

FISHER HOWE

Interviewed by: Charles Stuart Kennedy

Initial interview date: February 3, 1998

Copyright 2008 ADST

[Note: This interview has not been edited by Mr. Howe]

Q: Today is the third of February 1998. This is an interview with Fisher Howe being done on behalf of the Association of Diplomatic Studies and Training and I'm Charles Stuart Kennedy. Fisher could we start at the beginning? Could you tell me when and where you were born and something about your family?

HOWE: I'm a native of Winnetka, Illinois, born in 1914, of parents who were comfortable but not affluent. My father was an investment banker who had gone out to Chicago from Boston. My mother was a native of New York. We grew up in a family of five children, a very close family. All five children went to the same splendid North Shore Country Day School (K to 12). Four brothers went to Harvard, one sister went to Vassar. We summered regularly in Plymouth, Massachusetts, so that we drove east and had large members of a clan in a big family settling in Plymouth, Massachusetts each summer.

Q: You went through the Country Day school up through the twelfth grade? So this would have gotten you out when?

HOWE: '31. I went to Harvard in '31, graduated in '35. AB degree, history and literature. Debated as to going to law school or go into business. Everybody in my class said they'd do anything in business except selling, so I decided I'd go into selling. They said they wouldn't go west of the Hudson River so I decided to go to Texas. In fact I went to work almost immediately on graduation for the Coats and Clark Thread Company. After a couple months of training in their factory getting used to the thread products, I was assigned a territory in Northern New York and proceeded with a car full of thread samples to go from Albany, New York, north to Plattsburg and cross Ogdensburg and Malone to Watertown, and back through Utica selling threads on the way.

Q: I'd like to go back to the college years and then we'll come back to this. '31 to '35. This was the high point of the Depression. Was this making much of an affect on the student body and on you?

HOWE: Yes. I had to work through college mainly to pay club bills. I had a grandmother who paid a good part of my tuition. Tuition at Harvard in those years was \$400 for the year. We had a one-room of a three-room suite of rooms was something like \$265. I coached at a school in Boston - a private, very junior secondary school - to earn money to keep up with my peers.

Q: What about the political life of Harvard in those days? There was a lot of flirting with communism, even probably fascism and all that. A lot of currents were going through there. Were you feeling any of this?

HOWE: I don't think I felt one iota of that. I don't have any recollection of any political forces. I would not have, by the nature of my enjoyment of Harvard, would not have been involved anyway. I was going to enjoy people and social and athletic events mostly but I was not aware that it was going on and I had to be ducking it or taking a position on it.

Q: It doesn't necessarily mean there was. There's always some strain. I was just wondering whether it dominated the campus?

HOWE: No. Categorically no. It may have come up later, near the war time, by 1935. Roosevelt was controversial. My father was pretty strongly Republican and I was in the center and later very much for Roosevelt.

Q: In the thread business, was it difficult because of the depression or did people have to have clothes?

HOWE: Yes. It was pretty basic article, thread. Curiously enough, the Coats and Clark's Thread and Domestic Household had almost a complete monopoly so that I could go into any dry goods store or variety store in the country and they'd know the threads, very closely.

Anecdotal. They said, "Here's this Harvard man." When I got started in New York, they said, "We'll show him what it's like," and proceeded to put me at one end of Flatbush Avenue in Brooklyn with a spool of thread and said, "Don't show your face until you come out the other end." Three days later, I came out and I'd sold three boxes of thread in the whole length of Flatbush Avenue and two of them were returned. They'd bought it just to get me out of the place. This is a humbling experience.

Q: As designed.

HOWE: As designed.

Q: How long were you with Coats and Clark?

HOWE: I stayed with them from '35 to '39. Very luckily, within a year, I was chosen to be an apprentice to go to another British company in Yorkshire, England. I spent a year in England, came back and was assigned a territory in Colorado and then Arizona. I also had almost a year right in New York selling to the big department stores. I rather precipitously left the company, although I was very happy with them, because I got a sense that I wanted to go into the Foreign Service. I had a very good friend, Randolph Kidder, classmate, who was in the Foreign Service. I came east and talked to him and got encouragement from him and explored the tutoring services that were available and proceeded to come in 1940 - it may have been the end of 1939 - 1940, to go to Turner's Diplomatic School which was tutoring for the Foreign Service exam.

Q: With the thread business, I'm just wondering if they moved you around to these territories, does this lead anywhere? You say you were sent to England to get trained and all but then to put you out in the field and do some more selling?

HOWE: It was better and better jobs. They kept a record and when I left, I had built a record of selling in Arizona, particularly, that would have led me to a higher position. I was on a good track forward. I was not unhappy with what I was doing or the recognition that I was getting for what I was doing.

Q: What, besides knowing Randy Kidder, what appealed to you about the Foreign Service?

HOWE: Probably a misleading sense of the glamour. I had known once an Ambassador Wilson who was ambassador to Germany at one time. I've forgotten what his first name was. He was a friend of the family. I had met him and went up there on holidays. I had read some about foreign affairs but I was not a student by any means. I don't think it was any profound intellectual motivation that got me there, but I got there.

Q: You took this cram course. What were they concentrating on?

HOWE: It was a pretty intensive course; it must have been for a good six months. They gave us a good overlay of economics, international trade, and international law with professors, adjunct kind of professors, who moonlighted from George Washington and Georgetown University. Dean Acheson's brother, Ted, taught economics. A lawyer by the name of Armisted Booten, prominent in Alexandria, taught international law. There were probably 30 or 40 of us in that course studying really very intensely because the exams were known to be very tough. Four days in the exam.

Q: You took it in 1940?

HOWE: I took it first in 1940 and failed by a few points. It covered economics, law, geography, essay writing, a lot of facts, vocabulary tests. It was quite a mixture. I'd love to take a look at those old exams and see just what it was. My recollection was that we were there at least I think three and a half days.

Q: I took it in 1954 and it was three and a half days then, so I'm sure it was pretty much of the same thing. So you passed it when in '41?

HOWE: I came back. I went out and taught school in California for the nine months as soon as I got through taking the exams. I had written out and got a job at the Web School in Claremont, California and I taught there until the next June and I came east for a refresher course at Turner for the summer, and took the exam again in early September or late August of '41. At that time I passed it, although by the time I heard I'd passed it, I was already working for OSS (Office of Strategic Services) and was in London.

Q: So we're talking about September of '41 and within two months we were at war.

HOWE: Three and I had already been at least two months in England.

Q: What happened?

HOWE: Anecdotally, the day I got out of the exams I went down and looked into Nelson Rockefeller's organization dealing with Latin America where I had an introduction and I was told there was no room for me there. But there was a new organization down the street and why didn't I go look there? I did. Again, anecdotally, there was a very pretty receptionist there and I asked to see a list of the names.

She said, "It's much too secret for me to show you the directory." Then she asked me where I'd gone to college and wondered what kind of professors I'd had and when I'd gone down the list and came to Professor James Finney Baxter, and William Lager, she asked, "Which one do you want to have an appointment with?"

I proceeded to have an appointment. By another major coincidence I made a courtesy call on a friend of my father's who happened to be Assistant Secretary of Navy. He didn't tell me, but he had dinner with William J. Donovan that night and the next morning I got a call from the Director's office saying, "You are now Special Assistant to the Director of OSS, Mr. "Wild Bill" Donovan."

Q: With the OSS, could you explain, this is right at the beginning?

HOWE: It was called the coordinator of information. It wasn't 'til four or five months later at least that it was broken up into OWI (Office of War Information) or OFF, Office of Facts and Figures or whatever. It was Robert Sherwood that became the head of it. Donovan became OSS. By that time I was over in London and in fact was executive officer for both offices until they got squared away.

Q: This was of course the precursor to the CIA (Central Intelligence Agency). By the time you were over in London I guess we were at war or had we?? Did the war already start?

HOWE: I was on the station platform in Glasgow meeting some OSS people, Sterling Haden the actor, Percy Winner, correspondent, who were OSS people who had arrived by ship. We heard on the station platform that Pearl Harbor had taken place. When we woke up the next morning in London, everybody in London threw their arms around us because we were then in the war with them.

Q: What was your work with the OSS to begin with?

HOWE: I was executive officer of the London office. Three of us went over together. The Director, Bill Whitney, and Edmund Taylor, a correspondent who had written the book Strategy of Terror that was very widely respected at the time. I managed the office and indeed Whitney resigned a few months later and I was really in charge of the office until David Bruce came over and Whitney Shepardson came over. Donovan would come over and I would go and stay at Claridges with him and be his aide de camp as he saw all the top figures in London.

He told me early on, "Now I'll let you go out and secure three or four buildings." He knew that it was going to grow. I thought he was crazy but proceeded to get what later became the Headquarters building and two others which were used by OSS for the rest of the war.

Q: There must have been a tremendous learning time, because you were really starting out with nothing.

HOWE: Both diplomatically and intelligence-wise. I did not get any training in intelligence before. I was their rival liaison with the two British intelligences. One the famous Broadway or MI-6 and somewhat with MI-5 which was the security, like the FBI and very much with SOE (Special Operations Executive), the action side - the secret action type. So I was working with them. Same time we had initially an office in the embassy. I was in touch with the ambassador, John Winant. We were together in parallel with Harriman's office there, and the executive officer of that Winthrop Brown later ambassador in Laos and Korea. He and I lived together. Also Ed Gullion, later ambassador to Congo, with one of the fellows who we shared an apartment, Assistant Air Attaché ½ Tracy Barnes, later very prominent in CIA. He was another who lived in the apartment with us. So we were very much exposed to what was going on. Charlie Noise who was later deputy, United Nations, was another one. We had a very, very fancy good apartment-flat-in London.

Q: What was the initial thrust of the OSS?

HOWE: It was combined, in much too big a combination, of being secret intelligence, secret operations, which are mutually in conflict very often, research and analysis which is the think-tanks to make sense of the raw intelligence and propaganda, both white and dark propaganda. It had all of these together until it was broken up. The white intelligence, which is to say the open USIA went with Sherwood and the OWI forerunner and the intelligence and operations stayed with Ed. Black propaganda, morale operations, stayed with Donovan as did the research and analysis.

Q: Was there a problem of one with the British saying, "Look we're doing this. You just come and give us some help and we'll produce it all?" I mean to start in the middle of a war to assemble something like this is quite ?"

HOWE: Very mixed. Very mixed. The SOE people were enormously hospitable. In fact we used their communications at first in London. Very helpful. The traditional old line Secret Service MI 6 was very distant and very unfriendly. The head of it didn't hide his dislike. However, they jointly had in Washington a representative, Bill Stevenson, known for the book Intrepid who represented both and was a very powerful man. A fine gentleman, Sir William Stevenson. I knew him before I left. I knew him when he came to England. He and a Colonel Ellis later running into some troubles as to his loyalty though. In recent years actually. Looking back people have questioned whether he had in fact been loyal-whether he was in fact subject to, I don't know? I think it was Russian influence. Like others that we keep hearing about that were doubtful of their loyalty to the U.S. Anyway they were initially trying to help OSS get started and they did.

Bill Stevenson was an enormous help and his office was which was a big office in New York. They personally and organizationally guided OSS. But to your point, were they helpful, as the war went on I think it could be said the farther away you were from action, that is the heart of where the war was going on, the more strife there was between Americans and British. In London, there was except for this coldness on the part of Broadway, the MI 6 people, there was warmth and sharing. It was talked about jokingly. They'd bring the brains and we'd bring the money.

Later on it took on different forms when we had different tactical approaches. Conspicuous in the Air Force for instance as to whether it would be night bombing or whether it would be day bombing and saturation bombing and that kind of thing. The same kinds of things were applied in the intelligence. We were very dependent upon the British, particularly SOE in London, in Algiers, in Cairo and in the Far East where I eventually was in Ceylon, on their transportation. It was their special airplanes, their submarines that infiltrated our agents. That gave them a very controlling element over our operations. Fortunately SOE was usually very helpful. In Cairo, they could be very destructive.

Q: When you're trying to establish a think-tank or whatever you call it, people getting things, examining facts, data that comes in, how did you assemble people in England for example who knew enough to be useful and yet not have already been working for the British?

HOWE: We had a research and analysis section within the London office. Alan Evans was the head of it. He was a scholar, who later was head of the research and analysis section of the State Department when OSS R&A (Research and Analysis) moved over to the State Department. He had two or three scholars that worked with him. They were gleaning the appropriate information from research services in England and making sure it got back to headquarters research, which was where Bill Langer and Finney Baxter were and Sherman Kent and hundreds of well, well known scholars, were working in the R&A division of OSS, but it was an outpost of research. When OSS set up branches in Algiers and Cairo, they would have an R&A person there just to help get the kinds of documentation as well as the types of raw material that were appropriate to sifting out and getting the estimates that would be the ultimate outcome.

Q: During the time you were in London, how did the U.S. embassy fit in to what you were doing, or did it?

HOWE: Very ambivalently. The State Department never liked OSS. Adolph Berger was the Assistant Secretary of State. He went to great lengths, the Head of G 2 went to great lengths to scuttle everything Donovan and OSS tried to do. That was partially reflected in the embassy but not entirely. The embassy was in difficulty because Ambassador Winant had followed Kennedy who had been a very controversial ambassador. No sooner had he, Winant, arrived than the president sent Harriman over as a Lend Lease Administrator and a personal link with Churchill so that Winant always was one step out of it.

We were using the SOE communications. When I was in charge before the new head came over to OSS, Winant had called me in one day and said, "Look we want to cooperate and be helpful but I think we need to see all your communications."

I said, "I want to cooperate Mr. Ambassador, but I will have to get instructions on this."

I wired back a very full and careful personal telegram to Donovan asking for instructions. I heard nothing. That was Donovan's way of leaving me out there, but I think he had trust that I wasn't going to do it unless I was instructed and I didn't, and the Subject didn't come up again. One inquiry did follow and I simply said, "I was not yet instructed."

It was indicative of a condition which has gone through our diplomacy ever since. How do you deal with the communications in our embassies? We can come back to it, but at a later time in my life I was deputy head of intelligence in the State Department and the liaison with CIA and at that point I negotiated a formal "treaty" with the operations side of CIA, with Dick Helms, who later became head of CIA. A treaty which was code named STOSO. "S" "T" for State, "O" "S" "O" for the Office of Special Operations which was the CIA organization. It set a new line on diplomatic cover, diplomatic passports and so on. Once negotiated, I had to then go back and sell it to such powerful people as Lenny Merchant and Doc Matthews and Loy Henderson and Butterworth who were then the chief people in the State Department.

Q: In the London atmosphere, I would have thought it would be very difficult to sort out. You had all these governments in exile, the greatest being de Gaulle and the French but you had others, the Danes, the Norwegians, the Dutch, the Belgians, Yugoslavs I guess, all of whom had their own particular view of the world, their own interests. I imagine these would still be a source of information but it would be difficult to judge them.

HOWE: It was indeed, and very political and controversial. We, America, had an embassy on Barkley Square accredited to all the exiled European governments. It was in a sense parallel to the main embassy in Grosvenor Square and the name has gone out of my head who the ambassador was. Very fine fellow. Very friendly. We used to be helpful to them.

Revert to one of your earlier questions about R&A. As the war went on, the R&A groups came over and sat down jointly with the British and worked out targets, worked out specific evaluations that were directly pertinent to both the political and the military side. Walt Rothschild, Charlie Kindleberger, others, they were sitting right with them. What made me think of it was they also had an office in Barkley Square in the same building with our ambassador to the exiled countries. At a later time there was also the counterintelligence branch of OSS protecting our own security and intelligence, known as X2, headed by Bill Murphy why has his first name gone out of my head?

Q: Robert Murphy?

HOWE: No. No. No. He was Donovan's personal secretary and he later became Head of X2 and he was a good friend of mine. He had a group of people, very brilliant fellows, prominent people in the academic world who came over and sat with the British in working out the counterintelligence efforts to protect our positive intelligence effort.

Q: Well it sounds as though the research and analysis and the counterintelligence really became joint operations with the British where the operations remained somewhat more...

HOWE: Somewhat. We never did anything joint on intelligence with the British MI6. They resisted everything and scuttled much of what we were trying to do. Some of the SOE things were joint.

Jumping ahead, I was sent down to Algiers by Donovan to be a liaison between the British camp in Algiers and the American OSS camp, the SOE camp of the British. The head of that was an old friend from London. The American head was Bill Eddy. I knew them both well. They were somewhat at odds with each other and I went down to be a liaison and went on operations with the British as an American officer. So we did combine on some things with SOE. The Jedburgs, which were the advanced parties that went in just before D Day to set up communications and liaison with the Maquis, were, I think, in many cases joint British. Stuart also was one of those.

Q: The Maquis being the French?

HOWE: The French underground.

Q: What about when you were in London? What was the feeling toward the Free French, de Gaulle and all?

HOWE: Very mixed. Very mixed and very political, contentious, even in Washington and everywhere else. The British government was divided and the American government was divided as to which French you were going to talk with and de Gaulle was being very prickly and very difficult. I didn't myself get into the substance of the intelligence operation. By the time we were being acclimated, I was pulled off from being an executive director. I had been commissioned in the Navy and was getting commando training and parachute training ready to go off and operate somewhere. So that I did not get myself involved in any of the headquarters operations intelligence or operations.

Q: What was commando and parachute training like in those days?

HOWE: Tough. Rough. Commando training, we went up to Scotland for two or three weeks and were ruggedly run up and down mountains, taught how to use a 45, how to scale cliffs and cross rivers, how to use dynamite or other explosives. I had never had a gun in my hand until I got over there and learned how to deal with a 45 automatic, which is a pretty lethal kind of a thing to have in your hand. I came back absolutely fit and went to Ridgway where they were training - it was a British thing - but they were training some German perspective spies, perspective infiltrators. I was the only American with a team of 10 Germans and I couldn't speak to them or certainly know what they were doing. It was a week long course with about five or six jumps, low jumps and out of a hole of an airplane, not out of the side of it. I never had taken an operational jump.

The next to the last jump that I took, they had to teach the Germans how they set up a reception party on the ground. How they sent out the lights and what they do about the parachutes and so on. So I was the agent to follow them. There we were in an airplane and the Germans all went out and I was in the airplane by myself over the hole with the pilot way up in front. We were the only ones in the airplane and we had to fly over the place three times before they had the thing set up properly. He leaned around from the front cabin and said, "All right you can jump now." And I had to jump into the black darkness. It was very low. You jumped at I think it was 300 feet, with a ripcord that went almost immediately and then you were on the ground within a very short time.

Q: It was also before the days of maneuverable parachutes and all that.

HOWE: Yes. Yes. Anyway it was an experience I was glad to have had.

Q: How did they use you then after this training?

HOWE: I was trained also in small boats because as a Naval officer although the parachuting was a little foreign to a Naval officer. I was probably going to be and was in fact, destined to be on the maritime unit of OSS, which was designed for a sea infiltration. So I was sent down after I had gotten the training, including kayak training in and out of submarines, even some submerged water, putting limpets on boats down in training in South Hampton - I was sent down to Algiers and we moved into Corsica. I went in on one operation when the Germans were still there, to land supplies in the little town of Porto. The Germans were six or seven miles away but the citizens of Porto were there to greet us in the middle of the night and help us unload. Later I came back to set up a base in Calvi in northern - and then in Bastia - in northern Corsica, ready to land agents in northern Italy but particularly in southern France. I helped set up that base there with a British unit - a mixed British unit - of air, Navy, merchant Navy and soldiers and I the oddball American Navy officer. We set up this mixed thing that was prepared to land agents. Before we got the first operation going, Dick Heppner had been made Head of CBI, OSS and he asked that I be assigned out to be the head of the maritime unit looking to the infiltration out there by sea. So I went out to India and then down to Ceylon.

Q: CBI standing for China, Burbank, India.

HOWE: Which was initially with Mundant in New Delhi then Mundant moved down to Kandy in central Ceylon, Sri Lanka and we, OSS, set up a camp in Kandy, OSS headquarters. We had camps Bill Ripley was head of intelligence out there. He and I are old friends, toured around and found camps in Gaul and Saos and Trincomalee in the north. I was in Trincomalee training agents and going on one operation.

Q: What were the agents doing?

HOWE: They were Indonesian. They were going to go into Indonesia. The ones that were going into Burma and Thailand were mostly handled up near Calcutta, at another OSS outfit up there under Eifler and ?I read his name last night and I can't remember his name.

Q: You were dealing with Indonesia at that time. What was the attitude toward the Dutch?

HOWE: Very friendly. Very open. The Dutch had a naval unit in Trincomalee flying boats. I don't know what they were actually accomplishing. Of course Indonesia had been theirs so they had a very strong focus on Indonesia. That was the closest free spot that you could get to get across to Indonesia. We went on one submarine operation. We went to a little island if you can see here?

Q: We're looking at a little island here off Sumatra.

HOWE: It's the island of Sinalue, which was the northwestern most - what do you call a range of islands that are off shore?

Q: Archipelago.

HOWE: Yes. We took a British submarine with four or five agents and we were exploring whether that island could be a base for operations into Indonesia. We put them ashore and went around to the other side and picked them up, very luckily. Because it was a terrible and we had to wait three days beyond our meeting time before they came out.

Q: From your perspective, what was the role of Indonesia at that time? Did we expect to be doing much in Indonesia?

HOWE: It was Japanese-held. It was clearly along with Singapore, and the whole peninsula there, was going to be critical, the recapture - or seemed to be. In part I think it was geopolitical in the sense that MacArthur was so much involved with the other islands out there. Mundantín was very interested in getting operations going on the underside. It turned out to be important in Vietnam and Thailand and Burma to some extent, but of course the real focus was island hopping into Japan and the atomic bomb. So in the final end it may not have had that criticality.

Q: Looking at this, by the time you got down to the CBI, I take it the State Department was almost out of the picture, wasn't it? Because our embassy at that point was up in London and was there much to it then?

HOWE: There was a political advisor, none other than John Davies, who was political advisor to Mundantín and/or Stilwell. He had the rank, I think, of consul general, and was very much in evidence and a very fine officer and a brilliant and amusing fellow who became a friend later. That was perfectly friendly out in the field. In Washington one had a constant sense that both G2, as I mentioned, and the State Department resented everything that was to be done.

When I first went over to London, I flew through Lisbon where, because of the difficulty of flying from there on up through London I had to stay there for a number of days and I stayed with two Foreign Service officers who were assigned to Portugal. I got the clear sense that at that level they were probably second secretaries at the time, Goodyear and Boswell - very friendly to me but very resentful. Why do we have this organization here? That's what we're here to do. We can pass on any political information. We don't need any other people to go out and get intelligence or information.

I think this was so up in London. Gullion was first secretary or second secretary there. He was friendly, as I say, shared an apartment with us. I don't think he was resentful and Doc Matthews was always very friendly. Henry Stebbins, the administrative officer, was very helpful. So we didn't run into that resentment but we were always aware of the fact that the State Department just didn't like any part of it.

Part of this was Donovan. Part of it was the nature of it. Donovan demanded, attracted, and was great, as a leader. He attracted royalty from a wide number of very prominent, very effective people. But he also was a hard driving operator in the government circles so there were a lot of people in Washington that resented his close ties with Roosevelt. And he was totally dependent on those ties.

Q: I think one of the most interesting stories about looking at the Foreign Service is how essentially the State Department was almost completely bypassed during the war. Then in 1945 they were essentially handed the world and said, "Here it's your baby now," without much training because of this operational thing which stopped the normal diplomatic business.

HOWE: It's difficult for me to take other than the position that they brought this on themselves. The leadership then, G. Helman Shaw and what's his name, Long, Assistant Secretary Samuel Long - were totally traditionalists about it. I think Wells was, too, and Burly, I think, was not a Foreign Service officer, but he took a very limited view of the role and a very closed one.

I think it's not unrelated when I report that I passed the Foreign Service exams, written, and was scheduled to take the oral exams in I think February of '42. Donovan arranged for me to be able to fly home to take them and I took them and passed them. G. Helman Shaw said, "You will go be a vice consul down in Guayaquil."

Doc Matthews wrote over and Donovan pleaded with them and said, "Look he's doing this job over there. It's totally related to diplomacy. He's in the embassy. Defer him, do something else."

Doc Matthews wrote over and said, "Look, this guy's helping us all, defer him, hold onto him"

No way, so I had to have my name withdrawn from the Foreign Service. They wouldn't have anything to do with it. They dealt with Foreign Service auxiliaries as being second class citizens. This was typical of a very inflexible service.

Q: Also, the Secretary of State, sort of was almost bypassed for most of the war, Cordell Hull. His main interest seemed to be trade and Latin America, both of which were of lesser interest during the war. It was not a glorious time for the Foreign Service.

HOWE: No. It certainly wasn't. That whole situation was probably his own ineptness in a lot of the critical elements of foreign diplomacy. But in part it was that Sumner Wells had an old boy relationship with the president which he exploited.

Q: They both went to Groton.

HOWE: Groton. Yes. You know that Ben Wells has now come out with a book, his book, on his father which would be very interesting. It got a very good review in the Post I think or it was probably the Times because Ben used to be a correspondent for the Times.

Q: I'll have to look for that.

HOWE: You'd be very interested in it. I haven't read it yet.

Q: Anyway, this is interesting to capture the Foreign Service, well State Department, in this critical period. It just didn't measure up.

HOWE: It didn't and it's sad. It was resistant to anything new, different that the war time desperately demanded of it. They wanted to be the old line. Whether the British Foreign Service was the same, it's hard to know. The people that I knew in England I don't remember associating much with regular Foreign Service officers, British, because all my associations were with the intelligence types.

Q: How about when you were in Algiers. Did you run across Robin Murphy at all?

HOWE: No. I first ran into Murphy I guess back in the State Department after the war. Have you read Anthony Cave Brown's?

Q: Bodyguard of Lies?

HOWE: No this one is The Last Hero.

Q: Yes. I've read that one.

HOWE: Bob Murphy is very much in it. I knew Bob very well in late years. He was the Murphy Commission. I was staff for the Murphy Commission so I worked directly for him very closely.

Q: When were you down in Ceylon? Where was the war at that point?

HOWE: It was in '44. Most of '44. It may have been the end of '43 that I was in Algiers. Unfortunately dates go out of my head.

Q: It's mostly in relation to the war than the?

HOWE: Yes. D Day had not taken place. Clearly the North African had - the "Torch." The Germans and Italians were still there. We had not got into Sicily or Anzio yet. I was pulled off before then to go out in the Far East.

Q: Were you in the Far East at the end of the war?

HOWE: No. I got very sick. I had suffered from bronchial asthma before and had not been allowed into the Army back in the early days. What do you call it when they were enlisting everybody? What did we call it when we had to??

Q: The Draft.

HOWE: The Draft. So it was only when I got over to London that I was able to get in as a LTjg (Lieutenant junior grade), in London, so I went out to Ceylon and I went on this submarine operation. I came back with a very serious case of bronchial pneumonia. I was hospitalized and crated back and out of the Navy in '44. It must have been the fall of '44. At that point, when I got well in January of '45, I went out to Colorado. I was told to go out for six months to get well.

Q: Higher, clearer air.

HOWE: Yes. I came back in June of '45. I got married. I ran into my bride out there. We came back and I worked for Donovan for two or three months, again right in his office, before September when it was the major shift of OSS. All but R&A went into the interim office before it became CIA. The R&A was turned over to the State Department. I was separated but on exactly the same date I was hired by Will Clayton, a special assistant to him. That was September of '45.

Q: I'd like to stick to this period you were with Donovan. The war was over or getting over. It was over in August of '45. Was Donovan sort of ready to let go by this time?

HOWE: No. He was fighting desperately for a permanent Central Intelligence Agency. It was infighting such as he had all the time he had when he was in Washington. All during the war the military opposed him. They reluctantly made him a General, the State Department.

Truman finally said, "No," to his proposal to set up a Central Intelligence Agency.

In the closing months he said, "This is all going to be public very soon. We need to collect the good stories about OSS." He asked me to do this for some reason. I had no background in that, but we had a warm personal relationship and I think he trusted me. I got going on it and then I ran into Stuart Alsop and Tom?

Q: Hughes.

HOWE: No. Still around? Who were on their own privately writing a book on it in order to capitalize on it. They wanted to get whatever information I got but didn't want to be part of all that. They did write a book. Tom Braden. So in those final months that I was there and Donovan, when it was turned over to CIG, Central Intelligence Group, with General Bill?

Q: That's all right.

HOWE: He took over after and Donovan went back, I think, to practice law. He later came back to be ambassador to Thailand but that's another story.

Q: In looking at this, and I'm talking about at the time, this whole spirit that permeated the Central Intelligence Agency, of a few brave men parachuted in in the middle of the jungle can make a tremendous difference. There are those that are dubious about some of the claims. I mean the deeds were great, but the effectiveness was problematical. This is the way some people look at this. Was this ever questioned about trying to separate the actual effective of what was being done away from the bravery of the deed?

HOWE: There were very few people at the time who were in any position to judge, that could see the whole. There were a lot of skeptics. There were some generals or friends of Donovan in high places who felt that it was making a contribution. Looking back on it, you've got to question it. The Cave Brown book, Anthony Cave Brown I guess it is, it was time and again there were either flops or they were absolutely infiltrated by the Germans. You can make the case that the OSS and its efforts diverted the Germans enough in to thinking there was going to be, for instance, an attack through the Mediterranean, that kept major divisions down in that area so that they were not there for the invasion across the channel. This was a major claim. Donovan spent a lot of timmore time than he should havdown in Cairo mounting these operations.

As an aside on Donovan, he was irresponsibly adventuresome. He knew that Midway was going to take place and so he was at Midway. He was on the boats landing across the channel. He was right in the Mediterranean whenever there was anything there and doing things that no head of intelligence should have been doing. That's too bad.

Q: Well, the war was over by the time you were back in Washington working for Donovan.

HOWE: I was back working for Donovan at the time of the Japanese?

Q: Hiroshima.

HOWE: Hiroshima. Yes. That was in I think August. I started working for Donovan again in June or July of '45 for the last two or three months that OSS existed.

Q: During the last few months, did you get any feel for how OSS was doing as far as focusing in on Japan, which I would have thought would have been a very difficult job to begin to? As we got closer and closer to Japan, you couldn't just drop agents in there in other words.

HOWE: OSS was banned in the Pacific area by MacArthur - MacArthur and his intelligence officer, Willoughby I think it is. There was not a singling? That's why Donovan with Mundantin was coming up behind in this area. He was in to China getting at China but MacArthur did have another group that was going into China - Murray Miles - a Navy fellow who ran kind of an odd sock, secret intelligence thing, but OSS was not in any way involved in Japan.

Q: Well as this thing wound down and all?

HOWE: There was a very quick inventor, a scientist by the name of Lovell, who was a wonderful guy and he would think up all sorts of odd sock things. He had all kinds of gadgets that he wanted to have employed to morale operations on Japan. I can remember hearing about them. They would take cultural vulnerabilities of the Japanese or the architectural inflammability. He was devising things. I never heard that any of them were actually entertained.

Q: In a way, both the OSS and the British efforts fit very well into the Churchill persona as opposed to Roosevelt who kind of left this alone to his commanders. Nimitz and MacArthur, they were a different type. They didn't have to worry about a president pushing them.

HOWE: I think that's right. Certainly Churchill did climb in on the strategy much more than Roosevelt did. Roosevelt did have Marshall - I think the greatest guy of our century.

Q: Oh, I agree.

HOWE: That was very important too the way we ran our war. Marshall might have been, I suppose? I never could get, and don't even out of the Cave Brown book get a sense of Marshall's real attitude toward Donovan. He could have made a difference for him because General Strong of the G2 was and always has been an anathema to him and vice-versa.

Q: What happened at the end of the war when OSS was beginning to break up? What were you up to?

HOWE: I came back to Donovan and then went over to be special assistant to Clayton. I started out there, in the State Department, in September of '45, as special assistant to Clayton working on the economic commercial demands on the Foreign Service. It was related to the Foreign Service but it was the economic section of the State Department. Clayton was a superb individual.

Q: I've only heard the highest regard for him.

HOWE: He was an enormously intelligent, very successful businessman - a man of absolutely magnificent integrity. He was one of those people like Chris Herter or Ellsworth Bunker who could walk into a room and their strength and personality just shone. He was a very, very pleasant fellow. I was a special assistant in his office. He didn't take much interest in what I was doing. His assistant, Willard Thorpe, assistant secretary? Clayton was undersecretary and had an assistant secretary under him. Livy Merchant was at that time working with him and I worked with Livy some. I was doing that for a couple of years.

Actually, I was a participant with others in framing the Foreign Service Act of '46. The economic side was not happy with what they were getting from the Foreign Service. The Department of Commerce and Agriculture which had a stake in the Clayton operations, so to speak, looked to me to try and get the Foreign Service squared away. I was fighting to make it more liberal in the sense that I had experienced illiberality and the closed mindedness of it from my own experience.

Q: You are talking about the economic side, is that it? The economic-commercial side?

HOWE: Yes. But it meant opening up the Foreign Service and not having it a closed shop the way it was. Somehow bringing the Foreign Service auxiliary into the Foreign Service. They wanted to keep it down to 1,000 people or 1,500 people and everybody else was second class. How could they do it? And to frame a legislation that would be more representative of the U.S. government as a whole, not the small diplomatic or State Department side, which was doing it. Strong was involved, as was Andy Foster and Ted Lampson. They were all under Selden Chapin and his deputy. I was working with them a great deal in trying to get a Foreign Service Act that would make sense in our terms and from the perspective of other than just the political-geographic bureaus.

Q: Did you find at various levels you were up against an entrenched group of people who felt this is the way the Foreign Service is and all it shall be?

HOWE: Yes, I did. I'd like to think that I had almost a peer relationship in that they accepted me. I was not an oddball. I could have been one of them. I was acceptable in their social outlook, but they didn't like what I was trying to achieve so there was some who stood above it - were reasonable about it. I think of Durbrow and Chapin himself, Elbridge Durbrow and the others and I went to parties with them but they were pretty much entrenched and they were resisting change.

Q: Were you in communications with the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture?

HOWE: Yes.

Q: ?who were saying, "These guys are producing what we need."

HOWE: Yes. Yes. I was And what we ended up with was a Board of Foreign Service that was going to "control policy" for running the Foreign Service. How that was going to be structured bureaucratically was important to the Foreign Service so they didn't lose control. Who was going to be chairman and what were the powers of this group going to be? There was going to be a representative of the Department of Commerce and of Agriculture. How are you going to get the State Department and would it have a majority? When it got through they asked me to be the executive secretary of the Board of Foreign Service. The law created the Board of Foreign Service. It's interesting. What's ever happened to the Board of Foreign Service? I have never bothered to look.

Q: It's still there.

HOWE: At the time it was going to be the feature of how we were going to run it. The new director general - we created a Director General - and I was on his staff as the Executive Secretary of the Board. That meant working with the other departments and working with the economic side of the State Department and the geographic bureaus in formulating. I ran head into Joe Green who was the Board of Examiners but had taken unto himself to be the equivalent of the personnel manager. He said how many Foreign Service officers there would be, of what kind, not just how do you examine them. He and I were at pretty constant odds. Again, it was a question of I had friends who were his friends but we looked at how you manage the Foreign Service and what kind of a Foreign Service did we need for the challenge of the post war years. We just differed. He was bureaucratically working along a parallel path to mine. I caused enough trouble so they sent me to the War College.

Q: I would think the facts of life would be there for the Foreign Service because what you had was a whole new generation of which you were a part, people coming from all over. They could come from Harvards and they could come from the Slippery Rock State Teachers. But they had military experience, they were used to get out there operating and no matter what their background or social position had been, they were just a different breed of cat. Here they are over the horizon and the Foreign Service is going to have to let them in. We had tremendous responsibilities which the State Department had not had before. All of a sudden we were number one in the world and particularly the American diplomats are going to be the prime movers.

HOWE: Responsibilities and opportunities.

Q: Opportunities but was this one of things where the people sitting back in Washington, I mean a good number of them, just didn't understand this?

HOWE: It was an elitism. It was an elite core. They resisted change. They didn't want it. It had been good enough. Why do we change it? The British do it. Why can't we? The French do it. Why can't we? And we're totally different cultures. It was a governmental culture fight. I say fight - strife - and it worked itself at that time. The Foreign Service was a key part of it. We didn't do enough of it so Wriston had to come in and take an even more radical approach. If the Foreign Service had been more open to doing what Wriston did. There was no reason?

Q: We're talking about 10 years later, Henry Wriston came in and had a mandate which meant many more Foreign Service positions opened up. Civil Service was sort of pushed to one side and then it became more of a Foreign Service.

HOWE: He radically revised the structure of the Foreign Service and Civil Service and therefore the State Department personnel and required the Foreign Service to absorb a whole lot of people at a lateral entry, which had been resisted before. I had come in that way.

Q: Where was the State Department? It was a small group. Harry Truman is President, who obviously was no great admirer of the elitism of the Foreign Service - Foreign Service and State Department. Where was the State Department getting its support to fight this battle?

HOWE: That's a good question. I don't know how I could, looking back on it, could answer that. In short, they owned it now so they had to break away things in order to make any kind of change. Acheson was a strong? I don't think he took a very strong position on the management. When Dulles came in he got Wriston to do this. There were for instance, there were efforts? Holland Sargent was made head of an intradepartmental committee that looked at the reorganization of the State Department. It came out with a report that was widely admired and totally ignored. I don't know. Over time it changed. It changed because the Foreign Service was so thoroughly entrenched that it took time to change them.

Q: Were you getting any feel that the? I mean, the war was over, countries were becoming independent. We have a worldwide role to play and just the mere staffing of these posts must have put a tremendous strain on the Foreign Service.

HOWE: Absolutely. But again, there were budgetary questions. Even at that time, the Congressman from Brooklyn?

Q: Oh yes. John Rooney.

HOWE: John Rooney. He didn't like the Foreign Service and he controlled the budget so there was not a press to get money to open up new places. That didn't seem to be a forcing thing. There's no question on the demands on the Foreign Service and on the United States representation abroad. But it did mean a whole lot of other agencies climbed in there. That's when embassies and Treasury reps, Agricultural reps, FBI reps and if the Foreign Service had itself been more liberal in its outlook, there's good reason to believe that that could have been curtailed.

Q: Did you find in this infighting - Bureaucratic fighting - was the economic and commercial side given much weight or was this so second class?

HOWE: It was initially second class. In fact that's why Clayton and the people around him, Claire Wilcox and William Brown and Livy, I think, wanted to get somebody in there who would keep trying to remove the second class aura on it, to make an economic officer a respectable person not just a warden to the political officer kind of thing. It was an uphill battle for that and there was an increasing recognition. Again I mentioned Livy who was a superb officer.

Q: Livy. Livingston Merchant.

HOWE: Livingston. Yes. He was economically strong and represented what was the point of view that needed to be put across.

Q: Why don't we stop at this point here and we'll pick it up the next time. We're talking about setting up the Foreign Service Act and we've done most of it but I'd like you to before we leave this? We're talking about the Foreign Service Act of 1946, if you could talk about any tips you learned in fighting bureaucratic battles and what were some of the particular problems in doing this and the support - where you had to look for support - and we haven't talked about allies in Congress if that was on the thing. We'll pick that up next time.

Today is the 27th of April, 1998. Fisher, let's talk about any bureaucratic tips that you picked up when you were working on this particular thing.

HOWE: Can't think of any in particular. I was brought in by Will Clayton and his assistant secretary Willard Thorpe because there was a Foreign Service reluctance to acknowledge the key element of economic and commercial work in the Foreign Service and the Foreign Service was being very reluctant to broaden its membership which the times clearly demonstrated it needed to do. From a bureaucratic standpoint it's interesting to note that it took from the Foreign Service Act of '48, which did very little to liberalize the Foreign Service, until '56 when the Wriston program came in and forced the Foreign Service to accept people laterally and to accept a government wide mandate. Although that had been introduced in the Foreign Service Act, it wasn't really operative until they were forced by the Wriston program to accept it.

Back to the war time, the Foreign service reluctantly engaged a Foreign Service Auxiliary but they were definitely second class citizens, I don't know that they even gave them diplomatic passports. That was one of the key things.

Q: Here we are talking about 1948 now. The Foreign Service, looking back at it, had been practically shoved aside during World War II. It played really a very minor role. The military really took over. All of a sudden they're shoved front and center. But was your impression that this was not a very forward looking bunch of people? Sort of the old blood in the Foreign Service running a bit thin or something?

HOWE: Since we've talked, I've read two biographies of William Donovan.

Q: Wild Bill Donovan.

HOWE: That's right. The British opposite number who was known and intrepid Bill Stevenson. A book on the two of them and a book on Donovan. Ben Wells has written a book about his father, Sumner Wells, which I've read. Those three books really give you an indication of how restricted the Foreign Service outlook was. Particularly, the Donovan books show that people like Adolph Burly, Samuel Long, and Howland Shaw did not show any real flexibility in the changing times and the war time demands. They fought a rear guard battle and were very unpopular in the government, including with FDR who dealt with Sumner Wells as an old draconian friend, but had trouble with Hull and had trouble with all the others in the Foreign Service. It's a shame because that brought on the troubles they were in because they were so inflexible.

Q: Did you, as sort of the new boy in there, feel this was this really almost a club and you had to have gone to the right university and have the right family or at least put on the airs that you had the right family?

HOWE: All of the above plus the presumption of having money to spend. The Metropolitan Club, which I'm a member of and have been for a long while? Most of the Foreign Service were in the Metropolitan Club. Now there are very few in the Metropolitan Club.

Q: Yes. This was the sort of elite club of Washington.

HOWE: It's the establishment.

Q: The establishment. Not elite.

HOWE: The Foreign Service was the elite one.

Q: You have this feeling that here is a whole new generation bursting on the scene. We're talking about, at least in those days pretty much, men who'd been in the military and were out to change the world and had already had great responsibility and a very exclusive Foreign Service trying to hold back - sweep back - the ocean.

HOWE: I completely agree. It took a long while to change it. Perhaps historically you can look at it and say it's remarkable that the Foreign Service changed as rapidly as it did. Ten years is a geologic sense of time and 10 years can be quite rapid.

We're talking about the transition in the Foreign Service and the maturity of them. Absolute star in that was Livy MerchanLivingston Merchant, who was a Foreign Service Auxiliary, very bright, very able officer, and respected by the Foreign Service. He was the special assistant to Clayton when I was there and went on to be assistant secretary of state for European affairs. A very fine fellow who did in fact influence much of the Foreign Service to come around and become contemporary.

Q: How about Loy Henderson? Was he in the mainstream at that time?

HOWE: He was definitely in the mainstream and very much of a leader. I'm happy to say Loy and I got on very well. He was in the traditionalist tradition but he was willing to move perhaps more than some of the others were. Butterworth was also there and a traditionalist. Bob Murphy. Doc Matthews. Freeman Matthews. They became the leaders and rode with the new punch whereas the old timers, Howland Shaw, they took over from Howland Shaw.

Q: He was head of personnel for a long time wasn't he?

HOWE: Howland Shaw?

Q: Yes.

HOWE: Yes. But assistant secretary? What is the name of the fellow who was the head of the Examiners? Green. Joe Green. He was Head of Examiners and one of the major battles I had was with Joe Green. Joe Green was responsible for the examination but he took that as being head of personnel so he would determine what numbers of people were going to go into the Foreign Service and what kinds of people were going to go in, which was essentially personnel rather than examination. I was on the examining board and I was executive secretary of the Board of Foreign Service and therefore was looking at the Foreign Service administration. Joe thought I was the top criminal of the day.

Q: Working on this Foreign Service Act, how about with Congress? Were there those that understood it or were the neo-isolationists coming out because '48 was a difficult time politically in the United States?

HOWE: I did not have any dealings with Congress at that time. My dealings with Congress had been very limited anyway. I didn't deal with Congress until I was executive secretary of the department, head of the secretariat. Then I had some changes. The protocol department was generally under my budget and so I had to defend them. At that time I didn't. In terms of the Foreign Service Act, there was a lot of lobbying. I did know Mrs. Bolton who was very influential, mainly because her son was a very good friend of mine. She was on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

Q: Francis Bolton?

HOWE: Yes. Mrs. Francis Bolton. The key person there was the head of the Appropriations Committee, a congressman from New York. I've forgotten his name. But the Foreign Service Act sneaked by in one of those last few hours of a session and it was put into another bill and got passed. That was thanks to Selden Chapin. His deputy was the one who got it through at the very last minute and it was a very characteristic but very strange way of doing things.

Q: Did the Foreign Service Act have anything to do with how an embassy was set up and all? I was wondering because somewhere along the line, we more or less adopted the Navy system of an ambassador, his DCM (Deputy Chief of Mission), sort of his executive officer of various departments. It sort of fit into the military, particularly the Naval way of setting things up.

HOWE: I would have to go back and look the Foreign Service Act which I haven't in many years. I don't recall that it did do that. That escapes me.

Q: Did you have the feeling after the act went through, were there dirty looks at you in the corridors of power or ??

HOWE: I'd like to think that I had enough friends in the Foreign Service and was dealing sufficiently openly with them that I didn't develop any "enemies" other than Joe Green. Those who were working hard on it, Ed Gullion, Tommy Thompson not Tommy Thompson, the other Thompson? Addy Foster. I seemed to get on well. Ed Gullion was a particular friend of mine of old. They treated me perfectly genial. One day I got into the executive secretary Board of Foreign Service. Chris Randall came in to be the director general of the Foreign Service. That position and that body was set up by the law, I believe. I guess I was causing enough difficulty at the time so that they sent me to the War College. You go to the War College either because they want to get you out of what you are doing or you show brilliance. It was clearly the former. So I had a very good year at the War College.

Q: The War College. This would have been about '48 or '49?

HOWE: Yes. I think I was class of '49. I was the second class.

Q: How did the military react to having Foreign Service in there?

HOWE: I think they prided themselves on being very broad minded. They were very friendly. The War College was very congenial and there a lot of inter-service fraternity feeling grew out. It was a single service in that regard. They were Navy captain level which is full colonel level in all three services. There were two Canadians and two British who were also with us. It was very good and indeed that's the main thing you got. You listened to speakers from all the departments, then got into arguments and discussions about it and you wrote some papers. It was a good exercise but I think inter-service understanding was the greatest benefit that came out of it.

Q: This has remained the hallmark of this. So you came back then in what '49 to the State Department?

HOWE: Yes. I came back, Carl Humelsine was deputy undersecretary for administration. He wanted to change the deputy in research. He did not have confidence in that fellow who was Park Armstrong's deputy. He arranged that I come in and be Park Armstrong's deputy as head of intelligence. R which had under it the research arm which is INR (Intelligence and Research) and the collection branch of foreign intelligence which was of course overt intelligence, not CIA and we were the link to the CIA. We represented the State Department in the national intelligence estimates, which was an inter-service thing that was led by CIA. So I came in to be deputy.

Q: I'd like to get the dates. You were there from '49 to when?

HOWE: Maybe as much as '56. At that time I think '56 is when I went up to be executive secretary to the department.

Q: '49 is a very interesting time because we're talking about? This is the time when the intelligence aspects of the American government were being sorted out. The CIA had just been established hadn't it?

HOWE: Well '46 was the National Security Act which set up CIA and set up the office in the White House and brought the services together secretary of defense.

Q: So we're really talking about the very early time. What was your impression when you first got on board in '49 about where State Department fit in the intelligence scheme?

HOWE: The State Department intelligence arm had been the research and analysis section of OSS. So when they broke up OSS in '46 the one part that was moved to the State Department was for research and analysis. All the rest of it became part of the Central Intelligence Group under General Bill Quinn. That then, after a transition period, became CIA. The research and analysis group were less controversial, less contentious in terms of both the military and the State Department although once they got into the State Department, they ran head on into the authority of the bureaus for regional policy and understanding. Here was another group that said, "We understand these regions better than you do," kind of thing where policy and research gray areas collided. There was considerable resentment there. I'm not sure if that's helpful to you.

Q: Yes it is. It's part of the feeling. Did you find yourself sort of trying to get these lions to lie down peacefully together?

HOWE: Yes. Once again I like to think that I had enough friends in the various bureaus that I could work with them. They also needed me as the link with the CIA whenever there was any kind of an operation that was going on. I would be involved with CIA and its relations with the bureau or the desk officers that were involved. I had a personal reason to do it. Park Armstrong or I represented the department in coming to agreement on the national intelligence estimates. We tried always to be sure that we knew what the regional bureaus thought about a situation, as well as our own research divisions, in arriving at an estimate of intentions of an unfriendly country if it was that, or even that of a friendly country.

Q: I would imagine that you were pretty much focused on the Soviet Union and on China at that time?

HOWE: Very much so. Our Russian experts in research, Boris Clausen and? He was a very prominent, well known Russian fellow we had as head of the Russian section and Joe, head of the China section.

Q: These names you'll get the thing and you'll?

HOWE: These fellows were in close, but not always in agreement with? Actually the Chinese people and Russian people got on a lot better than the Western European or Middle East people, as between our research people. And Latin American people, they would have differing views because the bureau policy makers didn't want to have any analysis going up to the secretary that differed from what they had put forward as a reason for their policy. This is what, actually especially at the time of Wriston and at the time of various organizational studies. Time and again the regional bureaus wanted to put the research branches under them. Acheson understood very clearly that he needed to have a line of information independent of the bureaus. So that this was a very important arm. So at the time of the Hoover Commission looking into the organization of government, he stood staunchly on the side of an independent intelligence arm. Interestingly enough Air Force intelligence was under operations whereas the Naval intelligence and Army intelligence had a separate line to the chief. This would show up in our national intelligence estimate discussions - interdepartmental discussions - where the Air Force people were responding to what they were told to do by operations whereas each of the rest of us had an independence of view that we could put forward.

Q: How responsive did you find? these were tumultuous years - '49 China was moving into the Communist camp. Was this causing strains between the bureau and the research side?

HOWE: I don't recall that it did at all. I think the troubles that were there, and they were Hurley?

Q: Patrick Hurley.

HOWE: Patrick Hurley was a political problem where the varying parts of the State Department could stand together in trying to deal with Patrick Hurley. As against the politics of it, that was where that problem came up. Well, John Service and John Davies, they were both now out of the Far Eastern responsibilities but their troubles went back to their previous existence. John Davies was a friend of mine and just a very fine fellow. I knew Service too, but not as well as I knew Davies. John Davies was a wonderful, bright, able, amusing guy.

Q: Did you feel in intelligence and research during this period - we're moving into the McCarthy period - where there were attacks of the Foreign Service - Foreign Service is the wrong term to use - Department of State was full of communists and all this. Did you all feel the pressure and did you sort of have to react to it?

HOWE: The answer is you bet. And particularly it was so when the Dulles regime came into the State Department.

Q: This would have been about '53.

HOWE: Yes. Scott McCloud was made head of security and there was a guy - head of personnel - who was Bridges' man.

Q: This was Senator Bridges.

HOWE: Yes. Senator Bridges' man. They caused a lot of uncertainty and unhappiness in the Foreign Service. Scott McCloud was a repulsive guy. Again I was lucky. Although I don't think they ever thought I was an arch republican, even though I was close to Acheson, I seemed to escape their knives. But it was a very, very rough period. A very good friend of mine was caught up in it, Duncan Lee. Others I knew, Jess Leming. So when I had to get in the intelligence area I had to get "Q clearance" for atomic energy information. I had to go through interviews for one thing or another to make sure I was not a suspect myself. It was a terrible time.

Q: Did you have the feeling that the analysts who were doing research were looking over their shoulder and that maybe were trimming their sails a bit to make sure it fit the tenor of the time?

HOWE: I don't recall that they were. I have a sense that they were intellectually strong. There was a guy, Hughes, a western European scholar, Harvard professor who was "suspect" in the political field. He had to leave. I think Park Armstrong and I had the greatest confidence in the intellectual integrity of the people. I don't remember them doing other than playing it straight. It's one of these areas where I wish my memory was fresher.

Q: No. It was a difficult.

HOWE: My recollection of it is being a very, very difficult time.

Q: I take it there wasn't much feeling that... Well let me ask the question?

HOWE: I'll tell you what under Acheson's regime the thing came up, too. That was problematical because a lot of us knew who Alger Hiss is and were amazed at what went on there.

Q: When Secretary of State Dulles took office, he used the phrase when he met the department for the first time he used the phrase, "positive loyalty", which sort of sent a chill throughout the department. What was the feeling towards Dulles as far as both his work as a secretary of state but also as a protector of his department?

HOWE: Dulles made an absolutely critical error in coming on board when he made that "positive loyalty" statement. Acheson a week before had gotten everybody out in the parking lot, it was a beautiful day and out in the parking lot out back and gave a farewell speech that just had everybody in total tears of loyalty.

Dulles said, "All right. I'll get the whole State Department out there and I'll give a speech." He talked about his team in football terms. The people he was getting in. Doc Lawry was one of them, who had been a great football player at Princeton. Butch Fisher, wonderful guy, I think was legal advisor, and he had been a football player also at Princeton. And Dulles from Princeton. Anyway, it just bombed. It was so awful in contrast to what Acheson had done.

Q: It was a rainy day too, wasn't it?

HOWE: Yes. Everything went against him. He was just poorly advised to do it. The positive loyalty was just a cap on it when he came out with that. Then the appointments of Scott McCloud and the other fellow whose name I can't remember. There was a constant concern. And Dulles was just not the friendly personality that his brother Allen was.

Come back to Livi Merchant. Livi became one of Dulles' prime advisors. He was just a sensible element in the Dulles team. Another one was the Middle East fellow, wonderful guy, who has since died, Eddy. He was a Foreign Service fellow who commanded respect. Loy Henderson was deputy. I guess Doc Lawry came in and Loy was director general of the Foreign Service. Bob Murphy was a political undersecretary, but Bob would go with the wind. He waalthough I knew him well, loved him and worked for him later on on the Commission for Government Operations - Bob was not politically? He would wave with the wind.

Q: How did Dulles arrive on this mal-adjointed entry into the State Department work? Did a team develop with Dulles?

HOWE: Yes. Almost every secretary of state comes in with great suspicion of the Foreign Service. They suddenly find that these guys "A" know what they are doing and "B" can be loyal to their chief. They were not loyal to former administrations. They were non political and this is so for most Foreign Service and most leaders. Even Acheson came belated to it when he first came in, although he'd been in the State Department before. Dulles came to feel very strongly and often spoke about how strong the Foreign Service was, but at the same time he did have people under him who were not altogether friendly toward the Foreign Service. You realize I moved up. Dulles asked me to come up and bDulles and Herbert Hooveasked me to come up to be executive secretary.?

Q: You're talking about Herbert Hoover, Jr.

HOWE: Herbert Hoover, Jr.you're quite righwho was? This is just jumping ahead but?

Q: We'll come to him in a minute. I'd like to stick to the research side. This month really we're going through the 50th anniversary of the creation of Israel. You arrived a year later. Can you tell me in the research area, did you see a split in how we dealt with the Near East because of our Arab interests and our Jewish interests and was this a problem?

HOWE: It wasn't a problem because the choice of supplying Israel was totally political. As we know from discussions in general, Marshall was in it and I think you can say the people who were students of the Middle East were not for it but it was a political reality to which everybody had to adjust.

Q: Were there battles within?

HOWE: Again, I don't recall battles because I don't think there was any difference of view in the State Department. It wasn't as though there was a strong Israeli lobby within the State Department or people who from an intellectual policy standpoint were fighting that battle. It was so extraneously political.

Q: What about the Soviet Union at the time? Was there any discussion about maybe we could do better business with the Soviets or was it pretty well seen as later President Reagan was to call it "the evil empire"? Were there any mixed feelings on that?

HOWE: Well my recollection isn't clear enough to add to that. I can only look at it as that transition from being a war partner to being clearly an enemy and the Cold War was something that we all had to adapt to and did even as we then had to later adapt to their becoming a friend rather than an enemy. I don't have any recollections of the substantive policy troubles that were there. I wish I could remember the name of our fellow in Russian affairs who was widely respected throughout the government as a Sovietologist. He and Kennan would disagree some and with Chip Bohlen, but basically they tended to think alike and with Tommy Thompson. They were so dominant. Those three were so dominant in Russian policymaking that I can't think of any differences that emerged.

Q: Were there any, during this '49 to '56 period, any clashes in viewpoint with the CIA over any particular issues that come to mind? State Department? CIA?

HOWE: No. Their clandestine side worked quite closely with the bureaus. Defectors were a constant problem and refugees would go into our embassy. Who was the cardinal?

Q: Mindszenty.

HOWE: Mindszenty in Hungary. That was something that we were working very closely with the bureaus and CIA. I don't think of any major CIA, State Department tiffs on the substantive line. We had to fight out our national intelligence estimates. The bureaucracy of intelligence was full of tensions where how much was CIA going to be controlling, dominant, or how much was he the director of central intelligence and how much was he the director of CIA? This came up very constantly. It came up particularly with the communications intelligence.

Q: Prior to '55, '56 when the Wriston Program went in, the majority of your intelligence bureau was civil service. Is that right? Long term experts.

HOWE: Absolutely.

Q: But the reporting was done from abroad by Foreign Service for the most part. Did this seem to work fairly well as a system?

HOWE: Yes. Except that the question of intelligence needs, writing - the technical term for it has slipped my mind now - but where you write out what is it that you want in the way of intelligence. This was a constant controversy both interagency wise and within the State Department because of this Foreign Service totally abroad and doing the reporting. They reported what they wanted to and what they felt was needed rather than necessarily what Headquarters felt was needed. It was a constant tension there, but I don't remember it being particularly controversial.

Q: Well, then in '56, what brought about your move up to executive secretary?

HOWE: Bill Macomber had been a special assistant to Park Armstrong and me. He was up at that time as a special assistant to Herbert Hoover, Jr. He later became special assistant to Dulles and later became assistant secretary and then undersecretary. At the time he was assistant to Hoover. I think he suggested to Hoover that I would be the one who could replace the fellow who was then executive secretary. Again, name gone out of my head, but he had been Carl Humelsine's - the first executive secretary - he had been his deputy and he, my predecessor as SS, went out of the government. He was not a Foreign Service Officer and Carl Humelsine was not a Foreign Service Officer. I was not a Foreign Service officer at the time. He went up to work at Mobile. He left the government.

Amusing, rather than historical, my wife and I were at a party at probably one of the few right wing Republican people that we knew, Baisy McCormick Tankersly, who was a nephew of Birdie McCormick, Chicago Tribune owner. She was running the Times Herald and had a big place out on River Road. She and my wife had grown up together so she was a good friend of ours. We were out there at dinner and so was Herbert Hoover, Jr., who was deaf and very insecure. To my great surprise, I had known him slightly as the deputy head of intelligence, I dealt with Hoover as well as with his secretary. Anyway he took me aside at cocktail hour and totally upset the party by insisting on talking to me for a half hour when all the party was looking at him. He was the prime guest and Baisy had to delay dinner because he was off talking with me.

As it turned out he said, "I'm going to be speaking to you tomorrow. It's coincidental we're both at the same party tonight, I want you to come up and be executive secretary of the department."

So he did speak to me the next day and I did go up to become executive secretary of the department and was there for three or four years.

He, Hoover, was right wing and because he was deaf, he was paranoid. He was very suspicious of everybody. He was doubtful of the loyalty of people. I think he trusted me mainly because Bill Macomber told him I would be loyal. He was secretive. Also, anytime there was a crisis he got very tense, in sharp contrast to his successor, Chris Herter who was a dear and very close friend of ours. As soon as a crisis came Chris just unwound. His muscles became relaxed and he just dealt with the situation with calmness. Herbert Hoover, if he had to give a speech he would drop everything and go through version after version and get people to come in and talk about individual words and was terribly tense. It's not very complimentary of the fellow. I don't think he was a very successful undersecretary. Although I found him a delightful fellow in many ways, we didn't become friends particularly. I felt there was a limited amount I could be helpful to him.

Dulles was at the other end of the corridor. I saw a lot of Dulles. I was in every one of his staff meetings every morning. We'd go in and I'd take notes but I proved to him that I was not going to write notes that were going to be damaging but I did feel that you needed to have a record of what was said. Especially I needed to know what policy he'd asked to have developed and what papers to expect and what key visitors were coming in. On top of that, I was the link to the White House on all correspondence whatsoever. I came in in the early morning and made a selection of what telegrams were to go over to the White House. I had a white telephone behind me and General Goodpaster, Eisenhower's special assistant, was on the phone four or five times a day wanting special letters or arrangements.

I got into trouble with Dulles over it because I sent over a telegram - I forgot even what the subject was - but it was an "eyes only for the secretary" from Whitney, ambassador in England.

Q: Jock Whitney?

HOWE: Jock Whitney. I thought it was a general policy statement and I sent it over to the White House. Dulles suddenly got a call from the president saying, "What about this?"

Dulles hadn't realized that they knew that that telegram had come in so I was called in on the mat. I told the secretary, "I had to make a judgement and there were a lot of them, he'd have jumped me if I hadn't sent them over and this one I made a judgement that differed from his, and I was sorry."

He accepted it, but I never had another chance that Dulles trusted me. I had made a fundamental error that taught me a lesson, and I learned from it but I think it cost me with Dulles. In the first week I was in on a meeting. Dulles called me in and there was a policy paper that came in on the Middle East. He said, "Look this isn't right. This has got to be redone along these lines."

I came out and took this as a mandate for me to do it. And give him Dulles' instructions and tell him what Dulles had said and then follow up closely. I drafted a paper which was, I thought, quite reasonable, but it was not what he wanted. That was a lesson learned and I never did it again.

Q: I would have thought it would have been difficult to deal with Dulles, just in your role as executive secretary, because my understanding in talking to other people, including Douglas MacArthur, was that Dulles in all his meetings kept a phone handy and would call up the president, quite often, to check out things with the president. If this is going on, was this something that you knew about?

HOWE: He was in constant touch with the president. He would be interrupted in a meeting because it was the president on the line. I don't share Doug MacArthur's view that he would keep checking it out with the president. He guarded very closely his daily talks with the president. He would, I'm sure, take policies over and clear them with the president but he didn't do it, in my recollection, in any way that distorted the meetings.

The executive secretary is an extraordinarily interesting and challenging job. I used to say it was a job that had the highest ulcer quotient in the State Department. You had to think policy and think process at the same time. You were constantly saying, all right here's the policy that we're going for and understand the policy and the innuendoes of the policy, but here is the way to do it. And of course the principal thing you did was you stopped runarounds. A Middle East bureau would come up or a bureau would come up and you said, "Look this has got an economics overlay to it. Has it been checked out with the economics fellows." Or if it was from South Africa, "Well have you checked this out with the European division or whomever?"

That was enjoyable, although tense. One thing that kept me alive was I insisted on taking an hour at lunch time and going over and playing an intense game of squash at the YMCA and come back. But you'd be there - my wife says I was there early morning 'til late at night, and indeed I was. Especially during the Korean War when we had to go over...

Q: That would be INR.

HOWE: That would be INR where I went over to the Pentagon. But I had to be ready for it.

Q: Did you do much traveling with Dulles?

HOWE: I had one fatal one with Dulles. I went over to a? Let me go back. We always had a secretariat fellow who went with Dulles. He or she, usually a he, young fellow from SS was called off the line, the operations people. We had one, a fellow who was - for each of the bureaus - was the executive secretary's man for that geographical bureau. He would normally go with the secretary and would, ahead of time, marshal all the documents that might be needed. He'd have a trunk that would go along with him.

I went over to a NATO meeting. I think I also had one of the fellows from the line with me. I got over there and got a very severe case of bronchial asthma and was socked into the hospital and came back and had to go out west for a month to recover. So it was a very difficult time but I was there for the first part of that meeting. But fortunately there was another SS officer involved.

The secretary relied on the secretariat and we did have an efficient operation, so that he was in fact fully and ably supported in these trips. I never had a sense that he was struggling. I would have known because his special assistants were always very close friends of mine. Bill Macomber and then Jerry Green had been my deputy in the secretariat. On both sides of me there was, in the outer office of the secretary or the undersecretary, was somebody who would tell me if the secretary was unhappy about anything.

Q: You went over in '56. Did you get involved in the Suez Crisis which was sort of Octoberish of '56?

HOWE: No. I did not get involved over there. I was very much involved because of the correspondence that was going back? Eden?

Q: Anthony Eden, the British prime minister?

HOWE: Yes. He tried to go around Dulles into Eisenhower. Dulles was absolutely furious when he found out about it. We were all very conscious of the fact that this was a crisis in the special relationship and also with the French. It came off at the same time as Hungary. That also meant that we were in the secretariat in very much of a crisis mode. I can remember being down with Jake Beam who was - I don't know what Jake's position was but he was probably deputy assistant secretary of state for European affairs. In this single communication line that was going out to our embassy in Hungary, it was a matter of giving him instructions, and Jake and I had to call to Herbert Hoover because Dulles was somewhere else. It was a very tough time.

Q: Did you find that Dulles? You say he never really quite trusted you, didn't have full confidence. Is this a feeling he knew you had? Was it just that he was?

HOWE: It may have been mutual.

Q: This of course is something often forgotten. That if you have a subordinate who doesn't really feel that his superior is telling him what he should know, it can leave you in a very uncomfortable position.

HOWE: When I say mutual, I did not enjoy Dulles but I like to think that I never, never gave him less than my total support. I can remember, this as difficult, because I would go to parties and my Acheson friends, who were numerous - I think particularly of John Ferguson and Harding Bancroft and Jack Oley and Jerry Gazelle. Here I was the special assistant, executive secretary to Dulles and they would jump all over me for Dulles' policies and I would defend it to the end. I would like to think I did everything I could to help Dulles in what he was trying to accomplish. It's just that he wasn't a fello and I was spoiled because Chris Herter and Dean Acheson had been friends and very few people were Dulles' friends.

Q: It's hard from today's aspect to really know whether it was Dulles or whether it was the media picking on Dulles. He had an ability to make sort of frightening phrases like, "going to the brink," and things that were picked up and played that you can't think of any other secretary of state who had this either inability to express himself too well or that the media was picking on him. I'm not sure which.

HOWE: That would be something you could pursue. Carl McCardle has died but Bert Wilkinson is a very good friend of mine.

Q: I've interviewed Bert.

HOWE: He's got a very good memory and he is still a defender of Dulles in, I think, a very intelligent way. Bob McIlvaine was also in the public affairs section. Both happened to be classmates of mine. They were very, very close friends. They were there at the same time I was executive secretary and would be very helpful on public relations things.

Q: Why don't we stop at this point then? We have more or less covered the '56 to '59 period as executive secretary unless something occurs to you, you can add. In '59 what happened?

HOWE: What happened. Oh. '59 and '58 I was Wristonized.

Q: What that means is?

HOWE: I had joined the Foreign Service as a class two officer and was after a short while as executive secretary and then I was assigned to Norway as a DCM.

Q: So we'll pick this up the next time when you went to Norway.

Today is the 13th of October 1999, after a long hiatus. Fisher, you were in Norway from when to when?

HOWE: I was in Norway, I believe, from '56 for five years? Well '57 to '62, I believe.

Q: All right. Well let's talk about Norway. In the first place, how did you get the job?

HOWE: As executive secretary I was? I had taken the Foreign Service exams before the war. The Foreign Service had said I had to go over to a junior position in Guayaquil while I was already over in London doing a first class job in the embassy. I couldn't do it so I had to bail out of the Foreign Service. When I came back and the war ended I went into the State Department as a special assistant to Clayton. I went from there to other jobs. By that time I was executive secretary of State Department and was Wristonized. That meant we came in laterally, to class two level. Loy Henderson was the deputy secretary for administration. He wanted me to go to be DCM in Norway. Frances Willis?

Q: Oh. yes.

HOWE: ?was the ambassador. Frances was the senior female career Foreign Service officer. She was, I think, the first ambassador from the career service.

Q: I think she was. Let's talk about a number of things here on Norway. First place, could you describe Frances Willis, how she operated, your impressions of her?

HOWE: Frances, bless her memory, was a very competent, intelligent lady who was however a detailist if I ever saw one. She knew where every bit of dust was in the embassy and went through every detail of every communication. I suppose it was very good for me to come under that as my first post in the Foreign Service. She delegated very little although she was hauled back to the general assembly to be a liaison with other countries and so I had long periods of being *chargé d'affaires*. Frances delegated to my wife all of the uxorial responsibilities, calling on other ambassador's wives, calling on all the Foreign Service people. They had some magnificent house that goes with the DCM, a very modern house, on the outskirts of Norway.

Well Frances, it's worth an anecdotal.

Q: Yes.

HOWE: We had a new embassy constructed while we were there and it was done by Saarinen. He came over for the dedication. There was a debate between him and the ambassador as to where the seal was going to be put. He had designed a Viking traditional building and he wanted a Viking shield to be placed in stone out in front of the building.

Frances said, "The regulations say the shield of the United States will be affixed to the U.S. embassy." She wanted it slapped on the wall.

Saarinen said that was aesthetically outrageous. The ambassador won, as she would. Saarinen's conception of where the seal would be put aesthetically had to go by the board. Actually, he was boasting. When he came over, I talked to him at great lengths. He was boasting then that he had done the Dulles Airport design and he was boasting that he had redesigned the whole way you move people in an airport. I have since then cursed him with those busses at Dulles whereas other modern embassies have good underground trains. But John explained in detail how he was going to get people bussed around. That's something apart from the embassy, however.

Q: What were relations like, when you arrived in '57, with Norway?

HOWE: Extremely good. They were a very loyal NATO member. Harvard Longner was the foreign minister and he was very much relied on by the United States, because of his sense of? He was a very sensible guy and very stalwart. The major problem we had between us was our maritime policy. Our subsidy of U.S. shipping and the disallowance of all ships and indeed foreign airlines to travel between two cities in the U.S. That for a ship owning, ship?the largest fleet of commercial ships, especially tankers, in the world, I think Liberia may have more tonnage registered?

Q: But the Norwegian one was the real fleet as opposed to flagging convenience.

HOWE: Absolutely. So I was constantly talking to the groups about that aspect. I ran into, while I was charging, one time, there was a serious problem. My recollection was it dealt with Berlin and I wanted to encourage the Norwegians to come out a little more forcefully on behalf of their NATO position.

Q: That's the time of the Berlin Wall towards the end then?

HOWE: I suspect it was. If the Berlin Wall was in '50 before?

Q: Well it was during the Kennedy time. That would be '61, 62.

HOWE: No. This must have been before. It must have been some other issue. I got permission from the State Department to go into Harvard Longer and press the Norwegians. He was very upset that we had done it, that I had done it. Who needs enemies when we have friends like this, pressing him? He felt that we should have understood that from a political standpoint he was not able to go further out on a limb than they were. That was the only difficulty I ever had. We always had the friendliest relations with them.

Q: How did one at that time deal with the Norwegian government? Was it going to? They had a parliamentary government.

HOWE: Very definitely and very labor strong government. The conservatives, which were in a minority there, and the farm party, but the labor party was indeed very strong. The prime minister was frequently in the embassy as a friend. We saw people in the government and all the other state's government and they were always extremely friendly and were very proud and pleased of their close relationship with the U.S. government. It was not a difficult time from that standpoint.

Q: Were you able to get any high level visits to Norway?

HOWE: Oh. Very frequently. There was a NATO meeting that went on while we were there. Dean Rusk. Would he have been??

Q: Yes. Sure in '61 he became secretary of state.

HOWE: All right. He came over. There was a NATO meeting there. Justice Goldberg, Arthur Goldberg came over. We had lots and lots of visitors. I was trying to think of anybody else of particular governmental power. The NATO meeting was certainly on. We also were very close to the Nobel Committee so the Nobel Peace award is given in Norway. The other awards are given in Sweden. I remember particularly Albert John Lutuli, from a little enclave in South Africa, got it and he was very dependent on the U.S. so we shepherded him around. I don't think there was a South African ambassador. We traveled a great deal with the embassy plane and all over Norway. We up to the top of Norway, up to Lapland, for an Easter holiday and we were told that we could have got to the Mediterranean in shorter distance than going to the top of the ice cold?

Q: Yes. You really could.

HOWE: I was the first American diplomat, I think, that had ever been to Spitzbergen and Svalbard and I went up there for a visit. I did it, among other things, to get hibernated with only Norwegians to learn the language better. It turned out that everybody there spoke wonderful English and were just delighted to see an American so I didn't speak any Norwegian at all. What else?

Q: Any problems with the Soviets at that time?

HOWE: Well, there was a U-2 plane that was shot down and it was headed for a Norwegian Base, Bodo. I heard about it - again I think I was charged $\frac{1}{2}$ - by a newspaper correspondent who called me and asked me what I knew about the plane that had been shot down that was headed for Norway. I had to quickly find out what it all was. The Norwegians did not, I think, suffer from having been a host for the receiving end of the plane, which didn't arrive. But I'm sure there had been others before it that had. There is a Soviet border. We went up into Lapland and you could look across and see Soviet sentries walking up and down. But it was always peaceful. There was never trouble. Soviet ships would come along the Norwegian coast and the Norwegians didn't like that and complained and did what they could to stop them.

Q: What about Sweden? How were relations with Sweden from your perspective?

HOWE: They were very good. We visited there - the embassy there - and we kept in close touch. The Norwegians and the Swedes have mutual disdain but if anybody outside cracks down on one or the other, they immediately band together in Nordic brotherhood. Same with the Danes. The Swedes were of course more formal than the Norwegians. The Norwegians were very simple in a non derogatory sense and very family oriented.

Q: What sort of reflections were you getting in NATO with Germany now part of NATO? Were the Norwegians still unhappy about Germany or??

HOWE: We went from Norway to the Netherlands and we found a great deal more dislike of Germans and hate than in the Netherlands than we did in Norway. But the whole German occupation of Norway was a lingering distasteful episode in their background and they were ashamed of Quisling. I'm trying to think of his name - the first UN secretary general. Trygve Lie. He came back to Norway and was there as a province governor.

We used to see a great deal of him. He was a very, very fine and distinguished fellow but he was out. He had been prime minister. He had been foreign minister. He had been secretary general. But he went under the title of Mr. Lie. He was a very, very straightforward guy. I can't think that there were any official dealings that we had with him.

Another official dealing we had, which was a secret one, the now generally known international navigational device known as LORAN (LOng RAnge Navigation). A key and then secret spot was on the island of Mann in the middle of the Atlantic or Northern Atlantic. We negotiated with the Norwegians for having a LORAN station put up there. That was one of the major kinds of events that went on in the first year or two that I was there.

Q: Were there any fishing problems?

HOWE: I don't think there were any fishing problems that arose on the fishing, either with us or the Russians. The Russians have since I think caused trouble in disturbing or exploiting the codfish along the coast. I don't remember there being any kind of difficulty at the time we were there.

Q: When Frances Willis left, another ambassador came in?

HOWE: Yes. An absolutely wonderful fellow. Cliff Wharton, who was the senior African American in the Foreign Service. He and his wife Lanni became fast friends and we were able to help him. Cliff had poor eyes. He was very loyal to his staff and particularly I felt to me and our family. He consulted with me on absolutely everything he did. Even though he was himself a senior Foreign Service officer. I felt I had a much more compatible relationship with him than with Frances Willis, although Frances and I always got on very well.

Q: How did the Kennedy administration go over, when it first came in, in Norway?

HOWE: I can remember one thing. The Nixon-Kennedy debates were put on to tape and sent around to all the embassies. We had receptions in the basement auditorium of the embassy to which we invited senior officials. I can remember the prime minister of labor came and he was very friendly, a very good man but he listened to those debates and he said, "We have just witnessed here the total change of politics the world over." He recognized that when you have the debate on TV and be able to tape them and distribute them worldwide, that it was going to change the nature of who was going to be successful and how they were going to run their campaign.

Rusk, Kennedy's secretary of state, came once on the NATO meeting. I don't think of anything other than the friendly sort of support. We were in the Netherlands at the time of the Kennedy assassination.

Q: What about Norwegian Americans in Minnesota and other places?

HOWE: Very close. The Norwegian American society in Norway and the many Norwegian societies in the U.S. were a signal part of the whole government's attitude towards the U.S. They would send people over to talk in the big centers in the northwest and in Wisconsin, Minnesota and Brooklyn and some in? No Michigan is more Dutch. Nordics in Minnesota and Wisconsin and the state of Washington and Oregon and Seattle.

Public relations in the USIA had a lot of interest in promoting the close relations of that sort.

Q: In '62 you transferred to the Netherlands?

HOWE: In '62 we went directly. Ambassador John Rice had been in the Netherlands and he came up and visited us in Norway and didn't tell us, but he later confessed that he did it to look me over as his DCM because he went back to the Netherlands and asked for my transfer - a direct transfer without home leave. So we did go down immediately on a direct transfer to the Hague and settled in there for three years.

Q: So you were there '62 to '65.

HOWE: Yes.

Q: How was that? What was the difference in the Netherlands, working there and??

HOWE: As I look back on it, the international relations and politics were I think remarkably the same in that there was another staunch NATO ally on whom we relied very heavily. The Dutch were even closer and were able to produce more for the alliance and in a way, they were more significant. The same maritime policies, however, were present. The Dutch are a great international maritime country. It was remarkably free of direct U.S.-Netherlands? There were no serious problems. There was differences of views and I don't know where it came from in the stages of Indonesian independence but that was?

Q: That was way back. By this time Sukarno was even? Well, Sukarno I think was ousted in '64, but independence had been granted.

HOWE: After U.S. involvement.

Q: Ellsworth Bunker?

HOWE: That's right. Ellsworth Bunker was a good friend of ours and a wonderful man. Stuart, it's hard for me to recall any issues that were particularly strong, although I'm sure there were times when we had?

Q: One that comes to mind is landing rights. This was a really big issue with the Dutch who wanted landing rights in Chicago and others. Does that??

HOWE: If they were it did not come sufficiently strongly into my life that I now recall it. Maybe much of that was done through IATA (International Air Transportation Agency) and in the U.S. rather than in the Netherlands. Kay Lemme was of course a big corporate feature, as was Shell. John Lowden who was head of Shell. We frequently saw him and he came to the house frequently. Chris Herter came over and he was a personal friend and stayed with us. We had a party with Joseph Lutz, the foreign minister, and John Lowden, head of Shell and Chris and Matt Herter, that was a wonderful event as far as we were concerned. They were all such congenial people.

But in terms of foreign policy, I'm hard put to find any particular?

Q: Maybe not. In the trade wars, did the chicken wars intrude at all? I think it was around this time. At least some of Europe was unhappy about chickens that we produced.

HOWE: I remember that but I don't know that it was when we were there. I remember the chicken wars, but I don't remember it featuring in there. I somehow associate it with Belgium more.

Q: It may well have been.

HOWE: Doug MacArthur and his DCM, David McKillop.

Q: How about John Rice?

HOWE: He was a political democratic figure from Pennsylvania. He and his wife Elaine were extremely dependent, quite overly dependent upon us. He resigned halfway through our stay there and the president did not appoint a replacement for between a year and a year and a half. So I was chargi½ there. Not in the interim because it wasn't that the ambassador was away. It was when there was no ambassador.

I've even tried to remember who was the predecessor to John Rice [ed note: Philip Young, 1957-1960]. It's a choice post and its very apt to be a political appointee. I think they had all been political. William Tyler came over to replace Rice. The State Department felt that because I had been so long acting ambassador it would be inappropriate for me to stay so we went over to England and met him and came in with him on a Holland America ship. Then a week later departed. We just saw him into Holland. He was an old friend from the State Department and a wonderful person. I wonder if Will is still alive?

Q: I think he is.

HOWE: I think he is and I think he lives over in France.

Q: I interviewed him about six or seven years ago.

HOWE: Did you?

Q: How did you find the Netherlands fitting into NATO?

HOWE: Very well and very strong. Sticker had been Lutz's predecessor. He had then become the secretary general of NATO. That is inevitably a very close tie that was forged between the Netherlands and NATO. Joseph Lutz, the foreign minister, was constantly involved in NATO matters. NATO met once while we were there. Fulbright came over. Rusk was there again. There was much celebration and much turmoil around and festivities. It was a very important time. Whenever the NATO meet in a country it's a turmoil.

Vice President Johnson came over two weeks before the assassination and was very upsetting to the embassy in all the paraphernalia you have to go through when any vice president comes, but particularly Johnson. He was quite arrogant in the way he dealt with the Dutch officials, including the Dutch Queen. He declared who was going to be at her party for him. Two weeks later he was president.

We went over to Germany to George McGhee, the ambassador, who was a very old and dear friend and we were celebrating his 25th wedding anniversary with Doug MacArthur who came from Belgium, and Archie Roosevelt who came from London. We were having cocktails before a white-tie big diplomatic dinner dance when George got word of the Kennedy assassination. The people all heard it and all knew that the party would be off. We all got into cars. We got into a car, drove back immediately to the Netherlands, to Hague. It was a three hour drive at least from Bonn to the Hague.

Anecdotal, we went immediately to the embassy to make sure that things were in order, that the book had been put out and all the rest of it. It was all well arranged. There was a line for 200 yards in front of the embassy of people - and here it was 1:00 in the morning - lined up to come in and sign the book. Everybody in Hague had heard about it and came and needed to sign the book.

I went out so see the line and there, well down the line, just standing like anybody else was the minister of agriculture who was a friend. A very moving experience.

Q: What was the Dutch reaction that you were getting to de Gaulle and his sort of split with NATO?

HOWE: Lutz and the Dutch foreign ministry were a very sophisticated bunch. They thought the French and, led by de Gaulle, were not doing what they should to help NATO.

Q: After this in '65, whither? You say that when Phil Tyler came in they felt that you'd been there too long as chargi½.

HOWE: That's right. I was were assigned diplomat in residence in Salt Lake City. I think it was either the first or the second year of the diplomats in residence program. There was three or four of us who were involved. My wife and I went out and had one solid year in Salt Lake City.

Q: Was it at Brigham Young?

HOWE: No. It was at University of Utah. Funny enough, the political science department, which had arranged for my going out there? There was one man in the political science group who was, I think Hungarian born, who took a violent stand that I was the nose of the government camel when we had a Foreign Service officer come into his pristine academic surrounding. He would not let me be housed with them so I was housed in the law school. But I gave classes in the political science, geography, all over the university and all up and down the Rocky Mountains going on up knife and fork circuits talking to groups that anybody who wanted somebody. It was a time when people were interested in foreign policy.

Q: This would be '66 to ...?

HOWE: That's right. '66 to '67.

Q: '66 to '67. I would have thought that in Utah, since so many were members of the Mormon church, and that they had had a practice for a century of sending missionaries abroad, mainly males - you would see them everywhere - that you would have a sophisticated talent pool in foreign affairs.

HOWE: Yes. I think there were. It's very sophisticated. The thing about Utah is that everybody is the same. You don't have very poor and you have very few very rich. Everybody thinks the same, and conservative. It was pleasant enough. This was a very important personal year for me. I decided very soon that I needed to keep busy. I got tired of hearing my own voice talk about the same things in foreign policy so I took a course in the computer and decided to write a book on the subject. I came east at one point to talk to Alex Johnson who was then deputy political undersecretary. He was very reluctant but did agree that it wouldn't do any harm to my career and that it would probably be helpful. He was skeptical. My book, when I got through with it, was greeted with a large bunch of skepticism by the Foreign Service old timers, who would only half teasingly say, "What are you trying to do, computerize foreign affairs? And are you going to forget the important dynamics of the diplomatic world that can't be possibly captured on the computer?"

But it was good fun, and I was very glad to have done it.

Q: This of course was very early days in the use of the computer outside of mere calculation. What was the focus?

HOWE: Very good question Stu. I did all the research I could, and it was extensive, on what the futurists were saying about where the computer was going to go. I was then going to relate that to what foreign affairs was all about. I tried to reduce the elements of foreign affairs to categories and to see how a computer might be applied. It is extremely interesting to look back. Early days of the computer, the best futurists looking at it and not a single one of them discussed the word and computer. It was all numbers and the computer. Here, 25 years later, there isn't a desk in the United States that doesn't have a word processor on it and everybody carrying one around. Even then they did not see that it was going to make an inroad on the word rather than the numbers.

Anyway, that was a useful year just for me personally. It didn't help career wise. I came back in '67 and for two years I was on the policy planning staff with Henry Ulman and his deputy Joe Yager. They had been former associates of mine when I was deputy head of intelligence. They had me particularly going at country policies. There was a kind of a fad going around the State Department. People said, "Well we don't have a policy on something." So they were going to get for each country a policy. And we had to put together a team of people to try and articulate what is the policy.

Well it aborted as it would because "A" policy is such an ephemeral thing to come to grips with. It is the ends or the means to achieve the ends and it is the dynamic of action and reaction international. It is so many-dimensional with functional, political, economic, public affairs interrelation of international aspects, United Nations and NATO dimensions of our policy. Anyway I tried to marshal as best I could. I was assigned one to be the leader on which was Finland. Because I had been working on the computer, I tried to relate it to seeing if you could quantify objectives, and that aborted too. It was both a stimulus and a source of scorn from the political departments that we would try to quantify anything so "un-put-your-finger-onable" as policy toward a country.

Q: How did you find policy planning? Was it in the heart of things? I mean policy and planning depends on the secretary and other people.

HOWE: Stu, it depends entirely on the secretary. Rusk paid lip service to it but did not really look to it. I was very close to policy and planning when Nitze was head of it and Acheson was secretary of state. Acheson turned to them every time a subject came up and loved the idea of having a counter opinion to the straight political desks. We, from the intelligence standpoint reinforced the policy planning boys, much to the distress of the geographic bureaus. It was good. There was a lot of arms control that was getting attention. Henry was an economist mostly or had economic interest so he was always looking at the international economic picture.

Anyway, Fran Wilcox had gone over to be dean of SAIS (School of Advanced International Studies). He asked me to go? The Salzburg Seminar wanted me to leave the Department and become the executive director of the Salzburg Seminar.

Q: This is Salzburg in Austria?

HOWE: Yes. And it's got an American seminar that invites - mostly in the summertime - invites prominent Americans over for two or three weeks in residence with other international scholars, officials, kind of thing. Young people. I think it's still going.

I was with SAIS for five years.

Q: SAIS being??

HOWE: School of Advanced International Studies of Johns Hopkins. I was assistant dean and executive director which was a title they hadn't had before and didn't have after me. But it was to help Fran Wilcox in the management of the organization. He and I then were asked by Bob Murphy to leave SAIS and return to the State Department to be the staff for the presidential commission which was called the Commission on the Organization of Government for the Conduct of Foreign Affairs. Which defied even an acronym as a title.

Q: This was when?

HOWE: This was in 1973 to '75. It was a major endeavor where we finally produced a report with six or eight volume sized appendices where we had gotten senior scholars and officials to produce supporting theses and so on. Greatly admired and totally ignored as a finished report. It was at the time that Kissinger was moving from being the NSC (National Security Council) advisor to being the secretary of state. We pronounced very strongly that you should have a secretary of state. He was doing both.

Q: He had both hats for a while.

HOWE: Yes. That's right. We didn't like that. We did a lot of other things. I think this is interesting when you look at it. There was a major effort that had its origin with Senator Mansfield who was concerned about the congressional role in the declaration of war and the carrying out of war. They had just produced the War Powers Act which had given the Congress, or claimed for the Congress, authorities where our military could be engaged. Bill Spawne, Senator from Virginia was one of the key fellows involved in this and he lost the election and came over and was with us on the staff. This was to say he had the high title of counselor or something like that. The commission included Mansfield, Bob Murphy as chair - Master Bob Murphy - a number of prominent people whose names of course always go right out of my head. Dave Atcher was one. The prominent lady from Texas and the prominent widow. It's like Alexander but it may not be. I think she is still around. The widow of the prominent African miner of nickel and so on, who was a friend. She was a friend of Mansfield's. The commission was going on fine really, doing fine work, when the representative from New Jersey resigned and the president then appointed the vice president, Rockefeller. That immediately changed the dynamics.

Mansfield had been totally dominant of the commission. Now suddenly there was vice president from the executive branch. It was both political republican versus democratic and executive versus legislative branch on an equal footing and not willing to compromise one way or another. So I think that did more than anything else to neutralize the effect of anything that the commission produced. So much so that when it was produced, Kissinger, then secretary of state, told me that he thought it was a great report and he wanted me to stand by to help in the State Department to implement it.

I stood by for two or three months. It was a stall. He had no interest whatsoever in implementing any part of it. So I up and left and went to the Department of Energy. It was then its predecessor, the Energy Research and Development Administration with Bob Siemens. That actually rounded up my Foreign Service career. However, you may want to go back to any part of those.

Q: Could you tap into the State Department whether you were on the Diplomacy Study group to get expertise?

HOWE: The answer is yes. We would have witnesses and we would ask for reports. WE talked to almost everybody who was anybody in the State Department, particularly the political military people. I think Winston Lord, who was then political-military. We talked to the people and got very strong, good briefings from CIA, PFIAC (Presidents Foreign Intelligence Advisory Committee) over in the White House. We'd talk to people on the Hill. We commissioned all kinds of studies on personnel, on defense relations. One study was done by none other than our current ambassador to the United Nations. One study was done by Chester Crocker who was later an ambassador or assistant secretary.

Q: Holbrooke is our ambassador to the United Nations.

HOWE: That's right. It was Holbrooke who did one of the studies. We got in some people but there was a wonderful fellow from Chase Bank who was a real professional on personnel. He came in and did some work on personnel.

Q: Did you have any feeling - you've lived here in Washington since - that some of the proposals permeated the system in time.

HOWE: Categorically none whatsoever.

Q: Good God!

HOWE: In three years of highly professional work of leading people - experts - in all of them. It did come out that the commissioners and there were 10 of them I think - five from the Hill and five named by the executive. There may have even been 12 - were quite neutralized.

Oh, I'll tell you who else was on it. Bill Casey was on it but he was then Ex-Im Bank before he was CIA.

Q: If you people were looking at this in a really professional sense I would have thought there would have been some truths that would have come out that just by their very nature would have eventually penetrated the system.

HOWE: I would have thought so too. But I do fault? Mansfield was so distressed that we hadn't really? Let me go back. The essence of the reason for the commission was to get at the relative responsibilities of the Congress and the Executive Branch in foreign affairs.

That is an impenetrable subject. Absolutely. It proved to be that. So to the extent that that was the reason why and you would look at foreign affairs as it's now handled with that as the focus of attention, it was I think predestined not to survive. But the coup came when you did have this legislative-executive Rockefeller versus Mansfield. That meant that you could not get... We never did make any headway on the basic core subject matter, which the commission had been established to address.

Q: That's very discouraging isn't it?

HOWE: Oh it is. You look back on it. We were very enthusiastic about where it was going. Peter Zanton who was our chief of research. He is an absolutely first class guy and did everything he could to get the research done that would be helpful but it aborted virtually. It made almost no publicity. What publicity there was was the first week and nobody ever paid any attention to it afterward.

Q: Good God. Well, maybe this is a good place to stop.

HOWE: Yes.

Q: We've gone back through. You were around at interesting times.

HOWE: Yes. You are right, Stu, and it is a good time to stop because it completes my foreign affairs relationship and that's what your interests are. I only wish, as I told you before, that it made more of a contribution substantive to what you want to get at. But a combination principally of the memory factor is?

Q: All of this and you are hitting it at many different angles.

HOWE: You put them all together and I hope something constructive comes out. Or something constructive can come out of what I do. I know it comes out of what you do.

Q: I think all of this adds. Okay. Well, thank you.

End of interview