Pennsylvania as I was considered a political boss in Delaware County, a county that had been known for years for being a tough, rough, machine-controlled county. Because it was a lively political organization, I was in the newspaper and there were always political enemies attacking me. For the many of the genteel people of the Main Line, this was something that was, I suppose, inappropriate for a woman, or undignified or whatever. I was not the darling of the Merion Cricket Club during my time in Delaware County. However, that county did provide the big majorities that made it possible for these people to hold on to Pennsylvania as a Republican state. Nonetheless they always made jokes about the so-called corruption. There was a social class difference. These people were upper middle-class and the people in Delaware County were mostly middle and lower-middle class.

My children noticed that after I became ambassador that there was a marked change in the way I was treated by these people who, before this time, had not been so anxious to pay attention. I was happy because political life during those years was all-consuming for me. I was a widow and I had three children to raise, so it filled a void in my life. I didn't feel sorry for myself. I didn't have time to, and I genuinely loved all these people. Not only that, I felt I was doing something important and significant in restoring the reputation of that county, which I think we did, for good government. Also in building a Republican party organization that people were proud of. Political participation is very important in a democratic society. In order to encourage other people to participate politically, you can't have the lowest elements of society running the political organizations. You have to have upstanding citizens, good people, who take part. If good people take part then there will be others who will do the same - running for school board, for mayors, for town councils, for local commissioners of various kinds. I was always trying to find the most able people. One of my proudest accomplishments was to woo these people into government and into the political process. Some of my greatest - I look back on my accomplishments - are the caliber of people that I did bring in to the governmental process.

One of them is Steven Friend. He was my successor in the Pennsylvania legislature. He is a very able young man. He's the one that crafted the law in Pennsylvania that restricted abortions there requiring parental and spouse consent and a 24 hour waiting period.

Q: The one that was just passed, you mean?

WHITTLESEY: He was my successor. I am totally responsible for him. I arm-twisted, in a very trying-to-be-ladylike way, all my friends in the Republican organization where I had served as state representative to vote for him. They were not inclined to vote for him. I insisted they vote for Steve Friend because he's smart and he's good. He later opposed me and tried to depose me. We had a political falling out. He lost. I was very proud when that law passed because regardless of what you think of the law, he is a political master and a genius in fashioning the bill and drafting it in such a way that nobody could vote against it. It passed in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania is the first state to pass a restrictive law. Of course, he did it by saying everyone is against abortion as a means of sex selection. Everybody believes parents should get notification if a minor child is about to have an abortion. Either notification or even consent, and there should be spousal consent. There shouldn't be abortion after the third month, because then the child is viable. Most people are offended by the idea of a baby that might be able to live outside the womb, of killing a baby.

He did this. He won't go any farther, but he is probably the most skillful political operative in the pro-life movement nationwide.

Another one is a young woman who had a Ph.D. from the Bryn Mawr School of Social Work who runs the Delaware County social service system. It's a huge operation. She has been approached to take jobs in the state but she's the mother of two young children. Her husband is a dermatologist and because of her family responsibility she can't move. But she is one of the few social service people in the social service sector, who has a Ph.D. in social work, who is a Republican and a conservative. She does a wonderful job. And she provides the best possible services but she does it in a way consistent with good government.

Q: And her name?

WHITTLESEY: Sandra Cornelius. Dr. Sandra Cornelius. Another one is John McMurray, who became the chairman of SEPTA, the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority. Another one is George Cordes who became the administrator of the General Services Administration in the region. There was another lady who was the mother of three eagle scouts who became the leader of the political party in Haverford township. She's a housewife. Esther Davies is her name.

Q: These are all people you brought in?

WHITTLESEY: I brought into the political process. Esther became the leader of that

community, the political leader. She wasn't interested in any job, any financial remuneration at all. She wanted good government. She worked unceasingly towards that end. She was also the leader of a major political group in Haverford township at a time when there were hardly any women who were in positions of authority. They used to call us "the skirts." The men.

Q: Isn't that awful?

WHITTLESEY: I was the de facto leader behind the scenes. I installed Esther Davies as the leader. She worked very hard. She was this mother of three eagle scouts. The men who were very much interested in the usual fixing traffic tickets and political patronage, their jobs and contracts and the like, they called us "the skirts" disparagingly. But we accomplished a lot. Now it wouldn't be so unusual.

Q: Are they still in politics?

WHITTLESEY: Esther is not. She became very disillusioned. But she's interested, but she's involved in another community. Actually she moved away. She moved out of Haverford township. Also the young man, Steven Friend, proved to be personally disloyal to most of the people who helped get him elected. That was a great disappointment to her because she had been, at my request, very active in his campaign. He was personally disloyal to me, too.

Sandy Cornelius is still involved. George Cordes is still involved. John McMurray moved. He's now in a top position at the new Nabisco, RJR Reynolds Nabisco company. He's moved around the country, so therefore he left. But there were others. There are countless others. That was always one of my goals.

I look back on that time. Thornburgh was governor. Some of these people were quite disillusioned with Thornburgh, too. Because he seemed to have an attitude that anybody who was involved in the political party process was somehow tainted.

Q: Really?

WHITTLESEY: He had been a prosecutor. He had never been involved in day-to-day politics. In his mind all politicians were crooks. So anybody who had any connection with any political organization such as this was, was somehow tarnished. He also wanted to please the media - and the media, again, is always left of center, wherever they are - so he chose people for appointments on boards and commissions, for example, who were not philosophically in sympathy with Republican objectives. People from the League of Women Voters, for example... we used to call them the League of Women Vultures because they weren't bipartisan or nonpartisan, they were intensely partisan on the other side. They were Democrats. Even if they'd get some naïve Republican woman to join, as they frequently did, the leadership was always supporting the Democratic agenda.

When these various honorary boards and commissions came up we thought, some of

these people thought, they were college educated, they were prominent in their communities. They thought they had been involved in the effort to get Thornburgh elected, they should be considered for these positions. And lo, and behold, he would pick somebody who had been an adversary. That happened so many times that many people became quite disillusioned with him.

Q: Just rounding up your appointment as ambassador, were you called to the White House to have a picture taken with the president?

WHITTLESEY: Oh, yes.

Q: You were?

WHITTLESEY: I did that. Ron Spiers was ahead of me, I remember. He was going to Pakistan. I did that, yes, with my children. I went to do that. Let's see who else did I - before I went. I saw Wendy Borchardt. She was very helpful

The other thing I did before I left was to make the rounds on my own. I tried to figure out what the problems were between the United States and Switzerland. I had to read between the lines. I also got a call from a friend of mine, my former law school classmate, who was legal counsel to the Swiss Bank Corporation in New York. He still holds that position. He's in the office of legal counsel. His name is Albert Shultheise. I hadn't talked to him in years although I had introduced him to his wife, who was my college classmate. He called me because he had read that I was going out as ambassador to Switzerland. He knew that there were serious problems brewing between the United States and Switzerland on the matter of law enforcement and insider trading. He called to alert me to a problem he thought was quite serious.

I went to the State Department. They really didn't give me what I considered to be a clear-cut analysis of these law enforcement problems. I later learned the reason. Structurally, the State Department is constructed in such a way that Switzerland is very far down on the totem pole. The State Department is structured on an east-west basis. The UN plays a role. Switzerland is not part of the UN and it's not part of NATO or the EC. Because it's structured on an east-west basis, Switzerland is an adjunct of the German desk. They have a central Europe department. There is one junior officer who is responsible for Austria, Switzerland and Lichtenstein. Most of the action in central Europe relates to Germany, of course. West Germany.

I also found out that economic questions are not given very high priority. That was my experience. Commercial responsibilities were taken away from State by the Congress and given to the Commerce Department some years before. American foreign service officers are simply not very interested in promoting trade. They're not very good at it and they don't do it. I found that they weren't particularly sympathetic. I can give an example of that attitude in my experience. There was an airline trying to come in to Switzerland, run by an American trying to compete with Swissair, Panam and TWA; he was an American entrepreneur. As ambassador, I wanted to try and help this person. He was from the south

and he came in wearing a string tie, dressed in polyester. His wife had blonde hair piled way up on her head, wearing white plastic boots and short skirt. The attitude of our economic counselor was that he was not interested in doing very much to help this individual. There was a culture clash between these two men. The company came into Switzerland. They didn't succeed. But these are the kind of Americans that I believe we have to help abroad. In that particular case it didn't work. I was struck by the attitude of the then economic counselor. I believed it was because of the cultural differences between the economic officer and the American entrepreneur from Tennessee or Kentucky or some such place. He hadn't gone to the right New England schools.

Economic issues were not played front and center in the State Department. Political issues in the State Department are the ones that seem to attract everyone's attention. Switzerland is a country whose importance is primarily in the economic sphere. So Switzerland is quite far down on the list of State Department priorities.

The main problem that we had at the time was the problem of the insider trading and the clash between legal systems. I asked to have appointments set up at the SEC and at the Justice Department before I went out to Switzerland. I was quite surprised by the attitude of both the Justice Department and the SEC towards Switzerland. I realized the problem was much more serious than I had been led to believe by the State Department. State didn't have time to worry about this. They weren't interested. The attitude of the previous ambassador was that he thought it should be fought out in the U.S. court system. He did not interject himself in any way into this issue to try to resolve it in the diplomatic track. He thought it belonged in the American judicial system. I am a lawyer. I had worked for judges. I knew how unpredictable American courts are, and once anything goes into the judicial system, it's absolutely out of control. The relationship with Switzerland was very important in many ways. Not only in the law enforcement sense. There were a whole panoply of issues and levels of cooperation that might be jeopardized if we had a collision on this subject. I did not share the view of my immediate predecessor who was a career diplomat that the embassy should essentially stay out of it, just report and sit back passively and let it be fought out in the American court system. I realized the seriousness of it as a lawyer. As it turned out, I was the only lawyer in the embassy. The main problems between Switzerland and the U.S. at this point were legal ones.

I met John Fedders, chief enforcement officer, at the SEC, and the people at the Justice Department. They were angry at the Swiss. They were visibly upset, using very harsh language about the attitude of the Swiss toward law enforcement questions, and their compliance with the treaty that had been signed earlier. Their efforts, as they saw it, to circumvent that treaty were causing friction. I could see I had a big problem on my hands. But I didn't learn that from the State Department; I figured that out on my own by asking questions and going around on my own to these U.S. federal agencies.

I did have lunch with my immediate predecessor, Richard Vine. He told me that he thought it was a mistake that I'd been appointed because I was a woman, that the Swiss would not accept me. I was surprised by the reaction I received from him. But he had a completely different approach to the job. I think I traveled six times as much as he did

around the country in my first year. He believed in just staying in Bern, which is what he did. And yet, on paper his resumé would be very impressive to The New York Times editorial staff, they would see that he spoke several languages, that he, you know, had a long history of diplomatic service. However, I realized, when I got to Switzerland, that such a resumé was no guarantee that someone would be an effective spokesman for his country.

Q: Was he an older man, getting ready for retirement?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, yes.

Q: Did you have any brushup on your language skills before you went over?

WHITTLESEY: I didn't have time, no, I didn't. I should have. That's one thing I really regret. It always seemed to take last place, my languages. I wanted to learn French and I wanted to work on my German. I did have German lessons. I continued with my German my first tour. The second tour I don't even think I was able to.

Q: You mean private tutoring?

WHITTLESEY: Private tutoring. I had a teacher that came. I have so many German friends there's really no excuse, but we always speak English. I have many German friends to this day. I understand German, and I can read. I don't understand any French, don't speak a word - I call it my "emergency German" - I can manage in German if I have to. I found in Switzerland with people who didn't speak English, we could speak German. They don't like to speak high German; they prefer to speak *Suisserdeutch* which is a dialect. Most of the Swiss, the businessmen and politicians, speak English. The French speakers sometimes don't speak English. They don't like to admit they speak German, but I found that in certain cases, if we had to communicate, they would admit finally that they spoke German and we could speak German.

Q: I have a couple of questions here. I would like you to, if you can, remember your first day when you arrived, and the other question is: what were your goals? Did you have your goals set out when you went to Switzerland?

WHITTLESEY: I don't remember my first day, except... I really don't recall it specifically. Do you mean my first day in the embassy?

Q: I mean your first day, when you arrived in the country as ambassador.

WHITTLESEY: I was met, I believe, by the consul general in Zurich, whose name was David Schwartz. He was very nice. I liked him very much. He became very upset subsequently that I didn't name him deputy chief of mission, but I had the highest regard for him. He was an outstanding officer. I had another officer that I wanted to make deputy chief of mission, whom I also admired and respected. The two of them were the two top officers in the embassy. David met me, the then-deputy met me, I recall, at the

Zurich airport. I was exhausted, with the children, and all the packing. I'd come from all these parties given at the time of my departure.

Q: You didn't stop over anywhere?

WHITTLESEY: No, no. They gave us guidelines about going in to the embassy - what you do on the first day. I remembered all that. Frankly, I think I was too tired, but in retrospect, I really don't think it's so important. I think there are certain things that an ambassador has to do to assert control in the embassy but whether it's the first day or the second day or the fifth day, doesn't really matter. Or the fiftieth day. Obviously you have to get a feel for the people and find out who gets along with whom and who works well together and who doesn't. It's like any other human institution. There are all kinds of subplots and little undercurrents that are not visible at the outset.

Q: Well, you had already been told that the Swiss would not accept you, which we'll find out whether or not was true. Did you have any feeling that the officers at your embassy did not accept you? The career people?

WHITTLESEY: My then-deputy, an older man by the name of Charles Stout, made a great point of telling me that he was a Republican, although his wife was an active Democrat, and how open he was to the idea of women and minorities - that was a kind of a leitmotif in his conversation. Actually, I did feel that he resented very much the fact that he was reporting to me, number one, a political appointee, number two, a woman younger than he, and that it was emotionally very difficult for him to accept the fact that I was his boss.

Q: Do you think it was mostly because you were a woman, or because you were a political appointee?

WHITTLESEY: A combination, definitely a combination. And a younger woman... But this is not unusual. I have found in my life that men of his generation find it extremely difficult. Younger men seem to be less sensitive to it. They talk about it, and they're conditioned to say they will accept it, but when they actually have to live with it themselves, and actually be deferential to a woman. He was openly insubordinate.

Q: Oh, he was?

WHITTLESEY: Oh, yes. Finally, after five months, I asked that he be removed. I had the choice. State told me when I went out as ambassador that I could choose a deputy. They said there was someone there. My attitude was that, even though they told me I could choose a deputy, I would see how it went with the person who was there. I would give it a try and see how we got along. Then I would make a decision. At that time, an ambassador could choose her own deputy within the system, without any restrictions. I could choose anybody within the system of appropriate rank. There were "stretches" so that officers could be below this rank. It was fairly common to give stretch appointments, in other words, appointments to the rank of the person who would normally serve in such

a job. I did give Charles Stout a try, for five months. Then I decided that I wanted to make a change. He went into fits of apoplexy and did not accept my decision. His reaction unmasked his real attitude toward my authority as the representative of Ronald Reagan.

Q: Had he been there a long time, by the way? Was he relatively new there?

WHITTLESEY: I can't remember exactly.

Q: But had he been chargé for a while?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, he had been chargé. There were a couple of things that put me off initially. First of all, I had been in government a long time. I had not been in the State Department, but I was very familiar with the phenomenon of bureaucratic sabotage. I knew how a bureaucracy worked. I knew the mentality; I knew the characteristic of civil servants because I had worked in state, local, federal governments, I had been both an appointed official myself, a bureaucrat myself and an elected official. Although I was new to the State Department, I was not new to government service or the press. A couple of things made me wonder about him. Initially, he wanted me to establish my authority vis á vis the U.S. ambassador in Geneva. I was to throw down the gauntlet and make it clear that I was the ambassador to Switzerland and the ambassador in Geneva had a lesser role. I was disinclined to do that, because, first of all, I liked Jeff Swaebe, who was the ambassador, and I thought "I can get along with him and we can work this out. There's no need to have a disagreement over turf."

The mission in Geneva was always trying to expand its influence and deal with the Swiss authorities in Geneva, as though they were the representatives of the U.S. government in Geneva. They tended to overlook the authority of the embassy in Bern. That was a problem, but it wasn't one that I thought was of such magnitude that I wanted to have an immediate conflict with the new ambassador. It didn't make sense to me. He also wanted me to lay down the ground rules firmly with the Swiss-American Chamber in Zurich. The embassy in Bern had had a number of problems with the Swiss-American Chamber, clashes with the embassy. I certainly wasn't inclined, at the outset, to go in and make a strong statement. I wanted to find out for myself the history of the disagreements, whatever they were, and the personality clashes that were a part of it. I wasn't inclined to start out having a clash with the Swiss-American Chamber in Zurich based upon Charles Stout's recommendation.

I guess my biggest disappointment was... There were three things that happened. The first one was that I was invited to make my first major speech in Zurich to the Swiss-American Chamber. This group was the largest group of the leading businessmen of Switzerland [who] would attend this function. Switzerland is a country in which the business community is dominant. These are the most important people in the country, Zurich being the financial capital of Switzerland. There was to be a speech and a luncheon. In the evening there was a dinner. Charles Stout was invited to both of those. He gave me no help at all, in offering any advice as to how I should conduct myself or

what I should do, how I should speak or what I should speak about. I think, in retrospect, looking back on it, I don't think he knew any of these people. I don't think he was familiar enough with these circles himself because I later learned that many of these diplomats in Switzerland were not invited by the top bankers and industrialists because they preferred to deal with the ambassador or not at all. They would deal with the treasury attaché, but frankly, didn't have a high regard for our diplomats. They were simply not invited into the inner circles of Zurich. In fairness to him, he probably didn't know what I should do, but he didn't attempt to find out, either.

I had made many speeches in my life, but the day before the speech I attended a luncheon in Bern. I sat next to a prominent Swiss. I asked him about my presentation the next day. I said, "How would you suggest I approach this? This is my first speech; it's a major speech," and I said, "I had intended to speak extemporaneously the way I [do] in the United States." He said, "Well, my advice is that that's a mistake, because the Swiss won't regard it as a serious speech unless you have a paper to deliver." I learned later that this is true. They always have "a paper." They don't put as much stock in extemporaneous speechmaking as we Americans do and they believe, in order to show seriousness of purpose, you have to show prior preparation and a paper has to be presented. Even if a Swiss speaker speaks extemporaneously, he always has a paper that he has prepared for distribution later.

I had not done this, so I stayed up that night, writing a speech myself. I wrote it about what Reagan hoped to accomplish, about his belief in new federalism, trying to return governmental powers to local and state governments, to reduce regulation, and what this would do for the economy, basically about domestic policies, about court appointments, the fact that courts had usurped their constitutional prerogatives had become too activist. They were not elected officials and they should be carrying out laws, not making law. That was the responsibility of elected officials. These are the things I covered. I think it was quite well received. I stayed up the entire night doing it and I remember feeling, in the car driving down with Charles Stout to Zurich - I went down with him and his wife - that I was annoyed that I had to hear this good advice from another source in Bern, not from my senior deputy or anyone else in the embassy.

[December 7, 1989]

Another example: On a Senate courtesy call in Bern, asked, "Would you like to have a complete copy of the president's recent message? We have it in English." He said, "Oh, yes, very much." He would like it. I noted the Soviets had sent to every member of the Parliament a copy of their counter proposal. This deputy, Mr. Stout, had discouraged me from sending the president's speech to Parliament. I had specifically urged it be sent to the Parliament. He discouraged me from doing so. I accepted his counsel at that time because I was new. I thought he knew what he was doing. Only to find this result.

Then I went to see the new Canadian ambassador to make a courtesy call. A few days later, or the next day, and the same thing happened. I said, "Have you seen our proposal on zero option?" Yes, I think it's very interesting. I said, "Do you have a copy?" "No." I hadn't brought a copy with me. He said, "You know the Soviets have distributed their

complete counter proposal to the diplomatic corps.” So the Canadian and the leader of the Swiss Senate both had the Soviet response and here is Charlie Stout telling me, "Oh, no, we don't do that sort of thing." Was this attitude reflectively of laziness, ignorance or incompetence? Or was it because he personally did not like President Reagan's proposal.

I thought, "Something is seriously wrong here. I tried to persuade Charles Stout that I wanted him to reorder the time of the officers, the political officer, the economic officer and himself. I didn't want them to give to completely reorient their whole lives, but I wanted them to take ten percent of their time and use it in public diplomacy. Get out of the embassy, go and speak to opinion leaders and seek out speaking engagements. They would say, "Nobody asks us. We go if we're asked."

I've been in politics. I know you can generate invitations. He resisted that suggestion. They did not want to do that kind of work. They were very comfortable. They were very concerned about their perks, their houses, their servants, their nice lives and the diplomatic circuit in Bern. But that use of their time didn't result in increasing the number of America's friends. That little cocktail circuit in Bern, which was very comfortable - everybody knew one another - but it wasn't carrying out the mission that I wanted them to undertake.

Q: Was it all the diplomatic corps?

WHITTLESEY: All the diplomatic corps. They saw the same people every night. Back and forth, entertaining back and forth. Very little was accomplished for the United States. They also saw the Swiss government officials, but opinion was being formed and manipulated against us out in the country. They had virtually no contact with the political leaders, leaders of Parliament, with the major labor leaders, with the media. And Charles Stout adamantly resisted this effort. I understand because in the State Department they don't get any personnel department points for their promotions based upon public diplomacy. It's a very low priority. They get promoted based upon the number of reports they write to Washington and how well they write reports and the analyses. They can do that sitting in their offices, which they would prefer to do in most cases. Such was my experience.

He was also openly insubordinate. I had been a prosecutor - an assistant U.S. Attorney. I had therefore an established relationship with the FBI. We had two FBI agents, no, one FBI agent in Bern at that time. The FBI was asking for a second agent. The previous ambassador had turned them down. So the FBI agent came to me, the agent in charge. made a case and said, "I'd like you to reconsider this and make a decision on the merits." I was inclined to be sympathetic because I had the highest regard for the FBI and I could see that our legal problems were mounting. Based upon my visits to the Justice Department and the SEC, that our problems with Switzerland were not at a crisis stage but they were headed for a collision.

I saw the FBI agent in charge, Larry Levine was his name, alone. I may have seen him several times. After Larry Levine got out of my office, Charles Stout confronted him in

the hall and demanded to know what we had discussed. Mr. Stout didn't come to me and ask me; he came to Larry Levine. That was really the limit as far as I was concerned.

There were a couple of other things. I was invited to events. One time I was invited to a party which was the seventy-fifth anniversary of a Swiss company. I didn't realize it was a most elaborate party. I thought it was an in home informal small dinner party. I was expected to make a speech. I had been in politics and was able to handle it but I felt I was inappropriately dressed for such an elaborate party. I had on a long skirt and a blouse, it was not a really a high fashion elegant dress that would have been appropriate for the occasion.

Also there were a number of other things. He gave me no guidance whatsoever about the people or the event.

Q: Do you think it's because he really didn't know, or was there an attempt to sabotage?

WHITTLESEY: I believed it was sabotage. There were things that he didn't know, but he also didn't make an effort to find out. At the New Year's Day greetings, I had no idea what it was: I knew we had to go to the Foreign Ministry but I didn't know that it was a formal ceremony and that there would be all the major Swiss television networks there. It was a very big event. I went to the New Year's greetings unprepared. These are major events for which one has to be prepared. He didn't do that for me. Clearly he knew what it was. I got the feeling after a while that he wanted me to stumble so that I would confirm the notion that I was an inappropriate choice. Then, later, I realized that there were other officers who had negative feelings about his leadership. As I developed an understanding of the embassy and got to know some of the people better, I realized the people that I thought were doing a good job were not the people that he favored. My judgement about performance was clearly not the same as his. I tended to seek out the advice of people in the embassy who I believed were serious and were more than just time servers. You see, some people would come to Switzerland with the idea that it was a quiet post, a reward of sorts. We can relax, enjoy the good life, enjoy the Alps or the country, enjoy our nice houses, our maids and have a relatively easy time. Frankly, that's not my idea of any job I've ever undertaken. There are always things to do. There were things to do in Switzerland—a tremendous amount of work to be done. Switzerland may be small, but it is a global economic player and a major international center.

Q: So the embassy divided into two camps?

WHITTLESEY: Well, yes. I wouldn't say two camps. There was a strong feeling against the State Department on the part of certain other agencies like the CIA, treasury, especially the CIA, and defense and the FBI. And the State Department group, were dependent on the DCM. I became very disillusioned with all the infighting and pettiness. I wanted someone who displayed initiative and energy and who shared my interest in public diplomacy, in active trade promotion, in solving the problem of insider trading that we were having, by going out and dealing with the banks directly and trying to persuade them of our point of view. I didn't believe Mr. Stout could or would do it. He took great

offense that I wanted to change. He has continued to attack me ever since - within the system - even after he left.

Q: Has he?

WHITTLESEY: Oh, yes. How dare I criticize him, senior foreign service officer, was his attitude.

Q: Is he still in the service?

WHITTLESEY: He may have retired by now. I don't really know. But I wrote a personnel report that was critical of him. I believe it was buried and never went into his file. I don't think it was ever in the system. Somehow they managed to deep-six it.

I gradually asserted myself within the embassy. I saw things that I liked and didn't like. I didn't respect the USIA officer very much. He was a great buddy of Charles Stout. He was absent frequently. He came in very late. His office was a mess. He liked parties. He was generally a bright man, but not exactly the sort that I thought should be representing us.

I remember once I went to lunch with him with a journalist. During the lunch I kept asking him jokingly, "Whose side are you on?" He was quite critical of the United States at the lunch. Apparently, he believed there would be no repercussions if he advocated his own opinions instead of those of the duly elected government.

Q: Really, to a foreigner?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. He was a very liberal Democrat and liked to talk about all our social problems, and was totally unsympathetic with Reagan's approach to those problems.

Q: That's pretty tactless, isn't it? On his part?

WHITTLESEY: I was a younger woman. He didn't take me seriously. They thought they didn't have to. He was convinced the system would protect him. He moved out finally. I think he was recalled. He had a problem with alcoholism. In fact, I know he did. I think he went back for treatment. He was a great buddy of Charlie Stout. I had an excellent relationship with the treasury attaché and with the political officer, who was harassed by Charlie Stout. And with the FBI and the defense attaché. We had one good defense attaché, Col. Justin La Porte, and one who preferred not to work so hard. But with Col. La Porte I had an excellent relationship. One of our jobs was to try to sell the M1 tank to the Swiss, so we geared up to do just that. Reagan had changed previous defense department policy and urged us to make a major effort to sell the Swiss on the M-1.

Ultimately I made the political officer my deputy. He was the one with whom I had a good relationship. I had enormous respect for his intellect, his writing ability, his

willingness to work and to find ways to help the United States, to be creative and innovative to help his country.

Q: You didn't consider bringing in somebody from...

WHITTLESEY: I was very cautious because I knew once I was out on the post I would have to choose a deputy from a resumé. I didn't want to do that. I had someone in the post with whom I could work easily, [whom] I liked. I liked his wife. She was a lovely polished lady who was a tremendous asset. That was particularly important because I didn't have a spouse. She liked to entertain and she was very helpful at any social event. She would go around and introduce people, not just stand in the corner like a lump, or spend her time talking to other Americans. She was very skilled in social events, in representational events. She was also well-read and could speak well. She spoke French. I saw no reason why, if I had someone with whom I had worked successfully and who was a career foreign service officer in good standing, why he couldn't be made my deputy. Ultimately he was. It was a stretch. I'll say! Joan Clark who was then the director general... it was a stretch appointment for Jim. It may even have been a double stretch, but I think it was just a stretch. She tried to persuade me that I should think about this. But I insisted, and she finally agreed. It was interesting. I got help from another career foreign service officer in Geneva, Mike Smith, who later became an ambassador. He had some strong feelings about the system. He gave me very good counsel to make it happen.

Q: Was he in the system?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. He had known Charlie Stout. I would see him in Geneva and he would come to see me in Bern. You see, some of these career officers were sympathetic to the Reagan approach to the world. Some were not, like Charlie Stout. But Mike Smith was; Jim Shinn was. They wanted to help me, because they knew that I was there to carry out the Reagan agenda. I couldn't have gotten Jim Shinn named my DCM without his guidance. Every step of the way he advised me how to deal with Joan Clark and how to deal with the State Department. He was in the room with me when I made the calls to Washington.

Q: I gather Joan Clark was director general at the time?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. I sought approval in the normal course and I got it with the advice of Mike Smith. I don't think she realized that I had someone from the system advising me. Mike had had clashes with Charlie Stout and fully supported my decision. He was then the U.S. trade representative in Geneva.

Q: He was the trade representative then?

WHITTLESEY: He later became... let's see... he later became an ambassador. I really liked him. I kind of lost track later. He got a divorce. I haven't seen him in a couple of years. We had wonderful times together. I made Jim Shinn my deputy. The treasury attaché, Jim Fall, for whom I had the highest regard, and [who] also was a career civil

servant, fully endorsed my decision as far as Charles Stout was concerned, and, of course, the FBI rep, Larry Levine also. I worked very closely with them, you see, because our biggest problem was the insider trading crisis. The treasury was very important to me, the FBI was very important, and Jim Shinn was invaluable. He stayed with me throughout my tour. When I went back to the White House, he stayed and was DCM through the John Lodge administration. Then when I came back he stayed with me for a while. I wanted to keep him on. I asked permission, State said no he couldn't stay, because he had been there four years at that point and it would have been a fifth year. I acquiesced reluctantly. I tried to persuade Ron Lauder to take Jim Shinn because I knew Felix Bloch [Felix S. Bloch - DCM at U.S. Embassy, Vienna, Austria in the mid-eighties under Ambassadors Helene Von Damm and Ronald Lauder. Accused of spying for and delivering sensitive U.S. government documents to the Soviet Union. Dismissed from the service and denied his pension rights.] had been there with Helene von Damm, and I knew Felix Bloch was personally disloyal to Helene von Damm. I had visited Helene there; I didn't know that Bloch was also disloyal to his country. But I believed, because he had been personally disloyal to Helene, he would probably be also personally disloyal to Ron Lauder. I tried to persuade Ron Lauder to take Jim Shinn. He told me that he would. Then, without telling me or explaining, he decided to keep Felix Bloch, to his everlasting sorrow.

Q: Gee, I'll say.

WHITTLESEY: So Jim Shinn went back to Washington, where he was punished for being loyal to me.

Q: What happened to him?

WHITTLESEY: First of all, his career counselor never answered any of his telephone calls. One of the things they do, one of the standard ploys I've learned is, that they never tell these career officers where they're going next. Those that are the favorites, the fair-haired boys, get their assignments early on and they get the plum assignments. Those to whom a message is being sent that you're not in favor, they have to wait months and months, They never hear anything. Jim didn't hear anything which was most demoralizing to him and his family. It was a deliberate snub.

Q: So he went back without an assignment?

WHITTLESEY: Without an assignment. I tried to help him. Finally Allan Keyes did take him. He worked with Allan Keyes in Washington. Then Allan Keyes quit.

Q: Yes, I remember that.

WHITTLESEY: Allan Keyes was a good friend of mine. I had asked Allan when Jim got nothing else. Then Jim went to the Atlantic Council and subsequently retired. It was made clear to him by the system that he was not in favor.

Q: He has retired now?

WHITTLESEY: I think he's about to retire this year.

Q: He went to the Atlantic Council, you said.

WHITTLESEY: The Atlantic Council. He was frightened because he knew by being loyal to me through these struggles that the system would take its toll on him. But I would say he was reasonably courageous about it all. It was a major struggle.

As a result of my naming Jim Shinn and having this stretch appointment or maybe even a double stretch, I'm not sure which it was, they devised in the State Department what I call "the Faith Whittlesey Memorial Rule," [this happened in the Reagan administration] that, in the future, ambassadors are not permitted to choose deputies from anywhere in the system but from a list of three provided by the State personnel system.

Q: Oh, really?

WHITTLESEY: Now they have a committee, a DCM committee and an ambassador is permitted to choose the DCM only from the list of three provided by the DCM committee.

Q: When did this go through?

WHITTLESEY: In the Reagan years. Under George Shultz. When it was first promulgated, it was restricted to political appointees [a really discriminatory differentiation]. Its application was restricted to political appointees. That was really "the Faith Whittlesey Memorial Rule." That was because of my Jim Shinn appointment. They changed it to apply to everyone. But of course the rule is designed for political appointees. Jim Shinn was my deputy, and together we did a lot and had a wonderful time working hard for our country and the duly elected government of Ronald Reagan. I still have the highest regard for him, his wife and for his entire family. We're still friends although I don't see them as much as I would like.

And Jim Fall, I feel the same way about him. Also Larry Levine. There was something else I wanted to mention. I also thought it was curious that Felix Bloch had been in the post for six years. I knew that when they told me that Jim Shinn had to go back because it would have been a fifth year for him, that there were other people who were not being held to the same standard. You see, they bend the rules to suit themselves. The rules are not implemented across the board; they use the rules to advance their own causes and favored. For example telling me that Jim Shinn couldn't stay on when they allowed Felix Bloch to stay on for six years.

Q: I was astonished when I read that because I didn't know anybody could stay six years.

WHITTLESEY: I think they did it in Germany too. There was a DCM there who stayed on for six years. We knew we couldn't fight it. So Jim went back. I tried to get Jim Shinn

another job. George Vest said that I had threatened him, that if I didn't get a job for Jim Shinn... you know, actually, what I did was "Jim Shinn has done excellent work in this administration and he should be recognized for it." He stayed on with John Lodge, who was by everyone's account, a challenge. I admit I was annoyed that I couldn't keep a tried and tested deputy.

Q: He was a little senile by that time, wasn't he?

WHITTLESEY: I don't know. He was in very poor health. But Jim was the deputy all through this period with John Lodge after I was back in the White House. Jim ran the embassy and kept the lid on the situation there and had done an excellent job, and was highly regarded by the Swiss. He was invited into private homes in the highest circles in Zurich. He was the only American career diplomat that I know who was so invited, except maybe this new Consul General in Zurich, Ruth van Heuven. I think will probably be invited. Most of them don't get invited. But Jim Shin was invited and I think Ruth will be invited. The others were not and are not.

It was clear... and then George Vest... We had a discussion about the unresponsiveness of the State Department to the American electorate and he said, "We have more power now at the end of the Reagan administration. We in the State Department bureaucracy had more power now than we did in the beginning. He noted that the Reagan administration did that. Things like the "Faith Whittlesey Memorial Rule," for example. Of course, it was true under George Shultz.

Q: Of course, I realize that.

WHITTLESEY: Restricting the power of political appointees to choose their own deputies was his goal. We had a lively discussion. Then, later there was a congressional hearing. His version of our conversation was different than mine.

Q: I have read all of that, in fact I have a copy of it here, marked up, because I wanted to question you about that later, but, if you don't mind, could we take when the time comes?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, yes.

Q: Because what I wanted to know was, was there any delay in presenting your credentials? I know this is going back to the very beginning, but did you feel that the Swiss were hostile to you?

WHITTLESEY: No, I didn't. I never felt that being a woman was a disadvantage in Switzerland. I felt, from the very beginning, that the Swiss welcomed me warmly. I was immediately deluged - as soon as they got to know me - with invitations. I don't mean the standard diplomatic invitations to the diplomatic corps events, but into the homes of the most prominent Swiss. I would say they were more forthcoming early on in Zurich than in Geneva. The Genevois are more restrained and reserved. Only at the end of my tour was I invited into the homes of the most influential citizens of people in Geneva. But I was invited. They don't even invite UN diplomats into their homes. I would go to parties

in Geneva that they would have, and I would be - sometimes the French ambassador would be there - but usually I was the only diplomatic presence at all, in Geneva. And in Zurich the same. I started to be included. These were the top bankers, the top industrialists. They knew I liked the country. I went skiing; they would invite me into their chalets. In fact, I had so many invitations my son, my youngest child, didn't want to go because he liked to sleep in his own bed. Visiting private chalets involved traveling and staying overnight in strange places. He was young. That was hard for me. I ended up mostly turning them down in the end, in the second tour, especially, because William just didn't want to be on display in the homes of strangers.

Q: And he was approaching that difficult age, too, whereas before, he was a child.

WHITTLESEY: He was a child, but he wanted the security of his own bed. He didn't want to always be sleeping in a strange bed. Even today, he's traveled so much with me, I ask him what he wants to do on his vacations and he says, "I want to go home." He has traveled in his young life so much that for him the greatest treat was to be at home. That was always a problem but completely understandable.

Q: Of course. You're always pulled, aren't you?

WHITTLESEY: I always wanted him to be with me, and my daughter too. She was different. From the very earliest time, she liked to be standing in receiving lines with a thousand people. Neither one of the boys liked it. My daughter just loved it. It was like a fish to water for her. She thrived and now, I guess, in this new life she'll continue. There were differences among my children.

I was invited to make speeches. I tried to visit many places. I went out into the country. I visited opinion leaders, parliamentarians. Because I had been involved in politics, I could talk to them fairly easily. One of the reasons they invited me, I think, was because they knew that I brought a certain perspective, that I was a conservative, that I had been involved in politics, that I had a certain political view. They wanted to hear that view and they knew that I had information that they wouldn't read in the newspapers. I brought an understanding to them of what was really happening in the United States that they didn't get from other people.

Q: Do you think it was a help, too, that you obviously had political clout?

WHITTLESEY: No, I would say no.

Q: So they could send a message through you?

WHITTLESEY: No, no, I don't think that was [it.]. They knew that I had influence with the Reagan administration, but no, I would say it was more really that they liked to find out what was going on from an insider.

Q: And you were knowledgeable.

WHITTLESEY: I was knowledgeable about the things they were interested in. Charlie Stout used to bring these huge piles of cables in every day. I had to race to catch up and read them. That's one of the reasons why I didn't pursue my language, because I had to catch up with all of this reading material. In the beginning I didn't know what I had to read and what I didn't have to read, so I was struggling through it all. Had I read everything that he had brought to me, I would be sitting at my desk the entire day doing nothing else, which is what some people in embassies do, I guess. I learned fairly quickly, and one of the reasons I had Jim Shinn was that I learned that much of this material was not of critical value to me. I didn't need it. Much too much gets printed in the State Department anyway. I needed to defend and advocate the policies of the United States. I had to have these governmental presented policies in advocacy form, which the cables don't provide in most cases. I had to read the newspapers. I had to read American newspapers. I had to read the literature, not of the Washington Post and the Herald Tribune, but I read the material that I got from my conservative magazines, the National Review, Human Events, the American Spectator, the publications from the Heritage Foundation. This was the Reagan administration. The State Department, because it didn't really share the view of the Reagan administration, was not presenting the Reagan case at its strongest in the material I received.

Q: I see.

WHITTLESEY: I wanted materials that would allow me to make the case at its strongest, and also to have some analysis of what the opposition was, what the arguments were, how to deal with the various arguments. That's how I spent my time. I think that's what made me interesting to the Swiss. I, unfortunately, didn't speak French or good High German. They preferred to speak English anyway, but I did have something to say about what Ronald Reagan's goals were. You can speak the language and not have anything to say.

Q: Very true.

WHITTLESEY: Speaking the language is not necessarily the highest priority. I was a lawyer. I became very knowledgeable about insider trading and about the legal problems we were having with the Swiss and with the court system in the U.S.

Q: Did you find your very great experience in politics was a big help to you?

WHITTLESEY: Yes.

Q: It seems to translate very well.

WHITTLESEY: Yes, it translates. Also my experience in the theater was helpful, because being an ambassador is... in a way, there's a ceremonial aspect to it. I felt that I was on stage in these public performances. I sought out friends of the United States in Switzerland. I tried to identify people within the country who were friends. I wanted to

give them encouragement to continue supporting the United States, to continue speaking out on behalf of the United States, to give them information so that they could defend the United States more effectively.

Q: I see.

WHITTLESEY: I wanted the officers to go out and speak. Some of them were better at it than others. Jim Shinn did a lot of public speaking at my request. He used to bring me big thick books about his previous service in Italy. When he was posted in Italy, he would go out and speak all over Italy. He spoke fluent Italian. He would speak on American foreign policy and would get his picture in the local papers. He told me the State Department paid no attention to his efforts. He never got any credit for that. Mostly they were interested in cables, analysis and writing. With some of the others in the embassy, I wouldn't send out making speeches because they would lose friends for the U.S. They were not able to speak in public. They were very happy to stay reading and writing cables. I don't think we can afford those type of officers much longer. I think we should select our diplomats and select foreign service officers on the basis of their ability to go out to be multifaceted. Yes, they have to write cables, but they also have to be able to make a public presentation. There were far too many of them that I simply could not send out to make a speech in Switzerland.

Q: Do you think Switzerland gets the pick of the crop, or do they get sort of...

WHITTLESEY: I think we get a mix. I think sometimes we get some of the pick of the crop because it is such a beautiful place.

Q: It's sort of self-selecting, isn't it? I mean, the people who go there want to go there?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. They want to go there. They want to go there, definitely. I met a lot of foreign service officers in my five years. A lot of them came through Bern to say we got people in Switzerland that weren't the best. No, I think the system does not reward those qualities. If I were to do anything in the State Department, if I were ever secretary of state, I would make sure, and I would say this to people, that the only kind of people who could be admitted as foreign service officers into the American diplomatic corps were people [who], assuming they had language ability and good analytical skills, good writing skills, but could also sell a carton of pink toilet paper to a corner grocer who was already ten cartons overstocked. If he or she could do that, then he could sell American foreign policy to the most difficult adversaries. He could be on the cutting edge and could go out and make friends for the United States and diminish the number of her enemies. That was my mission as I saw it. That should be the mission, in my mind, of every American diplomat abroad.

Q: When you got there and found you had all of these difficulties facing you, did your goals change, or were you able to carry out what you expected to carry out?

WHITTLESEY: One of the major problems I had the first time I was there was the

insider trading crisis. In that effort our biggest problem was, again, the U.S. government. The attitudes of the U.S. agencies, who were not inclined to try to find a diplomatic solution. The previous ambassador didn't want the issue in the diplomatic track. He wanted it to be resolved in the courts. What I did was pull it out of the courts, essentially put the court action on hold, and bring it back into the diplomatic track to resolve it diplomatically and amicably. That's what my mission was the first time, and also to try to sell the M1 tank. We were successful regarding the insider trading. That required a major selling effort. Not only with the U.S. agencies, the SEC. I spent a lot of time with John Shad, John Fedders, Bevis Longstreath, the members of the SEC, who had to be persuaded that this was a reasonable solution. Also with the Justice Department, to a lesser degree with the State Department. State was merely the go-between. The major players were basically the U.S. Justice Department and the SEC.

Finding a solution to this problem was my primary mission, and I became very much involved in it. As a lawyer I was interested. It caught my imagination. It was a major problem between the two countries. The Swiss cooperate with us in a variety of ways, I'm afraid there would have been some repercussions elsewhere in our relationship had we not been able to resolve this amicably. I thought it was very short-sighted to say, "Let it run its course in the courts." I had to persuade the U.S. officials that we were able to do it this way. They sent a mission to Bern. I organized this mission of the SEC and the Justice Department. They were there only one day and said they wanted to go home because they didn't think the Swiss were serious and were trying to circumvent. The team wanted to leave after just one day. That first day of the negotiations, they were not getting anywhere." They said they were the same, they haven't changed their attitude, and we're going home and we're bringing the Swiss suit."

"No, no, you can't do this," I implored. In addition, I had to persuade the Swiss banks who were getting advice from American lawyers that they should stonewall the U.S. government, in short, not cooperate at all. I persuaded them to rethink their position, readjust and try to reach a diplomatic solution. If they didn't come to an agreement, the end result was they were going to end up in court. They didn't like that. They were going to risk treble damage fines, contempt of court citations, headlines in all the financial press in New York, which would not be attractive to them. I believed there was a middle ground somewhere that we could find over a period of time. For me to go as a woman to the big Swiss banks... I remember going to the leadership of the Union Bank of Switzerland, the biggest bank, and trying to explain this to them in diplomatic, tactful language. I was there by myself, thinking, in their society there are no women in business. Hardly any at all. I assumed they were thinking, "Who does she think she is?" I tried to be the most diplomatic, the most tactful, it worked ultimately. I went around to all the banks and explained that we had to reach an agreement, and we did. That was my greatest accomplishment.

That agreement which was reached has become the model for use in other jurisdictions by the U.S. Justice Department.

Q: Is that so?

WHITTLESEY: Yes.

Q: What was it called?

WHITTLESEY: It was the "Memorandum of Understanding on Insider Trading." It was the opening up of Swiss banking secrecy, which was really, considering the stakes, quite an achievement. (End of tape)

And Jim Fall.

Q: So that has become a model.

WHITTLESEY: Yes, and it still is. It went on. There were further refinements in my second tour. Now the relationship on banking matters, which was so acrimonious when I first arrived on the scene, is virtually trouble-free.

Q: That's wonderful. That's terrific.

WHITTLESEY: It took a long time. The Swiss take a long time for these things.

Q: Indeed.

WHITTLESEY: Political clout is generally given as a reason for appointment of a political appointee. The reason why a political appointee, in my mind, is better is not that the person has political clout, that your phone calls will be taken in the White House. The real reason is that you're a salesman who agrees with the product, that is, the politics of the duly elected government. You are willing, first of all, to understand the product, you understand the policies of the president, and are willing to advocate those policies enthusiastically. A political appointee needs those skills. I think if we live up to our trust [we must] appoint people as political appointees who have interest in the president's policies - are not just socialites or big givers. I believe in a system of citizen ambassadors. We don't believe in an elite corps of diplomats, a self-selecting elite. In our country, historically, we've had a system of non-career ambassadors who represent the highest traditions of America. These people should be skilled in discussing the most controversial aspects of a president's foreign policy and be prepared to advocate for him. That's the difference with career diplomats. That's why I think there should be more political appointees rather than fewer.

Q: Do you think there should be any from the corps?

WHITTLESEY: I think it's very hard to get political appointees to go to places like Lagos, Nigeria, but I would try to get the best political appointees to go if I were secretary of state. Unfortunately, as a result of the situation in government today, I think George Bush is finding that it's hard to get people to serve, period. With all the disclosure rules and the climate. It's unfortunate, but those rules mean that the establishment in

Washington has more power because there are fewer and fewer people from the outside. Any president needs to rely upon the existing bureaucracy, but the direction should be set by the political appointees - so that the national election has real meaning.

Ideally every ambassador should be a personal representative of the president, appointed to carry out the president's agenda. Career appointees usually don't want to expose themselves to the criticism that they think they would get in another administration if they were too enthusiastic about supporting the policies of one president. Therefore they tend, for reasons of survival, to be passive and more neutral. I think a president is entitled to more than neutrality from his ambassadors. A career ambassador generally can't provide that enthusiasm because he is, understandably, concerned about what's going to happen to him in the next administration.

Q: Sure. I'd like your views on this. If the foreign service corps, the officer corps in general, only gets to a certain level, aren't you going to get awfully mediocre people into the service?

WHITTLESEY: No.

Q: You don't think so?

WHITTLESEY: No, because I don't think they should be encouraged to think they can be ambassadors, you see.

Q: I see. Change the premise?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, we should change the premise. We invite them to come into the diplomatic corps. We have people now... how many do they have, a hundred applicants for every person they select? I don't think there's any danger of not having good people. People will always want to go and serve in foreign posts. Now, as it becomes more dangerous for the United States abroad, there may be some reasons why we won't get the best people, but I think there are other ways of making the job attractive. These people should be, ideally, neutral. They're not neutral now. The lower level people, they come in, they don't really know how they should behave. But the people at the top set the political agenda and they carry it out through the State Department personnel system. These newcomers learn very quickly that if you don't conform to this top tier political agenda, you will be penalized. This was made very clear to a fine young officer for example who worked for me. He was a Ph.D. He was the best foreign service officer I ever encountered. His Ph.D. was from Penn State. He left the system because he was so disillusioned. He is now the top aide to John Silber, the president of Boston University. His name is Douglas Sears. He could be a political candidate in his own right. He's so attractive, well-spoken, talented.

Q: What do you think of the idea of career people coming in and serving five, ten years, then getting out and doing something else, and then perhaps coming back? A lot of them have done that. Gotten themselves high-powered jobs on committees on the Hill.

WHITTLESEY: I think that would be a good solution, because some of them are away from the United States for so long, some of them don't even like the United States. I think that was Felix Bloch's problem. But then, going to another government agency is not really going out into the real world of the private sector.

I think Bloch was typical of a number of foreign service officers I met who consider themselves an elite. They are intellectually superior to the average American in their own mind.

Q: I know what you mean.

WHITTLESEY: I don't think they like middle America very much. The American people are ill-served by types such as this. Felix Bloch, to me was the epitome of that person, of which I saw a fair number. They scorn middle-class values. They believe ordinary Americans are cultural barbarians; their religious faith, their traditional values, their more conservative approach to family matters...

Q: Within the State Department itself, because that is a good deal of the thrust of what I'm working on, do you feel that there is a difference of the mindset and the philosophy, depending on the cone? I mean, are the consular people less "elite," for example?

WHITTLESEY: The consular people aren't very much interested in policies, regrettably. I'll give you an example. I find that most of the women seem to gravitate to this cone or that's where they put them. I guess that's been one of the criticisms that they're not given higher-ranked political officer positions.

Q: Right.

WHITTLESEY: And economic officer positions. For example, a young consular officer said to me, "I was at a dinner party in Zurich, and there were some young people there and they were asking me questions. They knew I was an American diplomat, and they were asking me questions about this IMF treaty - the zero option, it became the IMF treaty - and I told them that I didn't know anything about that aspect of U.S. policy. I'm a consular officer. I didn't know anything about that. So we went on to another subject." I was horrified.

Q: Yes.

WHITTLESEY: I found that the consular people were not interested in policy questions because it didn't matter in their promotions. It all has to do with how they get promoted. This prompted me - this experience with this young diplomat in Zurich - to start a program in the embassy in which, in our staff meetings, the various sections had to make a presentation every week on some aspect of American policy for the benefit of the others. So that they could all be informed as to what American policy was generally. I believed they needed more general information.

Q: Were they assigned certain things or did they pick it?

WHITTLESEY: No, they were assigned, according to their areas. This served two purposes for me within the embassy. First of all, young people like this officer in Zurich would learn about the zero option so if he again were at a dinner party, he would be informed and able to discuss it intelligently. And secondly, it gave me an idea as to which officers had any skills in public presentation.

Q: Oh, sure.

WHITTLESEY: Also, I could tell what their own views of these policies were. I had been around for a long time in public life and could tell in the manner of the presentation how enthusiastic someone was or was not about a particular administration policy. So what I asked them to do with these policies was to present the administration policy, the reasons for it, present the opponent's position and how to deal with that objection. It was important that we know what was going on in Switzerland and we would report to Washington. They would read the papers to prepare this report in most cases. Our job was to advocate current American policies to all of our contacts. The meetings were very revealing to me but entirely new in an embassy, apparently.

Q: I'll bet it was.

WHITTLESEY: It was very useful because I could see that some people were better than others in speaking. Those people I would then encourage to go out and make speeches. Those that were totally lacking in skills I would keep inside. I also was able to figure out who was generally supportive of the Reagan administration policies and who was not. They always claim they can advocate the policy of any administration, but it is really not true.

Q: No, I've never heard of that being done.

WHITTLESEY: We're light years behind in dealing with public diplomacy in terms of what the Soviets do in Europe. We have learned to wage war with tanks and high tech, but we have not begun to scratch the surface of the manipulation of opinions of populations against us. Of course we have a real opposition press and an opposition political party in our democracy, which they don't have. Now there is more attention being paid to active measures in disinformation. Even the State Department has a section on disinformation now. They didn't have one then. At that time nobody even believed that it existed. It was obvious to me, because I was so much interested in it. So I did a number of other things. I became concerned that at various social functions the Americans would talk to themselves. I'd see them in the corner clustered and talking among themselves and the poor Swiss would be standing around. Throughout my time as an ambassador I said in staff meetings, "These are not social events to which you are invited as guests. You are invited there to work. And you are expected to work the room and to socialize with guests" I said it over and over again.

Q: Aren't they told this in the A100 course?

WHITTLESEY: You mean the diplomats?

Q: Yes.

WHITTLESEY: No, they don't do it. It was a continuing problem.

Q: Really?

WHITTLESEY: They got angry. I would look around standing at the door in the receiving line on the Fourth of July and see those Americans talking together and my blood pressure would go up. I had gone over this in the staff meetings. Some poor Swiss or some Nigerian was standing off by himself and here the American diplomats were clustered. I couldn't tell the wives what to do, but the husbands, the diplomats, were expected make guests of the American embassy feel welcome. It was so basic.

Q: That's true.

WHITTLESEY: They resented any advice at all. This is another small thing. When they would come in to the embassy residence, I would always ask the Americans to come early for any function.

Q: Yes.

WHITTLESEY: I would spend two hours upstairs memorizing the list, going over my speeches, learning the names of all the people. I did that every time.

Q: Sure.

WHITTLESEY: I would ask the Americans to come early. I would talk to them about the list, the people who were there.

Q: And they would have the list.

WHITTLESEY: Yes, we were spending the taxpayers' money. They would have the list and the goal was to make the most of the contacts. The women would come, and I would say, "I consider you a co-hostess with me. You are co-hosts and hostesses." It's a small thing, but they would come with big pocketbooks. "Will you please put your pocketbook in the office, because a hostess doesn't carry a large pocketbook." That was like asking them to fly to Lagos, I guess. Small things. Some of them obviously were very quick and knew immediately, and others, the wives, would go around with these great big clunky pocketbooks carrying their life savings at a social event in the residence. That was just one small thing.

Q: And some of them became angry?

WHITTLESEY: Some of the women, I would even say the secretaries, one in particular, June Foster, who's still there, was wonderful. She was such a gracious hostess and would come to any function and was so well-mannered and knew how to deal with people. Our consular officer, Annette Feeler, was wonderful. She was very good. Always properly dressed and dignified. Others couldn't make table conversation, even had poor table manners.

Q: Really?

WHITTLESEY: Oh, yes. Elbows on the table. Chewing gum at residence functions.

Q: You shock me.

What about press relationships the first time? Did you have good relations with the press?

WHITTLESEY: The first time, excellent, yes, I would say.

Q: They pretty much followed your activities and gave you good coverage?

WHITTLESEY: Good coverage, I would say.

Q: Did American press people come through?

WHITTLESEY: Did American press people come through? Some. I had a very good relationship with David Broder of the Washington Post. He wrote about me in the book *The Changing of the Guard*. I can give you a copy.

Q: Oh, great.

WHITTLESEY: I have it here. In fact, I think I'm the first one that he writes about in his "women of the right" when he wrote that book. I stayed in touch with Drew Lewis who was my mentor and good friend. He served as secretary of transportation. He is not really an ideologue. He loves the sport of politics and he's a good Republican. He kept telling me that I should come back, that I was out of the country for too long, that I was out of the action, and what was I doing staying over there too long? He constantly urged me to come back and asked what did I want to do when I came back. He told me that he was thinking of leaving his job because you shouldn't stay in these jobs too long. I was aware that I was probably going to get a call to come back after the mid-term elections. They were in '82. I had a sense that I was going to get a call. And I did. I got a call in early January, January second or third, from Jim Baker, to come back to take Elizabeth Dole's job at the White House. He said that I couldn't discuss it with anyone and I had to let them know in twenty minutes or something, maybe it was two hours. Some very short time. Then Mike Deaver called and said would I please come back and take the job, dealing with the organized interest groups in the White House. I asked a few questions.

Obviously I didn't ask enough of the right questions. I really didn't know really what to ask. I said, "I have to talk about this with my family." So I did, and of course the children really didn't understand what was involved. My mother-in-law was there staying with me. I was worried about my daughter's schooling. We made a call to our good friend who was the headmaster of the Pomfret School in Connecticut, an old family friend. He said that if I came back that he would take Amy in the middle of the year at the Pomfret School. She was then in the ninth grade. He called me back in twenty minutes and said yes, he could do it and he would take her sight unseen without any tests of any kind. I said that I would come back. They wanted me to get on the plane and come back that night. That was impossible, because there were no planes. We were six hours ahead. I tried, but they wanted me to appear at a press conference with Elizabeth Dole and the president the next day. I couldn't do that.

So I packed up everything and went back to Washington. I went over and bought a house in five days. My mother-in-law came there with me. She likes to look at houses and she loves to decorate. So we found a house. I bought it and moved in. I never really unpacked completely. I never had any time. They called me in January and I started my job in March - March 3rd, I think. The move had been so traumatic, that I immediately got quite sick. I had one of these colds - terrible flu-cold - that didn't get any better. Of course, the illness really affected my ability to perform at the White House, because nobody understands sickness there. You're not allowed to be sick. The pace of life is so fast, working from seven or eight in the morning until late at night, and I was sick. I simply couldn't catch up. I got there and I had to hire people and persuade people to come with me. I had to hire a deputy. I had to do all sorts of things. At the same time, it was like jumping on board a train going ninety miles an hour. There was no time to prepare. The White House was moving full steam ahead. I had never been in Washington before so I was a complete outsider. I didn't know anything about the power. I knew some of the people but I didn't know the power relationships inside the White House. And I didn't have a powerful husband to protect me, although I did have some powerful friends such as Paul Weyrich and Ed Felnor, the president of the Heritage Foundation, Senator Helms, Bill Clark. I didn't really think I needed friends. I came into it quite innocently, really. I realized when I got in there that I was in a... I wouldn't call it a snake pit but there were lots of vipers and operators around with different agendas. I survived as best I could for two years and three months.

I think we accomplished a lot during that time. The office was quite large. We had thirty-eight people at the height. I turned it into a policy advocacy office. Elizabeth Dole had used the office to rally support for the president's tax cutting policies and she had rallied the business community quite successfully. She had a good person by the name of Wayne Virelis who assisted her in those efforts.

She also used it to promote her soft feminist agenda. I don't call myself a feminist because for me, as someone said the other day in jest, "At least in the economic prescriptions, feminism is socialism in drag." That was my experience, that feminists, people who use that term, were Democrats. I had been, for example, the highest woman of either party in Pennsylvania, the highest elected woman for six years. The feminists

never supported me because I was a Republican. They didn't even know I was a conservative. It was enough that I was a Republican. They always supported the Democrats or very liberal Republicans.

To find so much support for feminism in the Reagan White House was a bit of a shock to me. I was quite surprised, for example, to see some of the people in Elizabeth Dole's office promoting unisex insurance, and some other programs that I didn't think were consistent with Ronald Reagan's philosophy.

I decided, first of all, to shift emphasis because, I was a believer in the principles which motivated Ronald Reagan and the people who elected him. I decided to turn it into a policy advocacy office for those principles. I didn't have much guidance from Jim Baker, who was my boss, or any one else. I was the only woman member of the senior staff. I was really quite terrified of all the others there. I was struck by the fact that some of them didn't seem to be, at least the people on Jim Baker's staff, didn't seem to be committed to the same principles.

Q: Really?

WHITTLESEY: I knew there had been these divisions in the Republican party between the Bush forces and the Reagan forces. I knew that the Reagan people had made every effort after the election to bring in the Bush people for the sake of harmony and cooperation. Jim Baker was brought in. Lots of others were brought in to the Reagan administration. It's interesting the Bush administration has not acted in a similar way with the Reagan people. Reagan advocates were not generally brought in by Bush. In those days it was clear the Reagan administration wanted to have harmony and so brought in many of the Bush operatives. They hired other Bush people. I don't mean Bush people, but people who were not particularly committed to the Reagan ideals. There were lots of women who were, in fact, opposed to many of the things the President stood for. They were pro-ERA; they were pro-abortion. They believed in a much more expansive federal role in childcare, what we call "federal babysitting." This came as a great shock to me to find so many people in the White House who were not really committed to what we were supposed to be doing, or I thought we were supposed to be doing.

I also was quite surprised to learn that there were so many people there who had never been involved in politics at all. I thought the White House was the political nerve center. There were lots of people there who had never, ever been involved in politics.

Now there were lots of academic types. I gravitated to those people. Ronald Reagan attracted intellectuals. During the first term I found it quite an exciting place to work because of the presence of all these intellectuals. They were full of all kinds of bright ideas, and in the country they were really on the cutting edge of the changes that were taking place. They were creating the policies, developing the ideas and developing the ideas that became the Reagan administration. They had been professors, writers and scholars. Jeane Kirkpatrick brought her own group of intellectuals with her. It was a very exciting place to work. Many of them were in the speech-writing office. But they were

also elsewhere, scattered around. I got to know a lot of these people. They became my natural allies and friends because I was working in this administration because I fervently believed in trying to carry out these policies that we had fought for so long. That's what I thought we were supposed to be doing there. Ed Meese was a great leader and was inspiring to everyone. He still is. Despite the vilification he has suffered for his efforts to implement Reagan's policies, he still is beloved and is considered a hero by everyone in the administration. In contrast, for example, to somebody like Mike Deaver who is seemed devoid of any philosophical interest. When he got into trouble later, nobody came to his defense at all. He loved the glamour, the glitz and the contacts, but there was not a lot of substance. He was close to Nancy Reagan's. The White House was split. I soon learned that Jim Baker had made an alliance with Mike Deaver because Deaver had power with Nancy. Meese and Clark were on the other side. Clark was the National Security Advisor at this time. Meese was domestic counselor. It was not a triumvirate. There were four. There was Deaver, Baker, Meese, and Clark. There was very little love lost, in fact there were two separate camps. Ed Meese was a perfect gentleman, as was Bill Clark. Neither Meese nor Clark leaked to the press. Baker leaked to the press constantly through himself and through his aides, as did Deaver. They used the press to vilify their opponents inside the White House. People who would please Jim Baker would get puff pieces written about them in the Washington Post. People who didn't please Jim Baker or weren't in his little power circle, got nasty pieces written about them in the various prestige press outlets. Jim Baker is very skilled in using the press to damage his enemies and promote his friends. He does that to this day. That's why he's liked so much by the Washington press because he, as they say, works with them. He's a great source of information to them.

Shortly after I arrived Mike Deaver made it clear to me that I was supposed to be handling women's issues. I was somewhat offended. Had I known that I was coming back to the White House to handle women's issues, I would have turned down the job. That was not my idea of my job responsibilities. Men, I find, have a tendency to put women in a corner handling women's issues while they handle the more important things. They let women squabble about women's issues. Throughout my political career I was never involved in so-called women's issues because that was not where the action was. The action is in tax, fiscal policy and defense and foreign policy. That's where the real action is, not in women's issues. Although now, social issues are playing a greater role, but up until that point they were definitely [not]. The idea of essentially demoting me and having me deal with women's issues, I didn't want to do that and resisted. I and my office were not allowed to talk to members of Congress because that was the job of the legislative office. Our jobs were very strictly segregated. I was supposed to deal with organized interest groups. Other staff members of the senior staff were dealing with the Congress. Somebody else dealt with the press. Everybody was jealous of his or her turf. When it came to women's issues, none of these men wanted to deal with the women members of the Republican party, who wanted to have a big conference on women's issues. They wanted me to do that, which was a completely sexist approach. I wasn't permitted to talk to members of Congress on any other subject, but they wanted me to handle the very liberal Republican members like Olympia Snow and her group, Claudine Schneider and Lynn Martin, on the subject of women's issues. It was an indication to me

of the low regard they held for these women's issues. On other issues they would talk to the men, but with women congressmen talking about women's issues they would give it to me, in their eyes a lowly member of the staff. I resisted. Then we had some meetings. I am pro-life.

Q: Were you always pro-life?

WHITTLESEY: My position has evolved in that I was never passionately involved on either side. I guess in the beginning I believed that there should be abortion in certain limited cases, but not totally unrestricted abortion. As I have learned more about the subject, I have gradually become more pro-life. Obviously, there is some questions now that are difficult, such as rape and incest, but that's so rare. It amounts to less than two percent of the pregnancies. I was definitely at that time pro-life. It's interesting, I asked Elizabeth Dole what her position was. She indicated to me that she had successfully straddled the issue and hadn't been required to take a position and indicated she was pleased to be able to do that. Ronald Reagan was strongly pro-life.

Q: Was that a dividing issue in the White House, too?

WHITTLESEY: It shouldn't have been because the President was pro-life.

Q: It shouldn't have been but I wondered.

WHITTLESEY: Oh, yes, so many of these women in the White House were pro-choice.

Q: What about your four men, did they take a stand one way or the other?

WHITTLESEY: Bill Clark and Meese were clearly pro-life. I don't know about Jim Baker. Jim Baker didn't seem to have really strong positions about anything. He's a person who apparently likes politics for the sport of it. He's a very smart man, but any kind of philosophical principles I don't really think he has. I once heard him try to talk the president out of his firm position on abortion. In the car there were the three of us. The president became very angry at Jim Baker in a Ronald Reagan gentlemanly way. Jim Baker was trying to urge the President to back off the issue because "it's hurting in the polls. The polls are against us." His idea of politics was to be a follower of the polls. The polls are made by the establishment media. So he didn't care enough about anything or didn't see the opportunity of turning a negative into a positive. In politics you could take an issue and turn it around in public opinion. Jim was a status quo politician, status quo as defined by the establishment.

[Interruption]

Q: You were talking about Baker and that you respect him but he doesn't...

WHITTLESEY: I do. He just doesn't have the same commitment to these ideals that an Ed Meese has or I have or Bill Clark has. Or Ken Cribb or other people who worked for

the White House, so that his attitude was bound to create problems. There are some people in politics because they believe in certain things and others for a variety of reasons like the glitter and the glamour. Jim Baker is somewhat like Drew Lewis, he's definitely a Republican, but he likes the sport of winning and he's fascinated by the power relationships. He also likes to maintain his own personal power. That for him is the highest ideal, rather than a policy or program. Jim Baker is highly competent public servant with enormous "street smarts." We differed, however, regarding public policy.

Q: I understand.

WHITTLESEY: There are people in every institution who are, I suppose, more inclined to this point of view. But he is...

I guess things got off to a little bit of a bad start because of this issue of "women's issues" and these congressional women. They were all very liberal, or ninety percent of them were. I resisted the idea that I was supposed to be the women's issue person in the White House just because I was a woman. In my entire political career I had refused to be pigeonholed as someone dealing with women's issues. I have made almost a cause celebre of that view in my political career. They weren't aware of that aspect of my past, but I considered it, frankly, to be quite demeaning. And it was clear that they wanted women's issues to be my principle responsibility. They also asked me to start a program on Central America.

Q: This is the outreach?

WHITTLESEY: It was clear that the left had a near monopoly on the information that was being disseminated about what was happening in Central America. Very little had been done to promote the president's policies and support the democratic forces in Central America. At that time the struggle was in El Salvador. Now it's El Salvador again; now that we've lost Nicaragua. Both Jim Baker and Mike Deaver were conscious of what this was doing to the president's image. They asked me to do this. This was an authorization to use my office to become a foreign policy advocacy office. This was a new initiative for this office. The Office of Public Liaison, in the past had been restricted completely to domestic policies. This brought me into direct confrontation with the State Department, because they thought it was their sole responsibility to explain American foreign policies to the American domestic audience. But actually, it makes good sense for the White House. The President makes a speech and explains and it's logical that the White House staff be in a position to elaborate those policies to a wider audience. Now we were not permitted to do so.

It was clear that this development was a cause for great consternation in the State Department. I suppose this was the beginning of some of the struggles that I had later. Now, I had the Charlie Stout problem before, but other than the Charlie Stout problem, things had gone fairly smoothly. I think they were satisfied with Jim Shinn in Bern but this White House Outreach Group was serious for them-it was a loss of turf. They saw it that way, it seemed.

George Shultz was then the secretary of state. He invited me over for lunch with Tony Motley, the then assistant secretary for Latin America. George and Tony had been put up to this, I believe, by the leaders of the career establishment in the State Department. They didn't have strong feelings themselves but they were made to feel that this White House group was somehow inappropriate, improper.

I was fairly innocent at this time. I didn't realize that it was such a turf battle for the State Department. I didn't even know it was something that had never been done before. Mike Armicost also called me over for a private meeting. This was clearly, for them, something that they wanted to stop at the outset. I spoke to Ambassador Jerry Hellman. We had a long lunch in the White House mess. He had formerly been in the Carter administration, ambassador to the UN mission in Geneva. He was friendly enough.

These State Department people were not committed to the president's policy in Central America. They therefore were not prepared to really do anything to make the case for Reagan's policy, to make the case at its strongest.

I remember Mike Deaver's comment about getting the Defense Department and the State Department to help with Central American explanations. He remarked, "They have these huge bureaucracies but just forget it, it's a waste of time. Hire your own people." I said, what we need are materials that can be distributed that will make these issues understandable in simple language - not long treatises for scholars and Councils on Foreign Relations. We need material that a group of Young Farmers of America, the Nurses Association or the Gas Association could understand, and why this issue is an important issue for them and for the country as a whole.

What the State Department does in its efforts to explain foreign policy is to target other groups in the U.S. interested in foreign policies. What they don't do is try to explain foreign policy to groups like the Turkey Farmers of America, the National Florists or the National Cattlemen's Association.

In my office, we made foreign policy an essential element in every outside group briefing. We put out position papers, explaining these issues in simple terms. We'd try to make them attractive, easy-to-read, relatively short, big print. We had a series of briefings in room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building, sometimes as many as five a day. A group would call up, like the Nurses Association, and say they want to come to the White House to talk about health issues. We would say in a very nice way, "That's fine. We'll talk about health issues for half the time, but the rest of the time we are going to talk about things that we think you should be informed about. It will be an exchange of views. You'll have a chance for questions and answers but we think your membership and your leaders would be interested in these other issues as well." By that method I was able, over the course of the two years that I was there, to educate the leaders of a wide variety of interest groups on the fundamental principles of Reagan policies. It paid tremendous dividends.

You wouldn't think nurses would be interested in Central America or affirmative action or any other subject beyond health, but we always tried to explain, not only Central America, but his general foreign policy principles - peace through strength basically. We also covered the economic basis of the administration, which was contrary to the liberal orthodoxy of the time. There had to be an information and education process because the national media certainly didn't provide this information. We put out White House papers. Every step of the way, the State Department was there trying to stop, block, obstruct, close it down, shut it off.

Q: Was this through their White House liaison people?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. And through allies in Jim Baker's office. They persuaded Jim Baker that this was a dangerous enterprise that I was engaged in and therefore it should be stopped. They did everything to stop it. First of all, they wouldn't allow any press to come for the longest time. Then the press accused us of having a secret program. Well, we said we wanted to open it to the press; we weren't allowed to. Then they would make fun of it. People like Larry Speakes, who didn't understand and wasn't really very committed to any of Reagan's core principles either, that I was ever aware of, would ridicule it. They would try to block us from distributing our materials.

We hired bright scholars, young people to write these things. We vetted them with every agency. That was the rule. We had a clearing process and had meetings with all the representatives of other agencies. We vetted all these documents.

We tried to raise the subject of the influx of refugees. We took a poll in the summer of '83. We asked the White House pollsters to do it. The White House pollsters were everywhere because everybody lived by the polls on every issue. They were taking a poll every fifteen minutes, it seemed, knowing where everybody stood in the country, what groups supported which ideas. We asked the pollster to insert some different questions in the polls, which showed that if the issue of refugees were inserted that the support for the President's policies went from 20% to 80%, in one poll. If the issue of illegal immigration surfaced in the questions, in other words, if there was a danger of one million refugees coming to the U.S. if the President's policies failed, and there is turmoil and conflict in Central America, how do you feel about it? There was a complete switch. Therefore, we realized that the issue of refugees could be used. It is a real problem anyway and will worsen if the situation deteriorates in Central America. It was already serious then. Every time a communist government comes into power 10% of the people flee. That's just plain fact. Of course in Afghanistan, one-third of the population fled. We knew we'd have feet people, not boat people, walking over the border from Mexico, our 2,000 mile unguarded border. We tried to use this issue to alert people to what was really happening, because the poll also showed that many people in the United States thought El Salvador was an island somewhere off the coast of Spain. They were very confused about geography. The U.S. was on one side in Salvador and another side in Nicaragua, and they were very confused. We had a big job to do.

We thought we could use the issue of refugees in an effective way based upon the

historical record when communist governments come to power. We vetted it with all the agencies. They all approved. The State Department did not approve because everything they did was to block anything constructive. to help the president explain his policies in Central America. That was my experience throughout my time in the Reagan White House.

Q: Now is this pretty much attributable to George Shultz, do you think?

WHITTLESEY: Ultimately, yes. He bears the responsibility. He allowed it to happen. The reason George Shultz, in my view, was not vilified by the Washington Post as other Reagan appointees were was that in his actions he allowed the State Department to run according to the wishes of the Washington establishment and carry out basically a Washington Post agenda inside the agency. Ed Meese was crucified because he tried to implement the Reagan policies which are not popular with the Washington Post. That explains the difference between the treatment of the two. George Shultz allowed the career people within the State Department to run this aspect. His rhetoric was wonderful on Central America. But the inside bureaucracy simply did not support the rhetoric. There were countless examples of that. This is just one.

We had this policy paper on refugees. The response was, "Well, you know, it would create the fear among these people. We were chauvinistic and against brown people." All the refugee groups had cleared this. We had had this paper massaged countless times by all these outside groups, the leaders of all these groups. They approved it because they recognized the seriousness of the problem. Jim Baker essentially pocket vetoed it. He never allowed it to be published because he had to clear everything ultimately. Now when this issue of refugees on the front page of the New York Times I feel like sending him the clippings and saying, "Remember Jim, we could have done something about this problem then." He was responding to the wishes of the Washington establishment State Department.

We ran the Central American Outreach Program. It became a center. All the people in Central America who were fighting for freedom knew about it who were fighting for freedom. We had writers, priests, people like the archbishop of Costa Rica, labor leaders, teachers, businessmen, housewives, Indians. They came to the White House outreach group to tell their story to this weekly outreach meeting in room 450. We had different people coming every week telling the truth. We had to have a staff because every person had to be cleared to enter the old OEB. It was very complicated getting into the White House. You have to have social security numbers and all that sort of thing. It gave an enormous visibility to the president's ideas. We could have done much more had we had real support, but every step of the way they, they ridiculed, and did everything to stop it and diminish its effectiveness.

After I left to return to Bern, they discontinued it immediately. They started the brown bag operation with Ollie North. What we were doing was completely open and above board. It was an honest effort to change minds and hearts and to provide a forum for truth telling. After I left most everyone involved in the Central America outreach group was

hauled before the Democratic Congress and investigated by the State Department and/or the Congress - me, Bob Reilly, Otto Reich, Ollie North.

Q: Was there any fund raising in your group?

WHITTLESEY: No. Absolutely not. Ollie North was one of our most popular briefers. We had our official Central America outreach meeting every Wednesday at 2 p.m. Ollie North spoke every other time or so. Constantine Menges spoke; Colonel Tracy from the Defense Department. The President spoke, George Bush spoke, Jim Baker spoke once - Ollie North was a hit. Had that Senate committee done its homework, [the Iran-Contra committee,] they would have realized what a star performer Ollie North was. He has a tremendous stage presence.

Q: Before he got on TV?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, he was very gifted in making public presentations. First, Morton Blackwell ran it for me, then Bob Reilly did. Both were super. We put out papers, did radio and television; we distributed materials. We pleaded with Jim Baker to let us do briefings for members of the Hill staff. They blocked us. The Hill staffers were hungry for information about Central America. There were big fights in Congress. We said, "If you're not going to do the briefings of these people, why don't you let us do it?" They dragged their feet. Ken Duberstein was then the [assistant to the president for legislative affairs]. He and the Baker team didn't really support the program. They were in politics or in the White House for variety of reasons, but it wasn't to really help the president sell his more controversial positions. But ultimately the responsibility was the president's. He didn't insist that this be done. We were successful nevertheless. During the height of this program, we got a hundred million dollars in military aid for the contras. So we were able to influence opinion. It was, I think, one of the high points of my time there.

There was a terrible division in the White House. My heart was with the conservatives, not with the pragmatists who were in government for other reasons. I didn't seek out the glitzy life of Washington. I didn't care how many dinner parties I was invited to. I'd been to enough dinner parties in my life. That part of the life there didn't appeal to me. I didn't leak to the press. I found to my sorrow, of course, that you pay a price for failing to leak and failing to go out on the circuit in Washington.

Q: Was this the bulk of the work you were doing?

WHITTLESEY: No, it was one aspect of it.

Q: One aspect.

WHITTLESEY: But it was a very important aspect. But what I was doing is trying to turn the office into an advocacy office. We did work on tuition tax credits, on pro-life, on school prayer, on the cutting edge issues. We turned around unisex insurance. We got the insurance industry backed off supporting it and opposing it, as they should. It would have

been detrimental to women. It happened to be something that was appealing to the feminists but it doesn't really help women. We also had a very active business liaison program trying to explain the fundamentals of the president's policies, economic, social and foreign policies.

I brought Alan Keyes to the White House to speak. Before that as a leading black conservative in the administration, he was never invited anywhere to speak. He was in the State Department. I said, "Alan, you must be booked solid. How can you find time to come over here because you must be put out on the speaking circuit everywhere?" He responded - oh, no, he was never invited any where, because, of course, he was a committed conservative...

Q: He was in IO [Bureau of International Organization Affairs] wasn't he?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, then he was. We tried to work also on South Africa and were blocked by Vice President Bush. We tried to work on Ethiopia, trying to explain Reagan's policies. Remember the live aid, the farm aid business?

Q: Yes.

WHITTLESEY: What explained what was really going on, that it wasn't a natural disaster. Nature was part of it, but it was primarily government policies that were causing those terrible famines. Forced centralization. We tried to build up our relationships with black community who were interested in a reasonable dialogue.

It was a very active office. We had the Jewish groups in. We brought the Hispanics in. We brought the Puerto Rican leadership in to the White House for the first time. They'd never been invited before. We had the Balts, the Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians. I remember being utterly shocked at the emotional outpouring from the Balts. We called them the Baltic Group, the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. The great passion of these people, in fighting for their freedom was very moving. Here in the U.S. there were many groups. We organized Baltic Freedom Day. I was dealing with all the groups that were unfashionable. Others in the White House wanted to take the business portfolio away from me because they saw business contacts as a stepping stone for future careers. I was amused. All these ethnic groups. Nobody wanted to steal the Baltic group, the Hungarians or the Jews. Nobody wanted to steal those [Laughter] groups fighting in the U.S. for the freedom of the captive nations.

Q: A big turf fight all the time, isn't it?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. I also arranged a meeting between Jerry Falwell and the ambassador of Israel. I got to know all the famous preachers, Jimmy Swaggart, Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, the leaders of the new right. Jim Baker, then, launched an attack on me. I guess to try to get me to quit.

Q: Why? You were doing a good job.

WHITTLESEY: I was working for Jim Baker but Jim Baker was carrying out his own agenda trying to downplay Reagan's agenda. I was not conforming to Jim Baker's idea of becoming more moderate. I was conforming in my mind to the president's agenda of committed conservatism.

Q: You were getting visible, too.

WHITTLESEY: I was more allied with Ed Meese and Bill Clark - philosophically allied. But I was under Jim Baker's line of authority. Jim leaked these stories against me in the press. It was a constant leaking against me, and writing nasty stories going on and on. Then also doing nothing to help me. Trying to cut me off from promoting conservative policies, forcing me to take people that I didn't want on my staff. Jim Baker spies on my staff. Forcing me to hire people he chose.

When I came in I wanted to have my own people. I made quite a few mistakes in hiring because I had to move so quickly. I knew Elizabeth Dole's people were all loyal to her. My agenda and hers were not really the same. She took a lot of her staff with her. There was a big story in the Washington Post that I fired a lot of people. I did so only because I thought it was more compassionate to let them go at the beginning then change one by one, with the staff never knowing when they were going. Also people have time to build up resistance to any change the longer they stay in the job. It's easier to do it a clean sweep in the beginning and start from scratch. There were all kinds of little stories about my staff.

Q: Did these affect you, all this campaign? It must have.

WHITTLESEY: Sure it did. I realized that I had to develop my own constituency. The conservatives rallied round me. They called me the "last conservative on Reagan's White House staff." They realized that I was far from perfect but I was at least the best thing that they had seen in a while in that White House under Jim Baker. They decided to throw down the gauntlet around me and say, "Don't dare touch her or we'll... They made me the focal point of their resistance to Jim Baker.

I also tried to have a reconciliation of the conservatives with Jim Baker. I said, "Jim, why can't we get together over Central America? This is such an easy issue. You agree, the president wants it, they agree, why can't we bring everybody together on this issue?" I didn't realize how deep-seated the antagonism was between the conservative movement leadership and Jim Baker by this point.

Q: The two groups?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. It was just impossible, but I did try. I tried to bring together the religious groups with the business community, because in Ronald Reagan's governing coalition, we had Wall Street, we also had Main Street, and we had the religious right. They had to get along. If their influence could be joined, what a tremendous power it

would be to do good things for the country. I would help the president develop political support for his policy. Some of it worked. I kept trying these things, like bringing Jerry Falwell together with the leader of the business roundtable. Reconciling business and the religious right didn't work, mainly because there's a cultural clash between the two groups. Jerry Falwell is a very smart man, very well read, but he comes from middle America. Business leaders are for the most part upper class country club Republicans. They will never be comfortable with one another even though they were part of the same...

We brought lots of people into that White House. I had my staff giving tours and trying to get them rides on Air Force One - I use the term the "little people," for example, we brought in the Jewish war veterans; everybody wants to deal with all the big Jewish developers, the national Jewish groups, because they have lots of money to contribute to campaigns. The Jewish Veterans are the local butcher and others. These were the people that we tried to cultivate, and give a sense of recognition and feeling that they had some relationship with Ronald Reagan's White House.

You see, Ronald Reagan really broke up the old FDR coalition. He broke up the traditional Democratic strongholds of the ethnics, the Catholics, and the Jews, and the big city machines. Many of these people were very unaccustomed to having any relationship with a Republican White House. They weren't really sure they wanted to be a part of this. For years and years these people had been solid Democrats. My theory was... there was one magazine article called "Wooing the Working Class." I don't know if you saw that. It was a headline in the National Journal with my picture on the front. It wasn't exactly the working class we were cultivating, but these were the people that I knew in Delaware County that had been Ronald Reagan's strongest constituency. They had to know from him they were appreciated. We had to have a contact with them. We had to explain to them what was happening. We had to listen to them. We had to show them that they counted and mattered. That's what I did in the Reagan White House.

Q: That was your political instinct, wasn't it, coming out?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. I realized early on what Jim Baker was doing.

Q: How soon did he start this, within a matter of months?

WHITTLESEY: The leaking against me started after I had the argument about handling women's issues. They became annoyed. Part of the problem was that I was physically sick because of the move and the strain of my family responsibilities. Then I saw other people in the White House, people like Ed Rollins, who supposedly was a conservative, but in fact he was co-opted by Jim Baker. Many people who were supposedly conservative were really under the influence of Jim Baker and carrying out the Jim Baker agenda, which wasn't really the same agenda of the Reagan campaign. Baker was always nervous about Meese and Clark. Bill Clark always helped me and gave me encouragement, as did Bill Casey. Bill Casey fully supported my effort in Central America. He wanted to do more. He was always asking "What can we do with the

media?" Charlie Wicks also supported it. They didn't realize how much trouble I was having over it internally. Cap Weinberger supported it. Cap Weinberger was always a loyal friend, because the administration was split. On one side were Jeane, Cap Weinberger, Casey, and Clark. Then gradually they all left. The only one left was Shultz. Shultz was always on the other side. It was Shultz and Baker against Casey, Kirkpatrick, Clark, Meese and Weinberger.

Q: I read in one of these news articles that there was a move on to have you replace Jeane Kirkpatrick at the UN? Was that actual fact?

WHITTLESEY: There was probably - yes. Yes, there was some talk of that. It was out of the question because I couldn't move again. I had three children and I simply could not move again. It was hard enough. I used to come home at night and fall asleep in my clothes. My youngest child, Will, used to call me up, "Mommy when are you coming home?" I didn't go out in Washington. Most of the women in the Reagan administration either had no children or [were] divorced or the children were out of the house. I was the only one that had young children, in a top position. I couldn't go out at night. In Washington you have to go out and protect your flank. I know how to do that. I'd done it before, but I simply couldn't and fulfill by maternal responsibilities.

Q: You had no housekeeper?

WHITTLESEY: I did.

Q: You did, but you felt you had to be at home.

WHITTLESEY: A surrogate is not the same. I had a disaster with the housekeeper anyway. It's impossible to find someone who's... I just couldn't be out constantly. I would have had a disturbed child.

Q: Sure.

WHITTLESEY: The childless women would say to me, "You've got to be out on the circuit more." Well, I just couldn't do it. They told me, "You've got to spend time in a White House job promoting yourself."

Q: I bet.

WHITTLESEY: I was very uncomfortable promoting myself. Not that I'm not unaware of the need to do it, but it's not my primary motivation. It is for a lot of people in Washington. They're very skillful at promoting themselves. I admire them.

Q: It's so time consuming, for one thing.

WHITTLESEY: It's time consuming but it pays off. It pays big dividends. I made a decision. Conservative leaders came to me and said that I had to develop a constituency.

So I did among conservatives. Jim Baker would fire me but he couldn't. He would fire me because I was insubordinate, I guess, in his eyes. Ronald Reagan, what was he doing with a Jim Baker? Wasn't he supposed to be carrying out his promises? Ultimately the whole thing comes back to the president. We kept saying, 'Well the president doesn't know what's happening. He doesn't know what Jim Baker is doing.' But that only goes so far. The president perhaps believed he had to keep peace with the Baker forces and keeping Jim allowed him to maintain that fragile peace.

The conservative agenda was what the president told the American people he was going to do. Therefore I wanted to do what I could in my time in the White House to live up to these campaign promises we made. I also checked with my superiors. For example, I showed the movie, *The Silent Screamer*, in the White House in the Office of Public Liaison. I remember Don Regan's comment. He was there at the time. "But it's controversial." I said, "It may be but it's the president's policy." I realized that, obviously, you can only have a certain number of controversies but the pro-life cause was very important to Ronald Reagan.

Q: Where did Don Regan fit in?

WHITTLESEY: He came after Baker and Regan made the switch. Many left. All the bright lights went out in the White House one by one. When Baker was there with Deaver, Meese was there and Clark was also there. There were many missed opportunities, things we could have done that we didn't. After Jim Baker left for Treasury and after Meese left and Clark left, all the intellectuals, the bright lights, had no inspiration anymore. And Don Regan was uncomfortable with them anyway. So the brightest staff were either fired or left. One by one.

Q: Why was this change made when it was a successful team?

WHITTLESEY: Jim Baker was really tired, I believe.

Q: I see.

WHITTLESEY: Jim Baker wasn't comfortable around the intellectuals, but I believe he recognized that they were important for the success of the administration. I'm not sure how deeply believed that was or whether he thought that he couldn't get rid of them. Many of them were protected by Meese or Clark. They were inspired by Meese and Clark, and in foreign policy by Bill Clark and Bill Casey who were real leaders.

Q: Bill Clark was very highly thought of.

WHITTLESEY: Yes he was very highly regarded, but he was criticized for being a dunce. It was so far from the truth. People flocked to him, these bright scholars, as they also flocked to Jeane Kirkpatrick. They sensed that Bill and Jeane had a vision that others lacked. Also a conceptual framework for the world. Bill saw the world in moral terms. He's a devout Catholic. He believes in right and wrong and morally ordered liberty. He

was a passionate anti-Communist, like Casey, Weinberger and Ronald Reagan.

They rallied around Bill in particular. The same with Meese. Neither one has written. Bill Clark says he will never write his history. He may be forced to if Jim Baker writes a book and attacks him. I told him he's got to write for the record.

I have a civil relationship with Jim Baker. Some people on my staff created problems. I did hire some people that did some things to embarrass us. One lady by the name of Caroline Sunseth, talked to some religious groups and made some indiscreet comments to the press. Jim Baker was right in calling her on the carpet. She said that if you're not a Christian you have to get out of this White House or something like that. "You should have no place in this White House." She said other things that caused problems. He was always decent and polite to me in person. Jim Baker is a very complicated, charismatic person, very skilled in power relationships.

Q: Tell me, there was also talk of you being appointed to the Circuit Court of Appeals.

WHITTLESEY: Yes, I was asked by Senator Arlen Specter, repeatedly if I would be interested in a court appointment? I had said no. Arlen Specter called me. He was a friend. He's a very liberal Republican and was always taking positions that got everybody in the White House upset. Then they would call me and say, "Can you call Arlen and change his vote?" We remained good friends. He called and told me someone was being suggested for the Third Circuit Court of Appeals that he thought was inappropriate. She was too liberal even for him. He wanted me to go on the Court of Appeals. He really pushed hard. I was a reluctant candidate. He pushed and pushed. He said that he would get me through the judiciary committee, he and Senator Matthias. He said he had Matthias' word. "Don't worry about the confirmation fight. I'll be for you, Matthias will be for you. You'll go through. It's no problem." At this point I was a red flag to the liberals. They would turn me into a Dan Manion. He said, "No, no. Because you have me and Matthias." I knew Matthias and I thought I had a pretty good relationship with Matthias, too. But my heart really wasn't in it. So I started the process. I said, "Okay, I'll do it." Then I realized that the American Bar Association is controlled by liberals who behave like brown shirts. You know the fight that they have now trying to remove the Bar Association from a role in judicial appointments. The character of the ABA became evident during the Bork fight. The open season started with Dan Manion and some of the other Reagan judges. They were going to turn me into a cause célèbre as a conservative. I didn't want to do it because I didn't really care enough about it. It wasn't worth it to me. If I really wanted to be a judge, I would have said, "Okay, I'll go through with it" based on Arlen's firm assurances. I just didn't care enough.

Q: So you withdrew your name?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. There were others in the Reagan White House who were similarly treated by the Bar Association. The Bar Association is scandalous the way they use their role and, of course, liberals dominate it totally. They say, of course, that their arguments are always based upon qualifications, but it's really ideological. They use Bar Association

approval ratings as an ideological weapon. Now, there is a move to remove the Bar Association from its role in selecting judges. It came out during the Bork fight, and of course the Manion fight. I didn't have the stomach for it. I had received an offer from a law firm during this time. I really didn't know what I wanted to do. I didn't want to stay on in the White House because I knew I couldn't keep my children reasonably contented with that kind of a life. I used to drive my son into the White House in the morning for breakfast before I took him to school. I had a housekeeper. Finally I let her go because she was a disaster. I really couldn't stand the idea of having someone else take care of my child. This meltdown of household help has happened several times in my life. I would rather do everything myself than worry about somebody else. So I got up in the morning, made his lunch, did everything I had to do in the house, got him up, drove into the White House with him at 7:20 in the morning. He tumbled out of bed without his breakfast. He would have breakfast in the White House mess because I had an eight o'clock staff meeting. He was the only ten year old to twelve year old... He was the only boy of his age who had breakfast in the White House every morning every morning. I would have to say, "William, stand up. Here comes the vice president." He would be lounging on the rug on the floor or playing a game or doing homework. They loved him in the White House mess. After he had his breakfast I would come back from the staff meeting a little after 8:00, leave the office, go down to my car, drive him to school, then drive back to the White House and continue my office work.

Q: Where was your home, in Maryland?

WHITTLESEY: No, it was near American University in Washington.

Q: Oh, yes.

WHITTLESEY: When I had the housekeeper I would stay and not get home until nine o'clock or ten o'clock. When I got rid of the housekeeper, I decided, "This will force me to come home," because I had to pick Will up from school at five thirty, quarter to six. I just had to have a more reasonable life. So I would leave the White House early. If there were emergencies, someone else would go pick Will up for me. That did happen. My staff was great. Some of them would offer to go and pick him up. When I traveled I would take him with me if I could. But I had to leave the job. It was taking its toll on me and especially my children. I would leave the White House and go pick him up at six o'clock. So I couldn't go out on the circuit at night, and I didn't.

Q: It's an impossible situation.

WHITTLESEY: Sometimes I would have friends that would come and stay with him. He was old enough; he could stay by himself occasionally, but I was definitely limited in what I could do because of my family situation; it was definitely an impediment to my White House job. I also had limited financial resources.

I knew I couldn't stay. Don Regan was coming in, and he brought in what we in the Regan group called "the gray mice." [Laughter] That's what they were called, the people

who served him. However, in spite of this “gray mice” staff, Don Regan is a very smart person and was much more substantive than Jim Baker.

Q: Is that so?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, and also more courageous. Jim Baker leaked to the press. Don Regan refused to leak to the press, to his everlasting sorrow. You saw what happened to him. That's a lesson. “Leak to the press and we'll write puff pieces about you; if you don't Don Regan's fate will be your fate.” He also was interested in policy. He would master an issue, but he was mostly interested in economic issues. He had very little interest in foreign policy and had no time for it or social issues.

Q: You mean he really...

WHITTLESEY: No, the White House...

Q: Would not permit you to...

WHITTLESEY: No, not me. No, no for the president. I mean the president's speeches.

Q: Oh, I see. In the president's speeches.

WHITTLESEY: No, no, it was a dramatic change after Don Regan came in. Social issues were downplayed. Abortion was put on the back burner. Social issues weren't mentioned. Reagan made a major push for tax reform has been a major benefit for this country. The Office of Public Liaison was decimated. Linda Chavez came in as my successor. Her position was downgraded.

Q: Yes, I know it was. Did you pick your own time to leave?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. Let's see, the person that wanted my job was my deputy, Frank Donatelli. I didn't want him to have my job because he had been forced on me by Mike Deaver and Jim Baker. I did what I could to make sure that he did not get my job. I didn't believe he was the best person.

Q: He was one of their spies, was he?

WHITTLESEY: One their operatives. Maybe he was a conservative sometime in his youth, but he was totally coopted by Jim Baker and was primarily interested in making contacts for his future career. I was offered the job of going back to Switzerland. I took it. The question came, when would I actually depart? I said, "I refuse to depart until I'm confirmed." That was a minor skirmish, because Don Regan wanted his new staff in place immediately. I was advised to wait until confirmation by my friends. I thought that Linda Chavez would be a good director. I liked her and supported her. I met with her and tried to explain what I had done and some of the problems I had had. I think I left in May.

Q: Did you have any trouble with your second confirmation?

WHITTLESEY: No.

Q: Nor with the first?

WHITTLESEY: No. I thought I could do it without a hearing. Larry Pressler, a Republican senator, insisted on a hearing. I guess he didn't want to establish a precedent of confirming people without a hearing, so his position delayed it a little. Senator Claiborne Pell, was my friend and even though we disagreed politically, I knew him socially. He was the ranking Democrat. He was willing to dispense with the hearing, but Republican Larry Pressler insisted on a hearing. So we had a hearing. It was very short. I went out in May.

Q: Went out in May.

WHITTLESEY: Went out in May.

Q: Directly from the White House.

WHITTLESEY: Packed up, clothes and everything, out to Switzerland.

Q: Did you have to sell another house?

WHITTLESEY: I sold my house, yes.

Q: Did you really?

WHITTLESEY: Sold that house. My daughter at that time stayed at the Pomfret school. William went with me. Henry may have been at Harvard then, or St. Paul's, I can't remember exactly. I think he was in his first year at Harvard, or about to go.

I had a large staff in the White House. They knew that when somebody else was coming in they were going to be moving on. Some of them got other jobs. I've remained close to many of them. My old secretaries and my staff members. I see them. I've been very pleased at the success they've had after the White House. Some of the people I hired were mistakes of mine. Others were great successes as happens, I guess, in everything. I've always been worried about my judgment about people because I have made some tremendous mistakes in my life in my judgment of people I have hired to work for me. I suppose everybody makes those mistakes.

Q: Oh, sure.

WHITTLESEY: Morton Blackwell, Doug Riggs, Bob Reilly, of course, Mary Ann Meloy. Kathy Viaponde is now the U.S. Treasurer. I hired her. She handled Hispanic affairs. She was recommended to me by John Tower, who was a friend and still is. Doug

Holliday. Many of these people were let go by Linda Chavez because she wanted to bring in her own people, which is understandable. Eliza Pascal. I stay in touch with them. I saw Mary Jo Jacobi in New York not too long ago. She handled the business portfolio. Mark Klugman went on to become a special assistant to the president, a speechwriter for Ronald Reagan. He's now down helping the candidate of the free market get elected in Chile. They've done very well. I see these people around and I would say we have good relations for the most part. Doug Riggs did an outstanding job as the labor liaison. He went on to become legal counsel to the Department of Commerce.

Q: I would say that's a pretty good record. You looked forward to going back to Switzerland?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, I did, because I thought it would be better for my children. Life in Washington was not conducive to family life. My children were so excited. I told them on Christmas eve or Christmas day, I said, "I have a Christmas present for you. We're going back to Switzerland." They jumped for joy. So I looked forward to it. I had been there such a short time before. I didn't really have a chance to continue to do what I wanted to do there, and I liked the people. I enjoy the Swiss people. I enjoy the country. I've made many friends there so I was delighted to go. I was only there sixteen months when they asked me to go back to Washington. By the time I left the first time I had been there eighteen months. Altogether in my two tours I served nearly five years as ambassador. And two years and three months in the White House.

Q: Did you regret going to the White House?

WHITTLESEY: No, no. Not at all.

Q: Even though it took its toll on your family.

WHITTLESEY: Absolutely not. I made lots of good friends. I learned about Washington. I went there as a complete neophyte from the provinces, not knowing anything, made lots of mistakes, but I met some wonderful people and learned a lot. I think I'm a better person for what I learned. My own ideas have changed somewhat. My interests have changed. Now I describe myself not as a Republican but as a conservative. I was quite disillusioned with what I saw of the national Republican party. I don't give to Republican causes. I give to individual candidates, and to conservative groups - whatever small contributions I make. I saw how the parties work. The armies of consultants, the money that seemed to me was wasted in so many things and really not put into activities that were designed to inspire people with ideas, which are what move men and nations.

Q: And yet even after this very disillusioning experience you're still very idealistic, aren't you?

WHITTLESEY: Oh, I'm pessimistic about the world.

Q: Are you?

WHITTLESEY: Unfortunately about the United States. I saw in the White House the effect of Soviet active measures in the United States. One of my jobs was to deal with U.S. church groups. When the representatives of the Protestant main line churches would come in, their foreign policy agenda was virtually indistinguishable from that of the Soviets.

Q: Really?

WHITTLESEY: They could press a button and have demonstrations, people standing up in the Congress. I saw how they work the staffs in the Congress, whether the issue be the Philippines, Marcos, Turkey, South Africa, or El Salvador. They were all the same groups, the same people, but they could put their resources to work in support of any one of their causes. It was quite a surprise. We've figured out how to deal with war and tanks and weapons, but we have not figured out how to deal with the manipulation of public opinion in our own countries, in western democracies. We're very ill-equipped to do counter disinformation because we believe in freedom of speech, right of assembly, a strong opposition, and lively debates. I saw it again last night. I went to a dinner here in New York. A Soviet spokesman stood up and was talking about investment to a group of prominent businessmen here in New York. He was trying to entice them to invest in the Soviet Union. He said, "We like consumer goods but we're really interested in high technology." [Laughter] He was very clever.

Q: I'll bet they are.

WHITTLESEY: He is a member of the Soviet peace committee. It was a masterful presentation of disinformation. I could not believe that these people were so blind. A Hungarian, the president of the National Bank of Hungary, also spoke. With the eastern Europeans, at least, you feel that they're under the yoke. There is some hope that they are resisting and are trying to get themselves out from under that yoke. But the Soviets are very clever in manipulating western opinions. Helene van Damm was also there.

Q: Was she?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. We exchanged knowing glances. Mabel Weil was there. Her husband was the Reagan ambassador to Nepal, Lee Weil. Former congressman Joe Diogardia was there. We were not sold by this Soviet presentation, but the man was a master. The American business community appeared to be buying his line.

Q: They were sold on it?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, for the most part. There were a few of them who questioned, but the questions did not contain any indication of any reservations about the... or the regime. Nobody raised the question of why don't you take some money from your military budget and put it on consumer goods if you're so anxious to have consumer goods? Or why are you shipping twenty billion dollars a year to North Korea, Vietnam, Afghanistan, and

Cuba, twenty billion, if you need money. They were concerned only about the lack of stability, and whether Gorbachev could be overthrown. The only thing that makes the Soviet Union a superpower is its military arsenal which never even came up. It wasn't mentioned. The depth of anti-Americanism in Europe among the intellectual elite was a real shock.

Q: Was it?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. And the criticism.

Q: When you went back the second time, did you have some specific goals, were you given instructions?

WHITTLESEY: Goals. My goals were the same as before, to expand the friends of the United States and limit the number of her enemies or diffuse their effectiveness. We weren't selling M1 tanks this time, we were trying to persuade the Swiss to buy an American airplane. They bought four billion dollars of American aircraft while I was there the second time. Two billion of McDonnell-Douglas MD11's for Swissair, and they finally made the decision to buy the F18, an American fighter aircraft. The competition were the French and the Swedes. We were sophisticated, I think, in the way we went about persuading the Swiss to buy American products. We worked on it a lot in the embassy, and it was a big success.

We also resolved banking problems. We had a number of specific goals and objectives in the embassy in trade promotion matters. The storm of Iran-Contra broke soon; so much of our energy was consumed by dealing with that crisis because Switzerland was definitely part of it. We also had a very active program with young people, with school groups and with the press. Bob Reilly came over with me in USIA. He is so capable and active. He had Michael Korff as an assistant. Bob was a political appointee, but he had an assistant who was career USIA who is now there as the principal USIA officer. Michael Korff jumped right in and followed Bob's lead. The idea that I can't get along with any career foreign service officer is total hogwash, because with those that were willing to work, I had superb relationships. I maintain close relationships with them to this day. Many of the best careerists are looking for direction.

Q: Mr. Korff was there, was he? [When you went back?]

WHITTLESEY: He was there. Actually he came in later. The two people that were there, the two USIA officers who were there when I arrived the second time, were hopelessly inadequate.

Q: They must have come after you'd left.

WHITTLESEY: Yes. The first one was very ineffectual, very lazy, used the job to enjoy the perks, and did nothing. Knew nobody. Never entertained. Lived in a big house. I was absolutely unwilling to accept the fact that he was going to stay and be my USIA officer

for the duration.

Q: He was your PAO? [Public Affairs Officer]

WHITTLESEY: Yes. So he left. I told them in Washington that he was inadequate and I wanted to make a change. He also happened to be black, so this took a certain amount of courage. The second one was often late with unexplained and undocumented medical excuses. We suspected he had a problem with alcohol. We tried to get him treated. Jim Shinn called in the State Department doctor from Vienna. He refused. Because this may be public at some point, I will say only that my suspicions were confirmed. I guess to show me that they didn't value my or Jim Shinn's judgment, when he left Bern, they promoted him and made him the head of America House in West Berlin. I later heard that had many problems there also.

Q: Really?

WHITTLESEY: He took the Berlin position, for which he was totally unsuited. I later learned that he lasted six weeks. He was caught by the commanding officer, apparently walking down the hall in a state that was unacceptable to the commanding officer, and was sent back after six weeks. This personnel action was part of the accusations that were made against me, i.e., that I destroyed the careers of these people. It came up in the Congressional hearings: Did you accuse someone of being an alcoholic without proof? There are people in the foreign service who have problem with alcohol, as you may know.

Q: Oh, sure. They have a whole department to treat it.

WHITTLESEY: I had one the first tour and one the second time. We tried to get them medical treatment. They refused. When I was called back from my hearing, I didn't know that the second one had been fired from his post in Berlin. They didn't tell me. They (the Democrats) used that as though I had destroyed his reputation when in fact the same thing had happened to him at another post with an even shorter amount of time for him to prove himself. He was sent back to the U.S. after only six weeks in the job at America House. Then we got Michael Korff who's still there and who's great, who jumped in to the job with the students, with the papers, and traveled all over the country. He worked hard. I loved to take him with me because we always had a lively discussion with bankers, media people or whomever. Sometimes I would have a foreign service officer there who would sit like a lump, would never enter into the discussion with the Swiss or would never find ways in the conversation to defend the United States. Michael Korff was super. He would enter into the conversation, he would know how to handle matters tactfully.

Q: How did all of this trouble that you got into blow up?

WHITTLESEY: Most ambassadors wouldn't do what I did with the two USIA officers. It was high risk. I had let these two people go - I had made it clear they had to go. I knew

that I couldn't be successful and couldn't do what I wanted to do unless I had people who were willing to work. In the private sector, those personnel actions would have been accepted as normal turnover with a new CEO. It's not as if they were put out on the street; they were merely reassigned. I brought in Bob Reilly, a political appointee. It was all cleared through USIA. I did it in a totally aboveboard way. They had to approved it. But also he was on the cutting edge of the Reagan agenda. Later he wrote an article for the Wall Street Journal. He was investigated by the Democratic Congress seven times in the Reagan administration and exonerated every time.

Q: Was he really? Did you get Michael just through an ordinary transfer?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, an ordinary transfer. Somehow we got lucky. He came from Germany. He told me, "We never did any of these things in Germany." I said, "Michael you've got to go out and give speeches." He said, "I hardly ever gave any speeches, and if I did they were read and someone translated them into German." "No, Michael, you have to go out and talk to the press." So he did it. He plunged right in.

Then I got a new consul general in Zurich. I wanted a good person in Zurich because it was considered a very important position. We had had problems. I had chosen the previous consul general. We had problems with the consul general in Zurich. The first man, David Schwartz, I liked a lot. He got very upset when he wasn't made deputy, so he quit. I had to choose a new one. I had to interview the candidates, and I interviewed someone who was a hale-fellow-well-met. I thought he was all right, but he got into big struggles with Jim Shinn. They didn't get along. I was in the middle and had to support Jim Shinn. I had no ill feeling toward the other man, but it was a constant struggle. So this man became very angry and embittered in Zurich, and then we had to find another one. He was still there when I came back. So I wanted to have a good person and lo and behold, I found a conservative, highly intellectual USIA officer that I wanted to hire for Zurich. I didn't have the right to chose the consul general in Zurich but my opinions were considered.

Q: How did you find him? Through friends?

WHITTLESEY: I heard about him from a friend. He had spoken to our White House Central America outreach group. He was an expert on Central America. He spoke fluent Spanish and had been in Guatemala. He also spoke fluent German. He grew up in Germany. He was a Hungarian refugee, a naturalized American. He was perfect because Zurich is a major media center. I thought we needed a USIA officer, not a consular officer there because of the fact that it was a major financial center and a major media center. He handled the media brilliantly in Zurich for the U.S., and for that he was viciously attacked by the Zurich left-wing anti-American press.

Q: By Swiss press?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, but also by the State Department. I just talked to him recently and he feels that he's being persecuted again.

Q: They thought he was too outspoken, was that it?

WHITTLESEY: No, he's not outspoken. No, the real reason is because he was loyal to me and loyal to President Reagan.

Q: I see.

WHITTLESEY: He just left Zurich. The other lady that's there now in Zurich, I met. She's a lovely lady. I knew her in Geneva. She's the new consul general. I got along with her very well. She'll do an excellent job. Ruth van Heuven is her name. I made a request to have a USIA officer in Zurich, which was another jolt for the system because this consulate general in Zurich is a plum position that they wanted for one of their own. Here was an ambassador coming in and asking for a USIA officer there. I was pushing the system to the limit. Most ambassadors don't pay any attention to these things. They just take the people they get. I took a definite interest in the staffing and in what they were doing, because I didn't want somebody who was not going to be enthusiastic about carrying out the president's policies or wasn't willing to carry out public diplomacy in the manner that I thought was necessary. I interviewed these candidates. I had a series of questions that I would ask them so that I could determine what their real views were. A foreign service officer, loyal to President Reagan, developed those questions for me.

Q: Did you also do that same sort of thing when you were in the White House when you were hiring people, or is this a development that you thought of here?

WHITTLESEY: No, no. I became more sophisticated as I went along in terms of figuring out how to find out what the real views of career officers were, whether in the CIA, the Defense Department, or the State Department. One of the questions was, what do you think of Jonas Savimbi? There was a big battle going on then over aid to Savimbi. The State Department was against giving aid. Aid that came to him came because the Congress forced it on the administration, basically on the State Department. One of the questions I would ask would be how did they view that matter? I would get responses that would help me figure out where they stood. I was a big supporter of Jonas Savimbi and freedom fighters around the world.

Lots of people wanted the job in Zurich. I told State I wanted this particular USIA officer. I had also made this change in the two USIA officers. Then I made the case that I wanted Jim Shinn to stay on. Later on I found out Felix Bloch stayed six years. They made an exception for him. What was this, telling me that State had a firm rule? They bent the rules to suit their friends.

Q: You really did put the cat among the pigeons.

WHITTLESEY: This was a special request. He had done an outstanding job. I was entitled to have someone with whom I could work. Why can't you let me keep him? He wants to stay here. "No," was the response.

Q: Now, is this George Vest at the other end?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, George Vest. Not only that; they didn't even give Jim the courtesy of an answer to his request to know where he would go next for months and months.

Q: That's what you said he came back without an assignment.

WHITTLESEY: I had to choose a new DCM. I made one of the biggest mistakes of my life. I took another recommendation of John Tower and chose Eric Kunsman who had worked for John Tower in Geneva.

Q: Kunsman, okay.

WHITTLESEY: It was a terrible mistake. I knew it was a mistake practically two days after he came into the office. Mrs. Tower, Lilla Tower, (they subsequently got a divorce) had urged me not to take him - that he was untrustworthy in his character.

Q: Oh, really?

WHITTLESEY: She said "He doesn't tell the truth. He's devious. Don't trust him."

Q: Now, he's a career type?

WHITTLESEY: He's a career. He was clearly one of their golden boys.

Q: Water walkers.

WHITTLESEY: Yes. Lilla warned me against him. I like Lilla and I respect her. I'm still friendly with her. She's very ill, in the hospital. I disregarded her advice at the time and accepted John Tower's advice. He was personally disloyal to me from the day he walked in.

Q: Really?

WHITTLESEY: He had the idea that he was going to run the embassy and carry out the wishes of George Vest and company, i.e., the State Department career leadership, the union. He resisted everything. He told me at the interview that he liked social events and was willing to help in representation. I was very active in representation, traveling around the country. Jim Shinn and his wife, Pat, would go with me. They would entertain. If I couldn't go to something, I knew it could be covered by the Shinns. They could go and represent the United States well. I made the decision that they would cover the diplomatic circuit in Bern because I thought that circuit was less important than going to Zurich and Geneva. I thought I should be out in the country where opinion was being formed about the United States. I knew I could leave them with most of the responsibilities of the diplomatic corps in Bern because they would do it well. And they liked it. Eric told me

shortly after he arrived that he didn't like any of those receptions and would prefer not to go. He had been recently married to a woman who was in Poland. He didn't like people.

Q: He's in the wrong business then.

WHITTLESEY: He was very ambitious, worried about his career and submitting all the proper reports and cables that the State Department bureaus used in making promotions. Actually going out into the country and meeting people and hearing citizens' views, he couldn't do that. It came as a terrible shock to me. He had told me that he really liked to go out and meet people help in these activities which I believed were important. Now he said he didn't like it. I asked, "I'm going here this week, can you cover this and this?" His response was, "I prefer that you get somebody else."

Q: You don't mean it?

WHITTLESEY: I said, "You don't have to go, Eric, but would you please go?" "I prefer that you get somebody else to go," was his consistent reply. So I would. I'd try to get the military attachés. We were lucky, we had one really good military attaché, an air force attaché, who was very sociable and was well-received by the Swiss. He has subsequently been hired by McDonnell-Douglas to represent them in Bern. He was the mainstay for me during my time there, the air force attaché. I could rely on him. There were others, Michael Korff, Bob Reilly. Then I got Doug Sears - another career officer. He told me that they tried to dissuade him from coming to Bern because of me - that it would not be good for his career to work for me.

Q: Which slot was he taking?

WHITTLESEY: He took the pol-economic position. Let's see. Dick Devine was the economic officer. He was the assistant to the political and economic officers. That's what it was.

Q: Okay.

WHITTLESEY: Doug was superb. He was so talented. Because I couldn't rely on Eric Kunsman, I gravitated more and more to Doug Sears because he would help me. I also had a really good economic officer by the name of Dick Devine, whom I later made acting deputy chief of mission. I wanted to make him my DCM after Kunsman left. They turned him down. He also had been loyal to me through this struggle and still is a friend. In fact, I have to send him a Christmas present.

Q: He's still out there, is he?

WHITTLESEY: No, he's here. He was at the UN for a period of time. There was a political officer who came out who was very good at writing but was totally unable to go out and see people. He would go back and forth to the foreign ministry but he couldn't make any other contacts. At a party he would go stand in a corner. Could hardly talk to

anyone. Obviously didn't like social events. He would talk briefly but he was ill at ease in gatherings.

Q: Was he with you all the time?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. He and Kunsman. He ended up being a problem too. The problem was caused by the fact that when I went out a second time, I wanted to have a very active public diplomacy program. To that end, I had heard that Helene van Damm was able to have a supplemental fund. She raised money privately to pay for this, because the government budgets were limited. She had a fund [from] people who gave money through the State Department which could be used for augmenting the representation. I went to the State Department and asked questions. I said, "I've heard about this. Can you please tell me how to do it. If it's appropriate, I will do it." So they did. I asked my deputies back there in Bern to set it up, do what was required. Get all the paper work in order. I had approval from Mary Ryan and Ron Spiers. They knew I was doing this. The way the fund worked was people would make contributions, but the contributions were made not to me but to the U.S. Department of State. They had total control of the money at all times. I would spend my own money and would have to apply to this fund for reimbursement through Embassy Bonn administrative officer.

Q: I see. Presumably your administrative officer...

WHITTLESEY: They administered the fund through admin. All the reports had to be certified and okayed by him. No money could be paid to me until he had certified that they were proper. When the contributors gave money, they gave it for specific reasons set forth in the letters and the letters of acceptance. It would be used in my discretion to entertain Americans. In other words, to do things that we couldn't do with U.S. funds.

Q: You mean to bring Americans out?

WHITTLESEY: Every ambassador has a tremendous expense because Americans come out to visit. We want Americans to come to our embassies because they serve as catalysts in representational events. If I had, for example, Ed Fushner, as I did, the president of the Heritage Foundation, if I could get an Ed Fushner to come to Switzerland, I could have the leaders of the universities, the media, the academics, they would come to hear him. They knew me. I had been there for a few years. They might not come to a dinner if I just have a dinner. But if there was a prominent American we could attract - or a Frank Shakespeare - we could attract a group of people that we couldn't otherwise have attracted.

Q: Now I'm confused, because I thought as long as the majority or a certain percentage were foreigners, it was okay.

WHITTLESEY: Yes, but all the expenses of Americans coming to visit are not covered.

Q: I see. Expenses of bringing them out.

WHITTLESEY: He would stay with me and we would have meals. Not only bringing them out but all meals in the residence, that all had to come out of my own pocket and food in Switzerland was very expensive. Because any expenses for Americans were not covered, you see, except for perhaps one dinner where the government would pay if the guest list was over 50% Swiss.

Q: I see. You were using them as drawing cards, in other words?

WHITTLESEY: I had to absorb these expenses personally. These monies, you see, would give me an opportunity to bring people who would then be drawing cards for the Swiss. To the extent we had fifty percent foreigners, we could claim. But the representation money ran out also. It was a very limited amount. The purpose of this fund would be to pay for things, reasonable expenses that an ambassador incurs not covered by representation. In the past in the United States, only rich people could serve as ambassadors because it was so costly. The government paid for a certain amount of your entertaining, but for example no one can go to the Court of St. James unless he has a vast fortune because the expenses of an ambassador are not covered by representation funds. So unless you have your own fortune, a private citizen would have to go into debt.

Q: And you wanted to expand your program of representation.

WHITTLESEY: I wanted to have a more expansive program and I knew representation funds were limited. I didn't have a personal fortune to spend. The concept was to cover some of the expenses one necessarily incurs as ambassador, not covered by the representation account. That was the genesis of the idea. For example, in the residence, we bought things like large rubber rafts that were used on the Aare river in Bern. I had the Princeton singing group come, the Yale Alleycats, the Harvard Crocodilos. They would sing at a dinner and then they would stay for a few days. I might have them for a spaghetti dinner. I would give them the rafts, they could go on the Aare. They would go and sing in Bern, but these were expenses that I would incur. Families in the embassy also used these rubber rafts. In fact, they punctured them sometimes. The purpose was to make the life of our diplomats and our embassy staff more enjoyable. It enabled us to do a better job and make life in Bern more appealing with things that the government didn't have the money to provide. It wasn't going into my pocket. I bought things for the residence. For example, hair dryers for each room. We have guest rooms, people stay overnight. We have to have European hair dryers. People would come and say, "We don't have the right converter." It would take six months to get a requisition through the Department of State and they probably wouldn't approve it anyway, so we'll get them through the gift fund." We bought hair dryers. The state of the residence silver was atrocious. For certain things we had to use plastic implements.

Q: Well, State should pay for that.

WHITTLESEY: But they don't. They were running out of money. They were squeezed for finances. To get new things required volumes of requisitions and paper work. So why not buy some silver? We have this fund for such purposes. The silver stays with the

residence. So all of these things we purchased. Everything I did had to be cleared and certified by the certifying officer in the embassy. They had the money, I didn't. I only got reimbursed after it had gone through umpteen reviews. They had to review and approve every reimbursement to me. I still think it's a very good idea and should be used in every embassy. They used private funds to buy furniture for embassies, why not for other things?

Q: I know they do.

WHITTLESEY: Are they worried about quid pro quos with Merrill Lynch having a party on the eighth floor of State? They should be. That's what they accused me of. It's ridiculous. There are ways to accept these gifts and to write regulations to prohibit that sort of thing. No one ever claimed that there was any quid pro quo. What's more important, pieces of furniture or actually bringing people and having enhanced representation? What good is furniture if you have inadequate funds to represent?

Q: What was the genesis of all of this at you? Because Helene did it successfully and she had left by this time.

WHITTLESEY: Yes, yes. How it started, I guess...

...a target, and Helene was not. Well, Helene was a target in other ways.

Q: Was she?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, ultimately she was. She didn't make any of these changes in personnel that I made.

Q: I see. You made too many waves?

WHITTLESEY: I made a lot of waves.

Q: And also you think your White House activities...?

WHITTLESEY: I also was a potential future political candidate. The Democrats on the Hill knew that I was the likely candidate for governor of Pennsylvania. They had political motives in discrediting me because they wanted to make sure I could never be a candidate for governor in Pennsylvania, or senator or whatever.

Q: I see.

WHITTLESEY: The Democrats on the Hill work hand in glove with the bureaucrats and the Washington Post. It's an iron triangle. I was a political ambassador, I am not a social ambassador. Many ambassadors who are politically appointed are content to let the bureaucrats run the embassy. They go to their parties, but they don't make any waves inside the embassy. They're not really interested in changing policy implementation

inside the embassy. I was. They decided they were going to make a case of this. It was just utter nonsense. The administrative officer, who also had some serious personal problems, didn't get along with Jim Shinn, was another subplot. He blamed me for not...

Q: Is he the one who started this?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, the administrative officer. There were two that started it. One by the name of - what was his name, I can't even remember now. He was the economic officer that came before Dick Devine. He wanted an extension. There were several personnel actions that triggered this. This economic officer wanted an extension. He wanted to stay in Bern another year. Jim Shin turned him down. I also turned him down. He asked for reconsideration. I turned him down again. He had poor ratings. I even checked it with George Vest. I had learned enough that I went back and I said, "What do you think about this? I'm not inclined to do it but..." Vest he said he had no objection to my turning down his request for an extension. But you see, usually if an officer requests an extension, it's granted. In this case the man was so incompetent that I simply could not keep him for another year. The economic cone in Switzerland was the lifeblood of the embassy because the economic issues were so important. I'd taken transfer of technology away from him and given it to the commercial section because he couldn't handle it. I knew the Swiss didn't have much respect for his work. They were polite, however, as they always are.

Q: And Vest approved?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, he approved it. I turned down his request for extension.

Q: He'd been there two years, had he?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. He spent the whole year making trouble. He did not do much of anything else anyway. He spent the whole year, and he only left the following year. Officers get their decisions a year before they actually leave. He spent the whole year stirring up trouble because he was so resentful that I had turned him down.

This was not my only experience with this. You asked me once before about tandem couples. When I made Jim Shinn DCM, I promoted him from his position as political officer, but there was another economic officer, Gerry Moore, at the time who was higher in rank. The State Department bureaucracy is rigidly hierarchical. This economic officer was angry that I had made Jim Shinn the DCM.

Q: I can imagine.

WHITTLESEY: His wife was the consular officer.

Q: Now this isn't the same people?

WHITTLESEY: No, no, this was in the previous tour. The wife, after I'd made Jim Shinn

DCM, didn't speak to me from that point on. She was angry because her husband was not made DCM. This is an argument against tandem couples. Because if you take some personnel action affecting the husband, the wife is all out of joint, and vice versa. It really complicates personnel relations within an embassy when you have a wife and a husband. A wife is naturally loyal to her husband.

Q: An interesting point, I never thought of that.

WHITTLESEY: Not only she did not speak to me, but she didn't speak to my staff, my immediate staff. She was utterly rude. This woman also was, I think, vice chairman or chairman, Evangeline Monroe, of the foreign service officers association [American Foreign Service Association]. When I went through my struggles, the foreign service officers association made a point that they were going to embarrass me. They were going to target me as someone who had destroyed the career - I'm using the term in jest - destroyed the career, so-called, of this foreign service officer. This was the woman whose husband I had failed to promote. She thought her husband deserved this. I didn't promote her husband to DCM. I would not have done so. He just didn't warrant it, in my opinion. But I signed off on a meritorious award for him.

Q: Did you? That's pretty good.

WHITTLESEY: He had done good work but I didn't want to make him my DCM. She was so enraged and she never got over it. She didn't speak to me. She was really rude, Evangeline Monroe. She's active in what I call the union, the foreign service officers association. There's another subplot. She and Charlie Stout continued a vendetta against me.

Q: And that personnel action was the first time?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, the first tour. I had made waves with personnel actions. I turned down - what was his name - anyway I turned him down. Because he was a mediocre officer and he wasn't doing his job. He spent the whole year treading water, he never did anything of substance. We had to rewrite all his cables.

Q: That's this economic officer?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. This was the one before Dick Devine, who was there when I arrived. He came to the White House asking me for an extension. I said I would have to think about it. He was really determined to have an extension, not because he really liked Switzerland but because, he said, "I'm going to retire and I want to move back to Europe and I want to save my moving costs." That was the reason he gave me. Of course, later, they said later working with me was so terrible. Well, if working with me was so terrible, why did he want an extension? Why did he want to stay on? It was all concocted, anyway. I wouldn't have changed my personnel actions. I think an ambassador should be entitled to make certain adjustments within an embassy if he or she takes an interest and feels that certain people aren't living up to their potential or standards. I tried to hold up

standards only to find that the bureaucracy exploded in anger and resentment. How dare you interfere with our personnel practices? This is how powerful they are. It was personnel actions, first and foremost. Also I was the conservative lightning rod. I was a friend of Jesse Helms. The feminists were not my great supporters because I was not a supporter of ERA. I was a conservative in a town in which conservatives were tolerated during the Reagan years but are really not accepted. They later claimed there was some impropriety with this fund, which turned out not to be the case. The administrative officer said that I had used the fund to buy a blouse for my daughter. That's ridiculous. How could I do that? The certifying officer had to clear it and sign off on it. He subsequently apologized for that. That apology never came out. He apologized because he was running off at the mouth about this in the embassy and I heard about it. I said, "Don, you know, this is slanderous." I insisted that he apologize in front of his whole section and retract what he had said, which he did.

Q: He was running around saying that?

WHITTLESEY: Oh, yes, saying this. He had lots of personal problems. One of them being the same problem, I think, that some of the others had. The other two officers that were treated.

Q: His name was...

WHITTLESEY: Donald Lynch.

Q: I read this from cover to cover and it sounded like a pretty weak thing to me.

WHITTLESEY: Oh, there was nothing.

Q: Also when Vest got on the stand and Spiers got on the stand, they didn't say anything.

WHITTLESEY: No.

Q: The whole thing fell apart.

WHITTLESEY: It fell apart. It was politically motivated.

Q: But how did you feel having to go through all this? Was it a terrible experience?

WHITTLESEY: It was terrible. I had been through political struggles before, lots of them. I knew how to survive. You see, they thought I was a goner. They had a great sense of entitlement which is unfortunately common to many government employees. I was the CEO in the embassy. That they should be deferential to me as the representative of the president, of the duly elected government, of the electorate, did not enter their minds.

Q: The press certainly attacked you.

WHITTLESEY: The Washington Post led the pack attack. I was on the front page of the Philadelphia Inquirer, eight times. But the point of the coverage was to drive up my negatives in Pennsylvania because they thought I would later run for governor, you see. That was done by Bob Edgar, the former congressman from my home county, the Democrat. And Peter Kostmayer from Bucks County. They were the Democrat ultra-liberals in the U.S. House. Kostmayer, who was my chief attacker, was also the biggest supporter of the Sandinistas in the House. I was a Contra supporter. There were all kinds of...

Q: Wheels within wheels, weren't there?

WHITTLESEY: Wheels within wheels. He was the cheerleader for the Sandinistas, I was the supporter of the Contras. We had known one another politically for a long time. He is an ultra-liberal. I was on the other side and in Pennsylvania politics.

Q: I see.

WHITTLESEY: Then, of course, they got this Democrat operative, Spencer Oliver, involved in it. He's very partisan. The Washington Post joined, in as they always did when Reagan appointees were being attacked. They thought they had another victim, but they didn't find anything. I rallied my forces. I had a lot of people within the State Department who came to my aid because they realized what a smear it was and basically who believed in the concept of the gift fund. We had raised \$80,000 for the fund.

Q: Yes, that's the sum mentioned.

WHITTLESEY: The money just came in. I had been in the business of raising money when I was in politics before in Pennsylvania. I knew how to raise money easily. It was no big deal. For them, you see, \$80,000 was an unbelievable sum of money - and raised by a woman. There was a certain amount of jealousy. They thought, "There must be some sinister connection." There wasn't any. How could I raise so much money without making some promises in return? I had been an assistant U.S. attorney; I know legally what I can and cannot do. I'm smart enough to know I wasn't going to do anything illegal. I ended spending a lot of my own money for the representation costs. I was not reimbursed about \$25,000.

Q: Do you think this was a conspiracy set up?

WHITTLESEY: A conspiracy, no, but they worked together.

Q: And Kostmayer went to the...

WHITTLESEY: One of the foreign service officers who was my friend came to me and told me that this officer, the one that was denied the extension, came back to Washington and was peddling what he called "the scandal." He said, "I have a scandal in embassy Bern," and this officer, Harry Gilmore, said to him, "Get out of here." Apparently this

guy, Dick Dugstad, was known to be a lightweight and a loser within the foreign service. I heard that afterward. Harry Gilmore told me that.

Q: So he warned you that this fellow had come back?

WHITTLESEY: No, he told me all this only afterward. Richard Dugstad, Dick Dugstad. It's coming back to me. The one that was turned down for the extension. He had come back to Washington and was so embittered by the turndown that he went around to people that he thought were my political enemies and would stir this up. He himself stirred it up. He went to the Hill, he went to the Democrats on the Hill. I don't think Don Lynch, the administrative officer, was really a malicious person, but Don Lynch was very weak. He had a lot of personal problems. He had gone around telling a lie. I had forced him to retract it, which I had to do, I felt, for my own reputation. I think Lynch got in over his head. Dugstad was the one that was the real [instigator].

Q: All right, and the Munroes. They were all from your first tour?

WHITTLESEY: It was Dugstad and Lynch. And Kunsman, too, and Charlie Stout. Kunsman, the DCM, Dugstad and Lynch. Those were the three that worked against me within the embassy. He was drawn into this too, because the State Department establishment figured out that they could have a political ambassador victim, so Kunsman... but he was disloyal to me from the beginning in a general way and a specific way. He also didn't tell the truth on little things, which I discovered. From my first tour, the malcontents were Charlie Stout and Evangeline Monroe. They were back in the department. They had their own grudges from my first tour. Charlie Stout, because he had been removed as DCM and Evangeline Monroe because she so disliked Jim Shinn because her husband had been slighted in her eyes, and her friend, Charlie Stout, had been removed by me as DCM. She was an officer in the foreign service association [AFSA]. They put all that machinery in motion back in Washington. Charlie Stout was back there with Dick Dugstad. Then the man, for example the USIA officer, the black man I had sent back, he wasn't the kind of person to go and make a federal case, but they went out and recruited him. Other people were recruited into this effort to tarnish my reputation because they could make political hay with it. They were trying to emphasize the sleaze factor in the Reagan administration. They thought they had another victim, another confirmation of their position that political ambassadors always are a mistake.

Q: Oh, yes, I forgot about that, at the same time.

WHITTLESEY: They had lots of headlines but in the end it was nothing. The Congress ended up with egg on its face. They had nothing to show for it. I stayed on as ambassador. They would immediately run the same stories in the left wing Swiss press. They would be printed and would all go back to Washington in a cable which read, "Look, she's even being attacked in Switzerland." It was a circular motion, because they would be in touch with all these... and the Swiss press is quite left wing, with the exception of the NZZ. Like most press in Europe. Certainly not admirers of the Reagan administration. And especially negative towards the president's policies in Central

America, of which I was a leading exponent.

Q: So it was a way to get at you.

WHITTLESEY: It was a natural. They also started attacking the consul general in Zurich. They also attacked Bob Reilly. The consul general in Zurich was a career officer. They called him a spy. in the left-wing Swiss papers of dubious origin and financing. He was very distraught because his reputation was being sullied. They then accused us of trying to put undue influence on the Swiss press. The only thing we were doing was trying to make the case for the president's policies in Central America. We had demonstrations against our embassy that had to be broken up with water hoses. Not against me. At this time, the battle for the funding for the Contras was so intense that the left in Switzerland, in quiet Switzerland, was organizing these protests. We had people chaining themselves to the gates of the embassy, to the fence. Central America was the most divisive issue in Switzerland for the United States at that time.

Q: A very volatile issue.

WHITTLESEY: I was known to be a leading supporter of the Contras and the president's policies in support of the Contras and of Oliver North. My picture appeared in the paper with a little arrow... Oliver North. Then the Iran-Contra scandal broke. The whole thing was a convergence, and I was in the center of it.

Q: They tried to catch you up in the Iran-Xontra?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, they tried, desperately. They went through my files with a fine-tooth comb. I was interviewed for hours and hours, as were my staff. We wasted time in investigations, duplicate investigations from the House, from the Senate.

Q: That leads me to this question: Did all of this business that you were obliged to go through, did this seriously impair your effectiveness?

WHITTLESEY: When you have to spend so much of your time and energy on defending yourself, it leaves much less time to do the job that you're sent to do. I was determined that they were not going to win, because I knew I was blameless. I certainly had made mistakes of judgment. I wouldn't have changed any of the personnel decisions I had made. I had had the audacity, I suppose, in their eyes, to challenge their personnel system. They were determined that I would pay for it. That was the real reason the State Department went after me, because I had made waves in the personnel system. Most ambassadors don't do that.

I said, "Some of your people are simply not good enough. You have wonderful people, but you also have some lemons and I don't want the lemons. If I get a lemon I want you to take him out and give me somebody who is capable." That caused a huge storm. How dare I, I suppose, was their reaction. No one else had ever done it, you see. No political ambassador. Even the other Reagan political ambassadors never - I knew, they were my

friends - they never raised a storm. They took the people that were given to them. Should I have done that? Would I have done it differently? No, because I have to live with myself. If I'm working hard, I want people who are also working hard and who share my goals and objectives.

My disagreements with the State Department bureaucracy over personnel matters related to my belief that federal government agencies tend to become more unresponsive to the electorate the larger they become. As a conservative, I am reluctant to see too much power accumulate in Washington. My preference would be to have more governmental power at the local level, close to the people and more clearly visible to them. If the citizens do not like what they see, they can "throw the rascals out" at the new selection. Others may have more faith in the wisdom of federal bureaucrats.

It is, of course, necessary to have a federal bureaucracy in Washington to administer U.S. foreign policy and related international activities; however, even in these agencies, there is a need to be accountable to the electorate, i.e. to the duly elected representative of the citizens. Civil servants should not be able to thumb their noses at the policies of a duly elected president – and flagrantly undermine his policy prescriptions.

I was struggling with the very elitist State Department union leadership over questions of accountability. The issue in U.S. embassy Bern was who was in charge of setting priorities and establishing standards of performances in carrying out the president's policies – I, as the ambassador, or a self-selected, non-elected foreign-service association leadership group which was not at all sympathetic to the Strategic Defense initiative, the military build-up and efforts to combat Soviet indirect aggression in the Third World.

Our nation has struggled with similar questions of accountability with other large powerful governmental employee unions, for example, the teachers' unions. The national teachers' unions relentlessly resist most merit and performance tests imposed on them by anyone other than their own self-selected leadership even as test scores of children sink lower and lower.

Concentrations of power in the hands of a union leadership may bring some benefits to the members of the union, in the case of the State Department, the American Foreign Service Association, but such concentrations are essentially anti-democratic and non-egalitarian. The argument made these are merely questions of management and administration is specious. The key to the State Department system is that the policy agenda favored by the union leadership is enforced through the personnel system. Those who conform to it are rewarded, promoted and given choice postings.

During my years in the diplomatic service, conservative officers came to me and told me how they had to remain under cover so to speak, lest their career suffer. Also, I saw discrimination against conservative officers myself in the treatment of David Swartz, Jim Shinn, Doug Sears, Louis Segesvary, Dick Devine, just to name a few. This was over the nearly 5-year period I was in the diplomatic service.

Q: What do you see as your greatest successes in Switzerland?

WHITTLESEY: In Switzerland? Well, I think the resolution of the insider trading controversy with the banks was a big success, and I think the way I was and am still received by the Swiss. I would not have been elected president of the American Swiss Association if the Swiss hadn't liked me. That's my ultimate vindication. I was wined and dined when I left. I was invited everywhere.

Q: Did you not conclude some major agreements.

WHITTLESEY: We achieved some major agreements, technology transfer.

Q: These four here.

WHITTLESEY: Yes. Judicial assistance with the banks, law enforcement cooperation, that was major, a civil aviation agreement, and also the sale of the planes. Four billion dollars of sales is significant. And export control. Switzerland was seen as a point where there had been leakage of technology to the east. It was a major transit point for technology so we tried to work out agreements with them consistent with their neutrality. We were successful.

Q: You feel that you accomplished what you set out to do?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, I could have done much more had I not had all this diversion, but I think we did a lot. We inspired a lot of young people. I'm still invited to Switzerland, I'm invited to come see them. So is Bob Reilly. We had contact with countless young people. I went and made speeches everywhere, explaining American policies. Even now people say, casting no aspersions on any successor, "We really miss you. You were an active presence." And in fact, they say "we appreciate you even more now"

Q: Because they have something to compare you with.

WHITTLESEY: Not only that. Each person does it differently. I get invited to sit on the boards of Swiss companies. The Swiss diplomatic corps has basically a left bias that is similar to the left bias of the U.S. State Department. We have very lively discussions with Swiss diplomats. They call us imperialists in Central America and compare our policy there with the Soviet's in East Europe. In fact, I had one the other night at dinner say, "The Soviet troops are in East Europe and you're in Central America." Just unbelievable. This was a Swiss diplomat. Such statements are not uncommon among diplomats in Europe. They are generally to the left of their populations. Our State Department today is, as out of the main stream to the left. The policies that are imposed through the personnel system are those policies to the left of the general population. I come from a specific political perspective but I think they respect me for it. They know I am straightforward. They call all the time. It was a very difficult time. I think they respect the fact that I went through all this and survived.

Q: Did it affect your health?

WHITTLESEY: My health? I don't smoke, drink or drink coffee and I lead a very healthy life. I don't exercise at all, except skiing. I love to ski. I played in a tennis tournament two weeks ago with some great tennis pros. I don't have time to play tennis although I really ought to. I think the Swiss liked the fact that I loved their mountains and walked in the mountains. Most ambassadors in Bern never ventured into the mountains. They were comfortable on the diplomatic circuit. I was always out in the countryside. Some in State said I was going out, wasting miles going out into the countryside with a car. In my traveling around Switzerland, I was always the American ambassador wherever I was.

Q: Does life in the goldfish bowl bother you?

WHITTLESEY: Yes.

Q: You'd like to get away?

WHITTLESEY: Yes.

Q: It's almost impossible to have any privacy, isn't it?

WHITTLESEY: It's impossible. That's why I like being a private citizen now. So when people say, "Don't you want to go back into the government?" I say, "No, no, I'm not interested."

Q: Especially if you're a woman ambassador, it's very high profile.

WHITTLESEY: It's very hard. I skied everywhere in Switzerland. I think that helped, because they had pictures of me on the ski slopes. They knew that I genuinely loved the Alps. They love their mountains. I did a lot of business on the ski slopes. I usually skied with Swiss people.

Q: Of all of your career, and it's a fantastic career, what is the most important thing to you that you have accomplished? Was it the embassy, the work in the White House, getting Reagan elected?

WHITTLESEY: It would be hard to say.

Q: What gives you the most satisfaction, maybe if I put it that way?

WHITTLESEY: Obviously, working for a president of the United States is the greatest honor that any citizen could ever aspire to. I am eternally grateful to Ronald Reagan for making it possible for me to serve. And to the people who elected him. I have loyalty to him but it's not really personal loyalty because I know that he wouldn't have been elected but for the commitment of lots of people. I felt that I was, in a way, one of the emissaries of the people who elected him working in the administration. Those people deserved

someone who was committed and who was reasonably courageous in carrying out the promises that were made to them.

Q: And you felt that as an ambassador, too?

WHITTLESEY: Very much so.

Q: It's a pretty special thing, isn't it, to be your president's envoy?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, but you see - what I'm saying is that I was the emissary, not only of the president, but of the people who trusted him and put him there. There were certain things that he did that were quite disappointing to many of us, especially in the later years. But of course, he wasn't the same person after he was shot. I don't think physically he was the same.

Q: No, I was going to say, don't you think perhaps it was all the surgery and being shot at?

WHITTLESEY: Yes. Whatever it was he was different. He still was a remarkable figure and I consider it a great honor to have served him. My service in the Reagan administration would have to be the highlight - the people that I met and what I was able to observe and contribute in the Reagan administration. I can sleep at night. I feel that I did everything I could, given my own limitations, which are considerable, to do the best job I could for him.

Q: Now, you're still a young woman. Do you have any more plans for the future, any more mountains you want to climb, figuratively speaking?

WHITTLESEY: I don't know. Someday I may go back into politics. People ask, am I going to run for the senate, am I going to run for governor? Right now, I am not interested. However, I am still very much involved in the conservative movement behind the scenes. We are involved in developing strategies to influence the Bush administration, to persuade them to do what we think is right to live up to their campaign promises. I will continue because I do feel committed. I help lots of people. Those flowers came from one of the Reagan academics who sent a gift in appreciation for what I had done to help him. I spent a lot of time this past year helping the Reagan scholars and academics get money for books they're writing. They had a Moscow summer school this past year. I helped raise money for that. I am active with various think tanks, and in supporting the people who were in the front lines of the Reagan revolution.

Q: What's the greatest honor you've won?

WHITTLESEY: Oh, I don't know. I guess the Swiss-American Friendship Award. I was the first to receive it in 1984. I also got the Reagan Revolution Award. That award meant a lot because it was from the people in the Reagan group. I also got the alumni award from my college, Wells College.

Q: Have you had any honorary degrees yet?

WHITTLESEY: Yes, from Boston University.

Q: Oh, that's right, of course.

WHITTLESEY: Also from Kings College in Pennsylvania and Widener University in Pennsylvania. Eventually I should write a book. I know I should do that. Right now I have to establish a law practice to support myself and concentrate on my children.

Q: And still another move.

WHITTLESEY: Yes. I would like to get married again, now that I'm in private life. I don't like the idea of being alone. It was impossible when I was in public life.

Q: Well this has been a fascinating experience, hearing your story. You've had such a fantastic career, and I thank you very much.

WHITTLESEY: Well, I hope you can make some sense of it. If you have questions, we can [talk]. As usual I'm very busy. After the first of the year, once I join this law firm again I will be traveling a lot. I will be in Switzerland a lot, and I've spent a lot of time this past year doing work for worthy causes. I was just elected to the board of the New York Medical College.

Q: Yes, I have a press release on that.

WHITTLESEY: The cardinal wants me to do that. I hardly have time for anymore charitable activities, but I have been trying to help many Reagan people. I'm not going to be able to do it much this coming year because I have to concentrate on my law practice. I will continue to do it when I can.

Q: Well, you've got a full plate. My word!

End of interview