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

PATRICIA DERIAN

Interviewed by: Charles Stuart Kennedy
Initial interview date: March 12, 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Joan Braden

State Department: Coordinator/ Assistant Secretary for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs 1977-1983

- History and personnel of office
- Mark Schneider
- Roberta Cohen
- Stephen Cohen
- Security process
- Amnesty International yearbook
- Christopher interview
- Congressman Donald Fraser
- Establishing bureau
- Dealing with bureaucracy
- Member, Committee on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) Controversy
- Argentina visit; meetings and conditions
  - "Disappeared ones"
  - Argentina murders and atrocities
  - Admiral Emilio Massera
  - Maxwell Chaplin
  - Military justification for its actions
- El Salvador visit; meetings and conditions
- Kissinger
- Maxwell Chaplin
- Dealing with the press
- Israel eyes Patagonia
- Chile
- Mexico
- Cuba
  - Wayne Smith
  - American Interests Section, Havana
  - Fidel Castro meeting
  - Kathleen Kennedy interview with Castro
- Guatemala
- Panama
  - US military views of human rights
  - General McAuliffe
- Nicaragua
  - Sandinistas/"Sandalistas"
  - Somoza
  - Ambassador Lawrence Pezzullo
  - View of democracy
  - Charlie Wilson
- Bolivia
  - American detainees

Embassy destruction
Zia meeting
Environment

INTERVIEW

Q: This is an interview under the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training with Patricia Derian. Today is March 12, 1996, and I'm Stu Kennedy.

To start with, could you tell me something about your family background?

DERIAN: Well, my father was the first foreigner to be in my mother's history in anybody's memory. That is, he came from Montana. She came from Virginia, from Lynchburg, Danville, towns in Southwest Virginia. My "foreign" father was named Ronald Thomas Jeremiah Murphy. He was called Harp, because he liked Harp beer.

Q: And also Harp was often a word for an Irishman.

DERIAN: Because of the beer, though. The first time I went to London I was so impressed with the wonderful, great people and how sturdy they were. It said "Courage" everywhere. My grandfather was named Jeremiah Joseph Murphy. He was recruited as a very young man, probably 18 years old, from Ireland to be a Texas Ranger. He might have been born during the Civil War. He went there and was a big success. He was 6'5" and had a great big mustache. Then the fellow who started Anaconda came from Montana and recruited him to come and work in the police department in Butte, because Butte had an enormous infusion of Chinese miners and they had more Chinese in Butte, Montana at that period than any other place outside of China. They had a lot of Eastern Europeans who came also and these were not immediately congenial.

Well, I went there for a year and a half, somewhere around when I got married the first time. Never remember when I actually got married but I think it was 1952. In any case, I lived in the coalfields. We can talk about that later.

Anyhow, my grandfather had been married and had three children and his wife died. So he married a woman from upstate New York, who lived in a house called "the house of seven gables". She was the mother of my father. Her name was Delia Wall Murphy. She was very mean. She was a secret drinker who sent the other three children away. The two daughters became nuns and the son became a businessman. In order to entice my grandfather to come from Texas to Montana, this man, whose name was Nathan Marcus, gave him a big interest in a copper mine. So it made him probably the most comfortable police officer in the entire world. So, anyway, she was an abusive and unpleasant parent. My grandfather was always trying to make up for that, to compensate to my father for this terrible situation.

In any case, my father went to the University of Virginia for the last two years of college and for law school. He met my mother, who was one of ten children. Her name was the worst name in history: Ruby Purcell Hardiman. I think my grandmother was so wonderful, had twins and named them Marvin and Melvin, so names were not her strong point. In any case, they eloped, much to the consternation of both families. My mother's family had been in Virginia since the Year One and they were all Baptists. My father was a Catholic, nominally, but it didn't matter. Everybody came to grips with the reality.

My grandfather hired an airplane, this was 1927, so it was a very little airplane, and flew from Montana to Charlottesville, which is where my Dad was in school. He got off the airplane with his Gladstone bag and he went into the little house that my parents had rented, pulled down all the shades, opened his Gladstone bag and took out his giant gun and put on it on the table and then he took out what he thought would be enough money for them for the next year. My mother was deeply impressed with that because as Virginians they had never seen a lot of actual cash and maybe not any. Also as Virginians for them the Civil War was The War, or at least until my Uncle Curtis ran away to World War I and was gassed. So anyhow, they got married and my mother had to promise to raise me as a Catholic, raise any children who came and I was born a couple of years later and my sister came 12 years after.

I was born in 1929, August 12. I was not told until I was about 14 that I was not fully Virginian. I was born in New York City, a real scandal. What happened was my mother obviously knew she was pregnant and I'm supposed to be born in early October, somewhere in that time. So they went to New York for the previews. They used to preview the new season's plays in August. During an interval my mother went into labor, which was a great shock and then got to the hospital and had identical twin daughters, which was an absolutely astonishing shock. Unfortunately, the other baby died of a diarrhea epidemic. Reaching back into the past, that's the way things were. They had separated us in two different nurseries, a thing I never knew, I'm a nurse, too, I never had known to happen. Usually they put the two in the same bassinet but for some reason they didn't and in that nursery they had a little explosive epidemic of diarrhea and a good many babies died and they tore the hospital down. Anyway, my father was a lobbyist for Anaconda in Washington, in the Investment Building; and we lived at The Westchester [Ed: located at 400 Cathedral Avenue in Washington, D.C., The Westchester was four buildings built in 1930 and open for rentals in 1931. The whole project was not completed due to the Depression.] My mother had a house that belonged to her in Danville, we lived in Danville, too, we would go there from time to time.

Q: I think it's interesting that your father was so closely associated with Anaconda on the law enforcement and then lobbyist side and you later getting involved in civil rights, because Anaconda was sort of the devil as far as the labor movement was concerned in that period that you were growing up.

DERIAN: Oh, it's true but growing up in that time, nothing like that touched children unless they were part of it. If we had lived close to the mines, perhaps. What I did know was that the Chinese workers had tong wars in Butte and my father and his friends would

go up on top of the police station and throw brickbats down on them. Not a charming story about your father but it was a weird and bizarre time. The problem was between the two groups. I do know that when I went to my grandmother's house some years later, after she died, you could put your ear to the ground and you could hear miners talking underneath. The whole of Butte was just resting on top of the mines, very interesting.

In any case, then it was time for me to go to school. My mother felt that her responsibility to raise me as a Catholic was kicking in and she was very leery of the whole idea. So they sent me to Immaculata, a boarding school in Washington, DC. It was a boarding school until American University bought it a few, several years ago [1986], a boarding school for little girls. Far as I can tell, my father never actually paid any bill. I think my grandfather continued always to support the family or augment it or something. I do know my parents were very, very bad about paying tuition. So every now and then I had to go to Holy Cross boarding school for a while. That was such an esoteric life. By then it was the height of the Depression.

Then, just shortly after my 12th birthday my sister Michael was born. She was born on October 7th and then came December 7th [Ed: the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, 1941]. On January 7th one of my father's best friends, who was a West Point graduate and a pilot, a captain, was killed in the Pacific theater. The U.S. government had just begun a program of trying to come to grips with the fact that they didn't have any stuff in the Pacific. There they were with no real preparation. What they had was pretty much wiped out at Pearl Harbor. So they formed, I'm sure, many little groups like this but this was a group of thirty, give or take five on either side, can-do men that they asked to become a member of this little band. They were essentially turned loose in the Pacific to make arrangements, to make deals, to scour, to lean on people in Washington. They were all young Washington insiders. I guess my father was, I think he was born in 1904, so that would make him, what, about 38? They all knew each other and they knew people everywhere. So, he joined that, he was sworn in on March 1st and on March 7, 1942, he flew away from National Airport. There's a wonderful picture of my mother in her little fur hat and fur coat and me in my boarding school blue felt cap with a ribbon down the back and little velvet collar and Alma, the nurse, holding the baby out at the airport seeing Dad off. One of those little things that trigger, I do remember having mixed feelings because I loved being at the big airport and the airport was pretty new.

So, anyhow, my mother then was in some disorganized state because here she was with the new baby who had turned out not to be a boy. Here's my father gone. She had no idea how to manage anything. So we stayed on here for a while and then we went to Baltimore, where my grandmother and grandfather had for some reason moved a few years before. Grandmother still had children in school. This was my mother's mother, the wonderful grandmother, my actual all time favorite relative. So we went over there and stayed a while, then we came back to Washington for a while. I went to school for about two months in Baltimore and then I came back and went to school for a month in Washington and then we moved to Danville. We couldn't go right away to Danville; somebody had rented our house, so we stayed with my aunt and uncle. Then we moved into our house and spent the war years there. My Dad didn't come back until the war was

over. He had been slated to fly back and he had jungle rot to such an extent that they thought he wouldn't live. They put him on a ship and sent him back and that slow change of climate was apparently beneficial to him. Then he was in the hospital in San Francisco for a while.

The only thing of real interest, how you happen to wind up living the life you do as an adult is that I was this Catholic child in this pretty much Baptist town. There was one other teenager, a boy my same age and we were the only two kids in our little parish. I think that little parish was the only one, unless there was a black church which we certainly didn't know anything about.

I started high school in Danville. One day when I went into Latin class a young woman, whose name I think was Mable Tanner was the teacher and I had already had almost seven years of Latin by then, said, "Are there any Catholics in the room?" So we raised our hands and she said, "You might as well leave, I don't pass Catholics." So I, joyfully, got up and left. That class was just before lunch. A great chunk of family assembled at lunchtime for the adults' main meal and so I went home and took my place at the table and didn't say anything. Finally, someone said, "Aren't you in school?" I said, "I'm not going back anymore." After a while I told them what had happened, whereas they rose in a body and in four automobiles convoyed themselves down to the high school where we had a wonderful principal named Mr. Christopher. So they finally all came back and said I could go back to Latin class. I said, "No, no, I'm not going back to Latin class" and had a little confrontation, briefly. So it was decided that I would go back but I wouldn't take Latin, which was just wonderful joy. Then Miss Tanner, as it turned out, was forced to come and apologize to me, which was extremely humiliating for both of us. Oh I hated that and never wanted to see her again. It's funny, we had the 185th reunion of our high school class and I went to it a few years ago. We were talking at the dinner party and Charlie Williamson was there, the other Catholic and I said, "Do you remember that or have I embroidered it over these years? Was it really like that?" He said, "No, I don't remember it." Four other people said they remembered it. So I was happy that I had not made something out of a trifling thing. There was that and then, these were days of such matter-of-fact racial segregation that I never heard anyone speak of the possibility that we might live in some different way.

Q: Danville, for someone who's not too familiar, is on the North Carolina border and inland. So it's really back country.

DERIAN: No, no, it's not back country because it had the Dan River cotton mills there. It was, at the time, the world's best tobacco market. So there was a lot more industry there. It was really, relatively prosperous through the whole Depression. It was not an intellectual metropolis by any means but people traveled and read books and went to New York and did all those kinds of things. It wasn't Greenville, Mississippi.

It was a segregated society, segregated in two ways, not only between the two races but the people who worked in the cotton mill lived in what is called Schoolfield. If you look at your desk here, this whole thing, and you put a park one third of the way down, and on

one side of the park lived people who worked in the cotton mill, called Lint heads, who were mostly white. They had a company store, a company doctor, had company housing and company schools. So they were never, ever part of the life Danville. Then Danville was segregated racially. It was also segregated between north and south. North was old, original part and south of town was the good times, mostly, I'd say that all that stuff was built in the Twenties and quite a bit in the Thirties, until the war came. That was the "nice side" because it was the newer.

Q: Could you explain what segregation in Danville meant. I'm talking about racial segregation.

DERIAN: Well, it meant that the black community…and I have no idea of the extent of it; although when I went on the Democratic National Committee, the national committeewoman from Virginia was a woman named Ruth Charity Harvey, she was my exact contemporary, a lawyer and a black person. It was so funny because we had so many experiences alike and no contact at all. It was not a big town but we never saw black teenagers. It was just as though we lived in different worlds. So in terms of children, just about the only children that black children saw were other black children and the same in the white community. The standards were so different.

One of my aunts who lived there was very beautiful and very demanding and difficult. She had endless number of people who worked for her, all of whom were black. She came around to our house one day and piled us all in. I think this was before the war because I was about ten, and they took me along with them. She was furious, just really angry. It turned out that someone had stolen her silver. So we drove into a part of town I had no idea existed. The dirt there is beautiful red clay. In the white community, there were sidewalks and gutters and curbs, normal. This part we went into had a few trees but it was built on a hilly part and the road was down kind of low. The road wasn't paved. There was no plumbing. There was no electricity. There were outhouses and wells and kerosene lanterns. We walked up to this hapless woman's house, a long flight of rickety wooden stairs and then you walked along a dirt path for maybe ten yards to her house. We marched up two or three steps, just up from the dirt onto a porch and my aunt walked right into her house. I was shocked. She wouldn't walk into her best friends' house. She wouldn't walk into our house. Walked in and started going through the belongings of another person. It was one of the most horrifying moments of my life, where this woman was completely disregarded. She had children there, her children saw this other, it was really terrible. Unfortunately, she also found the silver, a nightmarish thing. So, silver under the arms, she marched out and we marched out behind her. I can remember crying and crying and having her snap at me. You saw the sort of nasty niceness of those days, where no derogatory word was used, beyond "colored people." There was none of the stuff that you get in the Deep South, or got in the Deep South, get a little almost everywhere now, in terms of name calling. I told my mother I was never going to Del's house again when we got home and my mother was very angry at my misbehaving. But she was very angry with Del, too. Those two things really made a difference.

Then, years later, when I was, maybe, 17 and living in California, we had a wonderful writing teacher in the high school I went to there. We were supposed to write about the biggest surprise. We had a number of days or weeks, some period of time between the assignment and I was having a hard time thinking of what might be a good surprise, because life was so surprising anyway for kids, even though I was a teenager. Then, I had my greatest surprise, while I was trying to figure it out. Our house was on West Main Street and it had a big porch, in Danville. You walked down a few steps and then you walked on the sidewalk and there's a maple tree on either side of that and then you walked down some more and you were on the real sidewalk. So, this family sort of was an amorphous presence. We almost never just ate dinner or any meal with ourselves. There was always somebody else there. When we ate at our house, everybody would go out on the porch and watch everybody drive by. We would be playing, my cousin who was closest in age to me, on the sidewalk and then somebody would say, "Come on up here, honey. Come on." And we never wanted to come; we were playing tag or catching lightning bugs or something. And they'd lure us up with these sweet voices and when we'd get on the porch they had nothing to tell us. And I realized, it was just one of those things that occur to you, that every time there was someone black, a black man, maybe, obviously someone they didn't know since everybody knew everybody else's people who worked around there. As soon as that person would go, then we could go back on the porch. That's all there was, nothing said. I think that's the strongest teaching of racism comes in those subtleties that children cannot intuit at the moment.

Like the man who worked for us, came and did the stoker and did things in the yard, carried stuff around, was named Jesse James. Sometimes he would be arrested, I guess it was for drinking, I don't know what it was, there was some frequency. Since my father was away, my Uncle Clay would go to jail and bail him out. He was often left there over the weekend and not bailed out until Sunday night or Monday morning when he could have gone to get him the minute he walked in the jailhouse. There was always sort of amusement. I'm sure that every time that happened it wasn't a topic at the table but there was enough so it's a very vivid memory of my own. Nobody ever told us that we shouldn't talk to black people or that we should be rude but it was absolutely rigid. Black people did go to the same movie house but they sat in the balcony and they entered from somewhere else, didn't enter there on Main Street they, I guess, went in through an alley or a back door.

Q: Either a separate theater or. During the same period of time, I was a teenager in Annapolis. There was the Star Theater, which was where the blacks went, but also I think, I don't think the main line theaters, which had the better movies, had a balcony situation. The whites called it "Nigger Heaven."

DERIAN: I think they did, although I went to the Uptown Theater in grammar school, on Wisconsin, and I think they went there, too. Anyway you're talking about Annapolis, that whole Eastern Shore of Maryland was one of the most horrible places for black people. It's still not very good.

Q: Well now, one other thing I'd like to touch on, you were born in 1929, I was born in 1928. I was a boy growing up in Annapolis and my brother was in the Navy, so we were focused on the Navy. What got me into the Foreign Service and many of my generation, was almost the, it's hard to say, it's the wrong word but the attraction or the romance of the war, because we got a tremendous feel for the geography of the world which stands with me today. There was war everywhere and we followed it on the map, so I could tell you where Rostov was and El Alamein and on and on. You're in Danville and you were a girl and there's a difference and also you probably had a lousy newspaper, too. We had the Washington Post *and really the* New York Times *and the* Evening Capital*, which was an Annapolis paper. I was wondering, what was your impression of the world, since you grew up during the war*

DERIAN: You were reading city papers; I'm not sure we read the Richmond Times-Dispatch. There were very few other fathers who were away. Dr. Upchurch was in the Navy and my friend Jean Wilson's dad was a Royal Crown and Dr. Pepper bottler. Those were the only ones. Jimmy Hamlin's dad, I guess. We didn't talk much about it but we listened to the radio. My father wrote regularly and so we had a lot of mail back and forth, although sometimes we'd get tons of V-letters. One of my chief impressions was if there's ever another war, I'm going. The war's biggest impact on me was after the war, in every way. My father came back a wreck, psychologically and never really got right again and I read The Wall.

Q: John Hersey's book, which was about the Warsaw Ghetto.

DERIAN: In those days, when I was going to high school, I was reading two books a day. So I did very little school work. School was quite concerned because they thought they were failing, talking about a different age, that somehow they could not catch my interest. So they passed me along, as I just drifted through. I was prepared in a way but I hadn't done any wartime reading. Nothing prepared me for the Warsaw Ghetto. I was just absolutely astonished. And he wrote it so soon after. I was so happy I got to meet him later; it was before I was in the State Department. I told him he was one of the formative people of my life. I was so glad I got to tell him.

Q: Would you consider yourself a sensitive child, as compared to a non-sensitive child?

DERIAN: You know, I was an only child until I was 12 and I really think that only children grow up in an entirely different way. Particularly because I had very glamorous, party going, party giving parents who were almost totally absorbed in their own lives. I was more of an ornament because none of their friends had children. When my sister Michael was born, they were just beginning to have children. She has a lot of contemporaries among my mother's and father's old friends but I have none. So everyone kind of doted on me and I was alone a lot and very self-sufficient. Reading all the time but I spent a huge part of my childhood in Glover Park neighborhood, all by myself, climbing trees, building huts. So a big chunk of myself requires being outside a lot. In a way, I raised myself.

What was transmitted to me, my father's lifetime message to me was "You live your life so that you can look any man in the eye and tell him to go to hell!" I got a profound message from that. Those aren't the fighting words I grew up with kind of thing, that isn't the effect they had on me, but it did make me weigh choices that I made, would I be proud of myself for doing this, is this a good thing to do? Had nothing to do with me sexually as a wild teenager and I was, blessedly, a wild teenager whose parents had no idea of the things we did. I started smoking when I was 13, for instance. We all did, in my little group. But nobody told their parents. We were at one of these lunches at Del's house and the room where you ate lunch at that house had its bathrooms upstairs. I was up there smoking and blowing smoke out the window and they kept calling me for lunch and I kept saying, "Oh, I'll be there in a minute!" waving a towel and all of that. So I went down and I stood in the door, I must have been still 13. I leaned against the door frame and I said, "I'm 13, I smoke and I'm not going to curtsey anymore!" There's this long silence and I can remember that feeling of dread that I'd just cut a lot of ties. And they all burst into laughter, being people of a wild turn and they were very pleased because I pack cigarettes and they couldn't. That was their story.

Q: You were in Danville, you moved to California for a while?

DERIAN: Well, what happened was, we were in Danville 'til the end of the war. My father came back. We couldn't get our old apartment at The Westchester back; there was almost no place to live. So we stayed in Park Fairfax, which was a new apartment complex in Alexandria and I watched Shirlington Shopping Center being built, as a matter of fact. I went to George Washington High School, which is now a middle school, for a brief period. My father rejoined his organization and was very, very restless, chain smoking and drinking a lot. He was in rage all the time because, except for that little handful of people that he went with, many of whom didn't come back alive, they had a very wild and wooly, honest to God war. Other people complained because they didn't have any steaks, that butter had been short, that the war had been so inconvenient, that they had had a terrible time and couldn't get all the gas coupons and things and just outraged my father who had friends dying right and left and was in battle. They had been asking him if he would come back and help them do a series of things. They brought a lot of people back who had Pacific and Asian experience, people who were Mandarin speakers and all of those kinds of things, doing kind of gathering stuff together and finding things out. He had said no and then one day he walked in and said, "Okay."

So he rejoined the army, one of the worst decisions of a life fraught with many bad decisions and up we went to Oakland Army Base, a place I adored. It's in the industrial section of Oakland in those days, wasn't like any kind of community that I had ever seen before. It was just enchanting to me. We ate at the Officers Club every night, which I liked a lot because I didn't have to stay at the table until everyone had finished. There were certainly a lot of cute boys around and there was a wonderful library that nobody used. So that's where I read the Menninger brothers' The Human Mind, which was also extremely useful for a kid living in a very chaotic family and trying to figure out the Warsaw Ghetto and the things that had happened. I was profoundly moved by those. I did

learn a lot of geography but I think I would have learned that anyway, because they taught geography and geography's so interesting.

Then we rented a house after we'd been there several months and after I'd finished The Human Mind. We moved to Orinda, through the tunnel on the other side of Oakland. We just moved our house there. Whatever my Dad was doing at the Oakland Army Base, he continued to do. We had a wonderful, exotic, non-Virginia kind of house built by a woman who was a sculptor. It was all on one floor, a wonderful new thing. My bedroom opened onto its own patio, as did everybody else's. She had as a hobby growing herbs, and I had always been a gardener. From the time I was about four I had my first real garden. So here I was with all these herbs and things I'd never seen growing. Every door to the outside patio was carved by the woman. Mine had Adam and Eve on it, which was of great interest to people because they had navels. So all of our neighbors would come and point out that Adam and Eve did not have navels. It's a very exotic kind of life. Where I came from the word navel had never been spoken. So I lived there a while and then my father was transferred to San Pedro, to Fort MacArthur, which was named after Arthur MacArthur. It was an old, wonderful looking, army base, small, must have been hell to be in the army in those days. It was another new experience for me and dinner in the Officers Club every night again.

So when I moved down there I had not finished high school yet. They said that I would have to go another year before I could graduate in California. So I came home and I said, "I'm not going. If you want me to go to college, just tell me how I should do that and I'll do it, but I'm not going to high school anymore." So there was, was it a woman's college, I can't remember because it finally folded up. I can't remember whether it was Pasadena or some, I went to one of those places and took the California whatever it was and the Minnesota Multiphasic something. So then everybody would take me because I did well on that. Obviously, it didn't have math or science on it. I got to look around and the Vanderlip family of New York owned the Palos Verdes peninsula in those days, the whole thing. They built a junior college there because one of their members of their family, exactly my age, Amanda Vanderlip Street, had run off with a trumpet player from Jimmy Ryan's night club in New York and had been found, many days later, and obviously compromised. So they started this college on the Palos Verdes peninsula and put her in it and I said, "This is where I want to go!" We were right on the ocean.

Q: You might explain because somebody wouldn't understand "obviously compromised." *This is such a term that probably*

DERIAN: From yesteryear. Obviously they had slept together and she was no longer virginal, if she was virginal when she ran away. That was really wild. Well, for a family like the Vanderlips. I'm not sure in my family, it was so gothic that nobody ever knew, no one would do anything that allowed them to get caught but I did think my mother during World War II decided she would take instruction after picking me up at church one day and seeing the beautiful young priest who was there. My mother is the most un-athletic woman who ever lived but extremely beautiful and decided that she would take instruction and they played tennis three times a week. I was somewhat older before it

dawned on me that there might be a lot more to this than the love of the Trinity. Then the day my father came home, the day he actually came to our house, the next Sunday my mother went back to the Baptist church and never went to the Catholic Church again. I think she felt she had fulfilled her obligation to my young sister. I'm sure that was her story.

Q: You started this junior college. What was the college called?

DERIAN: It was called Palos Verdes College and it was wonderful. We had really brilliant, brilliant people who were teaching us. Charles Laughton read to us, emoted for us. It was just a wonderful thing and in between times, we were either at the beach or playing bridge.

As you know, the Palos Verdes peninsula just hangs down there. You can see Catalina. It was wonderful. We were in old army barracks things they had moved in. Then my mother and father; they had an obsessive relationship from the beginning. So they (were) always in a state of total tension, except when they broke apart. They were even divorced and remarried, at least once. My mother was always leaving. So, we left. Michael, my sister, the silver, my mother. Did we still have the LaSalle? Wonderful car that I loved, the only car I really loved, gigantic car. Had a rope on the back of the front seat where you put the lap robe. During the war we didn't have that car. It was put up and the tires were taken off and parts of the engine were taken out. So, anyway, we got in the car and we drove to Chicago, where Ruth Shepard and her daughters lived.

She was the widow of the best friend who had been killed in the beginning of the war, a great friend of my mother's and father's. Her daughter, Pat, also, we were in Girl Scouts together. It was really time for me, though, to keep moving. So I helped my mother get settled there. They were always trying to marry me off. They were very concerned. I was probably engaged four times, because they really wanted me to get married young, before anybody noticed that I read all the time and liked books and wanted to be in the woods and things. So, I was engaged when we went there to a man 35 years old and in those days those differences were really vast. He was one of the Chinese speakers and that's how I met him. When somebody asks you to marry them, it seems to me that that must have been so hard to do. I always said yes. So I was constantly being engaged and trying to get unengaged, we were moving around so much that it was pretty easy. You just moved, wrote a letter. This man gave me an incredibly beautiful engagement ring, really the prettiest one I got, just perfect deep blue star sapphire, not a milky one. It was like a piece of the night with a star in it, so gorgeous. And had big diamonds around it. I was deeply impressed. I'm a 19-year-old. What was I, 18 or 17 or something? I just really thought I was top of the heap. So he left and went back. He was a vice president of the Hormel meat packing company. He was very good looking and a wonderful dancer. In any case, he had a huge, lovely convertible, all things that I like. However, he was old enough to be my father, as far as I was concerned. So I told my mother that I wasn't going to marry him. She and I were having a lot of tension about it. She kept saying, "You should call him up, we're here in Chicago" and I'm not going to do it. So two days before I was going to leave, I answered the door and there he stood. My mother had

called him. There was this beautiful new convertible. He held out his hand and dropped the keys in my hand. He said, "There's your car." He handed me some papers and said, "You start Northwestern in" whatever it was, three weeks or so. I was so angry with my mother. As I stood there in the door I said, "I'm really sorry, I just can't, I can't." And he said, "I want you to think about it." I said, "Oh, okay, I will! Yes!" Then I got in the car and I drove to Baltimore. I said to my grandmother, "If he calls, I'm not here." So after several weeks, he then had started sending her wonderful hams and things. Which she liked! She was beginning to have a very favorable impression of this person. She came in my bedroom one day and she sat down and she said, "I don't want you to think I'm pressuring you in any way but why don't you want to marry him?" I said, "Well, what you told me when I first got here." She said, "What was that?" I said, "Better be an old man's daughter than a young man's slave." She said, "I didn't say that. I said "Better be an old man's darling than a young man's slave." It just makes you believe in Freud from time to time. I certainly heard what I wanted to hear. That's how it seemed to me. So then I wrestled with my conscience and I sent his big ring back.

Q: The ring and the convertible.

DERIAN: Oh, no, I didn't take that car. Oh, no, I never sat in it or anything. No, no. The only, I mean he had given me little trifling things. So then I left grandmother's and what did I do? I went to New York and visited and got offered a job on PM.

Q: Which is a liberal newspaper?

DERIAN: It was. My parents were horrified. I was staying with my friend Amanda, who had a very nice place to stay.

Q: The compromised lady.

DERIAN: Yes, well, she was back at home with Mom and Dad. But I didn't take that job because they wouldn't hear of it. Then some St. Johns professors said that they had been contemplating admission of women and would I like to, of girls, is what they said, would I like to come. Boy, that was really where I wanted to go. They wouldn't even talk with anybody at school. It was really sad. So then I came to Washington and I got a job at the Washington Star, in the classified department because I'd learned to type when I was about five. I was a very early self-taught four-year-old reader. I got measles. In those days you had to sit in the dark, do you remember that? So they gave me a Royal typewriter. I don't think they bought it for me, I think it was probably theirs. In any case, I learned to type in there and of course I didn't learn the right way. So when they asked me if I could type I said, with all honesty, "Of course I could type." And they said, "How fast?" I had no idea, so I said some apparently phenomenal number, because people dictate those ads on the telephone. So, anyway, then I decided that I would go to Radford College, a woman's college, because it was in the mountains.

Q: This is in western Virginia.

DERIAN: Yes, near Roanoke, near Blacksburg. I went there and then my mother finally figured out where I was and had moved back to Washington, rented an apartment. I can't remember how it all goes. In any case, it was a kind of turbulent time. When the family finally got back together again, we had a serious discussion about my education. They said I could go anywhere I wanted to except to an all boys' school and that the only thing I couldn't do was go to nursing school. So the next morning I called the University Of Virginia School of Nursing and said, "I may not be qualified by your standards but I would like to come to nursing school there."

Q: Tell me, why would your family object, one, why object to nursing and, two, since they obviously knew you, that anything they told you not to do

DERIAN: They never learned that. They never learned that. It wasn't anything but it was what seemed unfair, because the reason not to go to nursing school was that my father had seen a lot of nurses during the war and they were not good women. It was hard for me to believe that. You know what, those two experiences in Danville and a series of other things but also seventh grade civics, where they talked about this country and the idea of it. And you have to remember I had this Catholic childhood of charitable duties and honor and all of those things and then you lay democracy on top of that. Well, you've got yourself a lifetime program. I think that was true of our generation, that you grew up, no matter what kind of pressure came from all around you, those things were given to you and you believed them. I don't know about your parents but my parents and a lot of my Southern friends' parents all saw to it that we had those kinds of education, complete with religion and idea of country and patriotism and love of democracy but they never expected us to live it.

That's really one of the key things, I think. They didn't go to church, they didn't vote, they were terrible citizens, they drank, they partied, they had a wonderful time. All of which I did, when I got a chance, when I was old enough.

Q: I suppose the combination of the Depression and World War II together, brought more of a unity together and so that in a way certain things were expected of you, a sense of mutual sacrifice that is lost on the current generation. So it was different. But I think Roosevelt summed it up: "To some generations much is given and to some generations much is asked and this generation has a rendezvous with destiny." We were the beneficiaries. You sort of, "Gee, I don't want to do this but I'd better." I think this is a motivator.

DERIAN: Well and you know what. My grandmother and mother essentially had the same childhood that my grandmother's mother did and their lives went that way. Then, along came the Jazz Age and here's my beautiful mother with her beautiful other sister and they just joined. They smoked. They cut their hair. They didn't curse. They drank. They did everything. I think actually I never saw my grandmother dance but I think she did. In any case, they had broken the mold. It's not just those two. Many of my friends who are women, and I'm really not sure what differences there were for men, except you following the war kind of thing. I did but nothing like the way you did.

So they went through all those rituals and they expected us to live like they did. And we lived like they taught us, which was completely unexpected. They had mostly tossed it out the windows themselves and thought we would. But we also lived like they did. But then look, I was engaged to a wonderful fellow at the University of Virginia, was really a sweet writer, ah, gosh, a lovely, lovely writer. And his father found out he was not going to law school but was going to stick with writing and he called him up and told him if that was his intention he was not paying for any more education. In their family they were lawyers and if he wasn't going to be a lawyer he had no interest at all in supporting his learning how to do something else. So he went through great agonies and then gave in. Whereupon, I broke my engagement with him. It paid off. I saw him again in the Sixties, here. He was in a big time law firm, had made partner and was miserably unhappy, on his fourth wife.

Q: We're talking about 1948 or so? What was it like being a nurse? Did you have the feeling that becoming a nurse was sort of déclassé*?*

DERIAN: Oh, no, I didn't! In fact I was always deeply offended because a lot of people would ask, "What are you doing here?" As though I was not the right kind of person to be there. Also, the school wondered. The day I arrived, had a wonderful professor of anatomy from McGill who looked like my idea of a nurse, her clothes were so starched and stiff and her posture was so erect and her head was so high and her diction was so good and she rapped on my door and said, "Well, we took you because we never had taken anybody with your kind of thing, where you're off the top of chart in literature and composition, but at the bottom in math and science. You know, you're never going to make it without some coaching. I'm so interested in broadening the kind of students we take; I've volunteered to be your coach." I was deeply offended. I was very polite, but I thanked her and said that I really wanted to do it on my own and so I did. I learned those things. Chemistry very briefly, just 'til I took the exam. No, I was intrigued by it. For one thing, here's a whole new world, the human body and all these terrific diseases; that nursing students were so exploited, that is, we went to school and we also worked all the time. I really liked that. I liked the work; I was a very good nurse. I just loved it.

Q: When did you graduate from nursing school?

DERIAN: If I got married in 1952, that's the year I did, 'because our graduation was in September and I got married in March before I graduated, but I stayed on. My husband was a resident in orthopedics. He was not a Southerner, and he was not from an old, old American family.

Q: Was this Mr. Derian?

DERIAN: Dr. Derian, yes. Everything about him was different. I always said I wouldn't marry a southern boy, their mothers had ruined them. Turned out, having married one the second time, they improve with age. In any case, the residency year ends in July. He was multilingual; his mother spoke French at home. His father was Armenian and his mother

was French. The story goes the father was escaping across the desert in Egypt with his family when he was about 11 years old. They saw dust in the distance, they were riding camels, and they put all their money and jewelry on him and told him to ride away and they would come back later. They went forward and he never saw them again. He fetched up in Cairo, apprenticed himself to a jeweler, fascinating fellow. This was father, not the son. In any case, we decided we'd go live in Paris for a year. We had to have some money to do it, as my family was not terrifically forthcoming under these circumstances. We were supposed to be married in June and on March the Seventh, a key day in my life.

A key day in my life, I just realized. On the First of March, I said, "Look, I can't do this. I don't want to go choose glasses. I don't want to talk about the clothes. I don't want to go to all these parties. I don't want to have to answer all these questions. I'm not getting married at all." So he said, "Why don't we get married next week?" I said, "Okay, if I can borrow Jackie's wedding dress." So I called up. Her mother said, "It's in an heirloom box but if you promise to get it put back in the heirloom box, I'll lend it to you." So we did. So they were pretty annoyed about that.

So he went to West Virginia and worked in the coal fields and when I graduated in September I went out there. That was my first contact with labor. He was working for a doctor. Is that what it's called, the check off, where the mine workers checked off that their doctor bills would be paid? I'm sure they deducted some money, right. Anyway, this guy had been out there for 25 or 30 years. In Pineville, they do what's called low coal mining, if they're still mining down there, which means that they have to ride in on their backs on these little railcars. They are lying down or kneeling, I'm sure things have improved since then, but they never can stand up inside of that space. These were very hard times, in the early Fifties, in the coal fields. People were so sad. There used to be a man who sold homemade soap out of a wooden bucket on the little main street. I have never, ever, been around such terribly impoverished people. The Hatfields were from that environment.

But this wasn't Harland County, which the Hatfields and McCoys made infamous. That's the site of the well-known mines. I can almost remember the name of that county. In any case, we had to leave there, finally. The doctor's office was on the second floor, over the bank. There was no elevator; you walked up the steps no matter what was the matter with you. I had thought that I would like to work, too. The doctor's wife was a nurse.

She took me into the operating room, which was also the delivery room, not a great idea. There were two gas tanks there. She said, "This one's CO2, or nitrous I guess it was and this one's oxygen." I said, "I'm sorry, I'm not trained in anesthesia. I have no idea how to do it." She said, "There's nothing to it. Give them nitrous 'til the earlobes turn blue and then give them oxygen." While I had not been trained in the machines, I certainly knew enough. And I said, "Oh, I can't possibly work here." So, I didn't. Anyway, we only stayed there a few months, it was so terrible. They cheated, they charged for things they didn't do. They didn't practice good medicine, anyway. It was awful. So then we did what's called *locum tenens*. We'd go for a week or two weeks, back in the coal fields to replace doctors who were on vacation.

For example, Dr. Tauriq Rosa had come from Puerto Rico to medical school, married the mine owner's daughter, who was about six feet tall and he was about 5'1". They had never left there. They were in their sixties. They had never gone out of that place. It was fascinating to see his laboratory, herbs, hand run centrifuge. It was really a taste of long before. Then what happened from there?

From there we went to Wilmington, Delaware, where I had my first child. Mike did crippled children and cerebral palsy. Then we went back to Charlottesville, where I had another child. Then we moved to Marion, Ohio. He really trained to be an academic surgeon, he was a great orthopedist, but he decided that before he did that he had learned how important it was to go out and actually practice medicine before you started teaching. So, he was on the staff half time at Ohio State Medical School and half time we lived in Warren G. Harding's home town, Marion. And now I have another baby.

Q: So we're talking about three. Boy, girls?

DERIAN: First two boys. One is now 41 and the next one is, he's the swing child, so some times he's a year younger than the oldest and sometimes he's two years younger. The same on the other end, with his sister. So that Mike who's 41, Craig, who is just about to be 40 in June and Brooke, who's an assistant district attorney in Brooklyn. Craig is a spinal surgeon of last resort and Mike is a father and a great personnel person, works for Agriculture and does some things at the White House. I always wanted to have as many children as I could before I was 30. I really wanted nine or ten but Brooke was born when I was 29, I guess. So it was too late, because she was born in October. That was all I had. Then I married Hodding Carter, who had four. So, it was very handy. Then they all got married, almost all. We have an endless number of children and six grandchildren.

Q: So you were in Marion, Ohio. Were you nursing?

DERIAN: No, I never actually worked for money as a nurse but my children were so small when I was there and I did have the only cook in town. Woman knocks on my door and said, "Everybody tells me you're a southern girl and you need a cook." And I said, "I do! Come in!" since I couldn't cook at all. She was from Louisiana and a great cook. So I had someone there but really the children were too small and I just was that generation that said if you can you should be there. So what I did was nurse recruitment and that was fun, because I got to meet an enormous number of high school girls and the Mid-West was really exotic to me. The way people talked to each other was so different, so direct; where in my part of the country blows a lot of smoke and fog, so I liked the Mid-West. It was very interesting.

Q: Very different. I don't know how it is today, but I must say that in those days southern girls were trained to be charming and wonderful talkers. I was a teenager and I lived in Annapolis and we used to take in drags, which were the colloquial name, I was 13-14 but to be exposed to the full force of a southern belle was really something. But it was a different world, if pretty superficial.

DERIAN: Oh, well, it is. In Mississippi, a woman built a house several lots down from us. We lived on the edge of the Pearl River swamp, really wonderful place, great swamp. So we had a house that looked like it belonged. It was silvery cypress wood, no glitz. Well, they're building Tara [Ed: a reference to the mansion in the movie Gone with the Wind.]. These giant white columns soaring up. It was a funny sight. I went over to see her while it was being built and she started talking to me about her life. She was about my age, I guess.

It was a very useful discussion to me. Here's what she was doing, and it helped me understand other people who had not jumped fence in the way that I did. That is: she had a list of rules and regulations from her mother and then from the family, which included her dad and mother and everybody else and from her church and from her idea of social class. The things she talked about and thing I really don't believe in, I believe it's money. That's all there is to it. Here, it's like having five different lists of Ten Commandments, except they covered all sorts of things. There must have been a thousand things that she had to try to weigh and balance and weave in. I think it contributed to the neurosis of an awful lot of otherwise bright young women. She'd been to college and she had loved it but that was gone.

Q: What happened? I assume at a certain point, did you and your husband, Dr. Derian, get divorced? Did he die? What happened?

DERIAN: Oh, well we were married 24 years and we had a really terrific marriage. At one point we lived in Mississippi which was extremely Southern. It's funny because when I agreed to marry him I was engaged to someone else who was also a physician and he was in the army in Germany. I decided not to marry him because he was from Mississippi and I didn't want to go and live in that place, about which I knew nothing, except that it was benighted and full of trouble. So I broke my engagement and married this New Yorker. We were in Ohio and we'd been there about a year I guess when Mississippi emerged. Now Mississippi at the time that he went to medical school, also when I went to nursing school, had a two year medical program. We had a big population of people really educated enough to go to medical school, to sustain a medical school but the state had grown after the war. So after their second year they would affiliate with recognized schools. So anyway they had built this medical school and it had been in operation a number of years and had really good people. The first heart transplant was done there. So they called him up and asked him if he would come down. He said that he didn't think he would.

He talked to me and I said, "Look, you've tried this out. You want to be an academic. Go look at it!" So he came back and he said, "They want me to be number two." He was 31 years old, 32, well early thirties. In any case, he was very young. He said, "I don't want to be number two." So he wrote them back and said, "Thanks a lot; we don't want to do this." He was being recruited by a bunch of other places. The academic world is small. He was known to be really sensational, made a great medical discovery when he was in the second year of medical school, lymphatic embolism, as a matter of fact. So in about

six months they called up and said, "Okay, we're going to fire this guy because we really want you down here and be head of the department." So he said, "Look, I don't want you to fire somebody else." Then they called back a short time later and said, "Well, he's gone!" He said, "I know you don't want to go." And I said, "Sure, let's go!" So we went.

That was the place that everything that you stored up as a kid was on the line. You either believed it or you didn't but you had to choose. You had to act.

Q: Where was the university, now?

DERIAN: Jackson. The medical school was in Jackson. The University of Mississippi is in Oxford, which is a small town on the other side of the state. So that's how I got to Mississippi. We were there and life changed dramatically because here I was with three children and they were going to have to go to school. When we moved there in 1959, even though Brooke was only a year old and the little boys weren't even in grammar school, yet the Citizen's Council was pressing hard to shut down the public schools.

Q: So we're talking about the end of the Eisenhower Administration. The Supreme Court ruling in Brown vs. the Board of Education came in 1954 *and desegregation was beginning for the first time to bite, wasn't it?*

DERIAN: Well, I think Mississippi had been in a panic about it for a long time. It was another intriguing place to mention, where everyone in public life and that counts school teachers, everyone, was totally absorbed by segregation. In both the black and the white communities. It had just reached the point, these men had just come back from the war and everything they'd been told about what they'd been fighting for was definitely a lie. People getting lynched. It was an astonishing place to be. Anyway, my friend Winifred Green and I, she didn't have any children but she'd been brought up the same way I had. We started talking about what we would do. We felt an obligation to do something. Turned out that a group of women, a group of ladies, had met one Wednesday to talk about what might be coming, the schools being closed and that kind of thing. They met once a week and they had a man come and talk to them, a man who later became the overall bishop, what do they call that bishop of the Episcopal Church?

Q: High presiding bishop.

DERIAN: Yes. The one who lives in New York. Well this man, he might have been Bishop in Mississippi then but he was definitely in his cathedral, I guess he was. He was invited to come one day. People were asking questions, it had been going maybe six weeks or so. Somebody said, "What do we do?" He said, "You can write letters to the editor." Somebody said, "Well, how do we do that?" "You just write what you feel. Don't accuse anybody of doing anything wrong but express your opinion in a very subtle kind of way but remember, you're all wives of prominent men. So you can't sign your own name." Somebody said, "Well, how will we sign it?" He said, "You just look in the telephone book and pick a name."

I couldn't believe this advice. I looked at Winifred. When it was over, I spoke to him very sharply. It was really over the edge. This was not some dummy. I mean, he was a dummy. Anyway, when we left, we went off in separate cars. We passed each other on the street, we'd parked at different entrances, I rolled my window down and I said, "I'm not going back anymore, Winifred." She said, "Oh, I'm not, either." So we went to my house, decided we'd form our own little group.

Well, it occurred to us that there wasn't going to be anything meaningful coming out of this group of our friends. So we formed an organization called Mississippians for Public Education. The aim of it was to keep the public schools open as well as integrated. In the early Sixties, yes. Trying to think when Medgar Evers got killed, but it was all in that same kind of time frame[Ed: Evers was a civil rights activist and was assassinated June 12, 1963. As a veteran he was buried at Arlington National Cemetery].

Everything was happening. I guess we had a year's head start on the civil rights activists who were coming from other places, the young people. Freedom Summer was 1964 but there had been an enormous amount of activity before that. We had Freedom Riders. In fact, I think we had the first of the Freedom Riders in that early period [Ed: The Freedom Riders road buses through the South in May 1961 to protest the segregation of public facilities engaged in interstate commerce, despite a Supreme Court ruling desegregating such facilities.]. So I had a little jail practice, where I went to visit them in the places they were being held. You just have to decide how much you're going to tolerate. It turned out my tolerance was very low, because it seemed to me, here I am facing my children, what will I say to them when they're adults? And what will I think of myself? I was acting in a large and interesting number of things in a very hard time. It's so complicated. If we start talking about those years and the complexity of it, I don't think we want to do that.

Q: You're right, this interview is ultimately concentrated on foreign affairs. Could you maybe, very briefly, can you give just a little summary of what got you onto the national scene?

DERIAN: I had studiously avoided any political party activity. Well, a few things but nothing where I had any organizational responsibility, because I didn't want that to get mixed up with the other things I was doing. But the time came when I realized that if we were going to advance the place that we lived, we would have to step forward. Part of my involvement was in response to when Fannie Lou Hamer and the Freedom Democrats went to Atlantic City and were turned away at the 1964 Democratic Party convention.

That caused the Democratic Party to institute a number of reforms and when the next go-round came, which was 1968, we went through the motions of trying to implement those reforms in the Democratic Party in Mississippi. And they just didn't do it. So we formed a party that was called the Democratic Party of the State of Mississippi because we would follow the national party's regulations. We had precinct, county, regional, state, went through the whole procedure and elected a delegation to the Chicago convention, half black, half white, half male, half female. Charles Evers was the National Committeeman. I was the National Committeewoman. Hodding Carter, my husband, now husband, not

then, and Aaron Henry were the cochairmen and we went to Chicago and challenged the regulars. It was the first time a traditional delegation had been denied and we were seated.

So, I was already working on a regional level with the Southern Regional Council, I may have been president of it then, I can't remember. Anyway, Bob Strauss became Chairman of the Democratic Party. I talked to him in Washington one time and said, "You know, George Wallace is really not a Democrat. He's a racist and we really shouldn't have him in our party. We should really drum him out." And he said, "Okay, but I can't do it 'til the midterm elections." So the midterm elections came and went and I waited a couple of weeks. I said, "Okay, are you ready to move?" He said, "Oh, darling, I can't do that! He's the most popular Democrat in the South." I said, "No, he isn't." He said, "You won't be able to beat him." I said, "Yes, we can."

So then I was looking for somebody to support who could beat Wallace in Mississippi. Hamilton Jordan and Frank Moore, two people who were working for Jimmy Carter, came to see me. I had only met Carter at the midterm conference, as a matter of fact. I didn't know anything about him. I said, "Well, if he isn't a racist and a sexist or a crook, I'll support him in Mississippi." I said, "But I can't do it 'til I meet him. I've got to determine." They said, "Oh, no, he's not any of those things." I said, "Well, I have to determine that myself." So I was on some party commission. Maybe it was the Reform Commission. Anyway, I went to Atlanta. Had an appointment to meet him at the VIP lounge in the Atlanta airport at seven o'clock the next morning. We stayed up most of the night meeting. So when I woke up at quarter 'til seven I called the airport. Hamilton answered. I said, "Oh, I bet you have a room full of people, because I thought it would be one of those things where the hand comes out and the eyes go over the shoulder. He said, "No, it's just the two of us here waiting for you." I said, "Well I just wanted to tell you I was going to be late." So I jumped up and jumped into my clothes and went out.

There is really no one more impressive on the one to one basis than Jimmy Carter. So I said, "Okay, I'll do it in Mississippi." I wrote all the rules and went out and tried to get everybody to participate, old regulars and all the white groups and the hate groups. It was really very interesting. And we did, we left Wallace in the dust.

Q: Did Jimmy Carter talk to you at all about anything in this first meeting that was specifically human rights or anything like that?

DERIAN: No, no, beyond the fact, here we are, two Southerners talking about the absorbing issues of our region. We were talking about race and we were talking about straight shooting and trying to find a way to not let Wallace walk away with anything. So, we chose our delegation. Carter had the most votes. I'm trying to think who was still in it. A bunch of people wanted Teddy Kennedy. Robert had been killed [Ed: June 6, 1968]. There was a lot of feeling that Teddy should run. In any case, immediately after that they had a National Committee meeting. And then they formed the Democratic Policy Council and Hubert Humphrey was the chairman of it. Yeah, I think he was. It was sort of a place for him to be. It had Patsy Mink, Gloria Steinem, the wonderful woman used to sell

refrigerators, Betty Furness, yes. I can't remember whether there were four of us or five of us. Four women and something like 52 men. That's how I started operating at the national level. I really had no foreign policy experience at all, except we'd traveled. It didn't really come up except in the second meeting of the Democratic Policy Council. Hubert was the chairman; Averell Harriman was in charge of the foreign policy part. Averell and I had met a number of times before. We always got along very well socially, but we really seemed to disagree on nearly everything. So he got up and made his report and this was during the Vietnam War.

So when it was time for the discussion I said I thought we should pass a resolution saying that we did not want the war to be extended to Laos and Cambodia. Of course, almost nobody in that room knew that it was already in those two countries. So Harriman said, "Absolutely not!" Then Wayne Morse[Ed: Senator from Oregon], who was also on the committee, and a maverick, got up and said, "Wait a minute! Why not?" So Harriman made this long speech and then I stood up. We had a big thing that ended with Harriman saying, "If you pass this resolution, I will resign." It was really kind of a sweet moment. I liked it a lot. So then, once you're in, you're in. One thing comes after another. That was all before Carter became more prominent.

So after Mississippi Carter asked me if I would become part of his campaign staff and be a deputy director and I said that I would. During that 1976 campaign my portfolio there was liberals, intellectuals, editorial boards, university types. Sort of a fireman. Then when it was over and Carter won the presidency, I went back to Mississippi and had only been home a short time when I was asked to come up and be part of the new administration's transition team.

So I did. I had a funny job there. I had organizations and systems of HEW (Department of Health, Education and Welfare). I shared a secretary with one person. It's one of the funniest things for a person who had never really had a job. Extremely interesting and really not hard but just there were so many people. I interviewed a number of former HEW secretaries. When I went to talk to the real systems fellow at the place, one of those folks who had really been in that department from the beginning, was serious about it and able, and he said, "Look, here's the way it works. We've had some phenomenal number of secretaries and nobody ever stayed more than 18 months I think." He said, "By the time a directive reaches the field, where it first causes some kind of activity, there is not just a new one but there's the second new one." So I ran into Jimmy Carter somewhere and he said, "What do you want to do in my Administration?" I said, "I'm really not looking for a job but there's one thing I don't want to do. I do not want to be associated with HEW in any possible way."

So then someone from the State Department called me and asked me if I would come over. So I went, not knowing why. I assumed that they wanted to ask me about something. So they said that they'd like me to come and work there and they had two jobs: they had the protocol job and something called human rights. I said, "Well, if I did it, I can't tap dance. So, human rights sounds more like something I'd be more interested in." I had worked on that. Also, I had been on the executive committee of the ACLU for a

long time. In fact, I may have been still on it after the election. So then I had second thoughts about it and I decided I really didn't think I wanted to. I didn't like the idea of being somebody who worked in the campaign and then got a job; there was something about it that didn't seem right. But I talked to someone I knew who worked there and said that this was a job that really had never been done. That's the kind of thing I'm usually interested in.

Q: Let me just ask the question, what sort of traveling had you done overseas or experience you'd had overseas before?

DERIAN: Well, I lived in Morocco for about four months and in Spain for about four months. My first husband had a sabbatical. He was working on cryobiology of bone diseases. We were in Czechoslovakia for a few weeks when the Russian soldiers were there[Ed: Warsaw troop intervened in Czechoslovakia in August 1968]. Of course, I'd been in England a lot and I'd been in the Philippines and Guam. I'd been to Mexico and Canada. I'd never been to Latin America. I'd never been to anything below North Africa.

Q: Had you had any, I'm just trying to get a sense of your mindset before you move into this job. Did any of these places hit you about the enormity of the problems of Morocco or Czechoslovakia or wherever you went?

DERIAN: Oh, well, certainly, I read four newspapers a day. I wasn't blind and confused. Mississippi's a rural place but there are people there who are active and thinking. I was very interested in the United Nations and extremely disappointed from the moment I saw how it worked until this very now. I think we've had good people there, sometimes we've not. I think that countries are perhaps afraid of us and while I roar around sometimes and say, "We ought to just do this or that." There was a bumper sticker in Mississippi that said, "Get the U.S. out of the UN and the UN out of the U.S." Filled me with scorn, was on the cars of practically very Klansman in the state.

Oh and one thing that happened in Mississippi was that USUN sent a speaker to Mississippi to explain how it worked. It was at that period when a lot of people were building bomb shelters. Have you ever seen that ad that says, "Oh how the heathen rage?" Well, it was kind of like that. The least thing caused that whole hate-filled element of the state to rise and roar. For a while I was castigated for flying the American flag. Then, all of a sudden, Soviets did something and everybody began to fly the American flag. Then they were mad at me for flying it because, they didn't think I was an American. It was a wonderful, funny time.

Q: But, anyway, did you have any, when you heard about this job and all did you have any sort of mental agenda that said, "I'll do this, I'll try to do this" or something like that?

DERIAN: Oh, when I took the job? Well you can't take a job like that without a very clear idea of what you're going for. I didn't just wander in off the street and sit down.

I had a clear idea. I spent my entire adult life working on civil rights and civil liberties. I worked all day every day. That was what I did with my life because, being a wife and mother. I was not what you'd call bleeding heart liberal. There are things you have to know. There is law. I was very well prepared for that job. What I had to learn was the needs of countries and it turned out I knew most of those. A lot of them I hadn't heard of, like Rwanda and Burundi. I had to learn the names of the rulers. It was really not hard. Going to the State Department, one of the things I really liked about our system, which many people don't like. There are a lot of talk these days, "Well, let's just get rid of all those bureaucrats. It's our turn. They're in the way. They slow us down." On the other hand the bureaucrats say, "Oh, God, get these people in here with their fly by night ideas. They don't know what they're doing. They don't know which end is up." But what's very good, and I may have said this earlier, is the push-me pull-you of it. You really have to refine your thinking. You have to be very clear about the basis on which you have made your decision, starting with the law and the stated policy of your Administration. And then, you've got all these people who are going to say, "Oh, we've already tried that in 1952 and here's what happened." So you have walking history and a million resources there. I don't see how anybody can walk in off the street and not do a good job if they use what's at the State Department. Even people who are opposed to what you're doing are often extremely helpful, sometimes inadvertently. By and large, most of the time, it's not so much personal with these people; they don't want anything to screw up. A lot of them don't want the Congress looking down their throat. So when I came there I came with a great advantage because Joan Braden had been at the State Department as coordinator of consumer affairs and special assistant to the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs in a job in that I was told, and do not know the fact of, was a present to McNamara because he wanted her to have a job and they made a job.

OK, McNamara had a very, very special relationship with that family. In any case, I said, "Well, what did she do? How did she do that?" I wasn't interested in having anything like that. This was after I had arrived. I just wondered what you did if you were the consumer person. Consuming who? It was interesting that she didn't come in. She just stopped in now and again. It was an office that didn't produce anything. Shoot, it would have been more fun to be in charge of the Arboretum than hang around the State Department. Why did she want to go to the State Department if she wasn't interested?

Q: What was seen as background for the Human Rights job?

DERIAN: When I went there, you see the Congress created that job over Kissinger's objection. [Ed: The position of Coordinator for Humanitarian Affairs had been established in 1975 and placed in the Office of the Deputy Secretary, Roger Ingersoll. See Foreign Relations of the U.S. (FRUS), 1969–1976, volume E–3, Documents on Global Issues, 1973–1976, Document 250.] The way the legislation was written supplied a loophole, which said there would be a coordinator of human rights at the level of assistant secretary. The people who wrote it assumed they were making an assistant secretary slot. When it came to the Department to implement, since it didn't explicitly say assistant secretary, they gave it the title of coordinator, but it still required Senatorial approval. They chose a man named James Wilson who had been working on the treaty

with Micronesia for quite a long time, but they never sent his name up. He was always acting.

At the same time State had a big, big refugee office. The refugee budget was, I think, larger than the State Department budget. That office had some excellent people, Shep Lowman and Hank Cushing being the leaders of it, just excellent people. Its portfolio included prisoners of war (POW) and missing in action (MIA), and political asylum. [Ed: At the time the Office of the Coordinator for Human Rights was organized in 1975, shortly after the fall of Saigon and the end of the Vietnam War, the Coordinator was James Wilson. Under him were: the Deputy Coordinator for Refugees and Migration Affairs, James Carlin; Deputy Coordinator for Prisoners of War and Missing in Action Matters, Frank Sieverts; and Deputy Coordinator for Human Rights, Ronald Palmer. Prior to the establishment of the Office of HR Coordinator, Frank Sieverts was the Special Assistant for Prisoner of War and Missing in Action Matters in the Deputy Secretary's office.]

And one wonderful fellow who was the whole human rights department. He'd been in Eastern Europe, I think, maybe in Czechoslovakia and had been horrified with life in a really totalitarian place. So when he rotated out he asked to be assigned to HA. He wrote the first set of country reports which were limited at that time just to people that we had relations long enough with to sell them stuff and give them aid. So when I came there that was essentially the office, a great big refugee office. Frank Sieverts was the deputy for POWs and MIA. Then I talked to Richard Moose one day and I said, "You know, I need somebody who can infuse this building. I need a real pol." He said, "You need a junkyard dog." I said, "Right!" So all these people were coming who wanted, most of them were people who had wanted the job and happy to say I didn't know any of them before.

Q: Who were these were people. Where did they come from, the political realm?

DERIAN: From the Hill and from the human rights community. The human rights community was small and it was in its infancy. Amnesty International had been around a long time, but they were really different from the rest of the community, even though it all cooperates. It is a human rights group; it's just a different kind. So Mark Schneider came along. He had been working for Ted Kennedy, for years. Right now he's at AID (Agency for International Development), if you want to find him. He knew everybody. He knew every old fight. All the who-shot-John, both on the Hill, which was helpful to me about some legislation because I had to spend a lot of time up there, and within the government and the State Department specifically. So he became my deputy. Then Roberta Cohen, who had taken the International League for Human Rights, which had been kind of a handful of lawyers who wanted to see if they could do something and help people in other places, using the Human Rights Declaration and international human rights laws, conventions and things. And she turned that body into the first really professional human rights organization. So I asked her if she would give that up. She made it a really big organization and got money for it. She was very well trained, well educated in international affairs. She married David Korn, who was, when we went there, the Israeli and Arab-Israeli office director. She, Mark and Steve Cohen, who's a professor

of law, not the one at Harvard, a professor of law at Georgetown, were my three principal deputies, with Frank Sieverts. There was a wonderful fellow named Jim Carlin there who was the deputy for the refugee side. When he retired, he became the Director IOM, the International Organization of Migration (IOM), which was really in total disarray, now been subsumed or renamed. It was the travel agency, essentially, for refugees, particularly the Soviet Union but also everywhere. He just had a genius for that. He'd been doing refugees almost from the beginning of real refugee activity. He was really a swell fellow. It was a very agreeable group. There was also a man there that moved on to do other things.

I did have a funny incident. When I first went there [Ed: in February 1977], I went into the HR office on the seventh floor in the Deputy Secretary's suite and talked to Jim Wilson, the acting coordinator. I said, "What are you going to do now?" He said, "Oh, I guessed I'd just walk the hall" and then he explained what that meant. Walk the hall! I had never heard of anything so barbaric! It was the beginning of a look at a really unbelievably bad personnel system. It's the worst I really have ever come in contact with. In spite of never having worked in many of them, I certainly have a lot of information about how they work. I said, "Well why don't you just stay here and I'll just go somewhere else?" because I thought it would be humiliating for him.

So (Warren) Christopher [Ed: Deputy Secretary of State (1977-1981)] said, "Have you moved into your office?" I said, "No, I've got to find another place to park because I'm just going to let the fellow stay there until I'm sure you've got a new job for him." I didn't want him to come out of Human Rights walking the halls. So Christopher gave me an office in his suite there. The first day I was there, sitting at a desk, someone walked in with a stack of paper about 14 inches high and said, "The Secretary wants you to read this." So I started reading and I thought, "You know, I don't really have a big interest in this!" So I read the whole Law of the Sea plan, which is enormously big, and marked it all up, made my comments in the thing. When I got through, I walked into Christopher's office and I said, "I don't think this belongs to me. I think it belongs to you." [Ed: For many years the office of the NSC Interagency Task Force of the Law of the Sea headed by Chairman Vincent Learson had been in the Deputy Secretary's suite. At the start of the Carter Administration the office was moved down to the sixth floor of the State Department and the Chairman became Elliot Richardson.]

Now, I had not been cleared for security or anything and it had all sorts of code words written all over it which, of course, were code to me, I didn't know what they meant. When I filled out my security clearance form, or whatever it is, you know the one where you give the references and things, I thought, "Well, I'm not from here. They don't have any little well to dip into." So I had to give them a whole lot of names. So I gave about a hundred names, addresses and phone numbers. They could see people who hated me and people who liked me and people I'd worked with and people who'd been my mentors in schools and things. So they interviewed all of them. Then they interviewed them again and they interviewed some people three times. Because I had a big FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation) file, full of things my neighbors said about me. All of it, I sent for it and

I was very pleased with it. Although there was a lot marked out I could recognize everybody's voice. So I didn't receive my security clearance for a long time and since I had no idea if there was a real security process, going into the secret room and hearing the secret words and all of those kinds of thing. As it came to me, I just, I mean it all came to me anyway. The fellow came from the Agency (Central Intelligence Agency, CIA) and gave me briefings, very nice guy. I was glad. I am very suspicious, not suspicious, I'm made very uneasy by mechanical perfection in the institutions of men. I don't mean just men, I mean people. I don't want it to work too well. I don't want just to be able to push a button. So when they came around with that information, I was glad to have it.

In the meantime, Ann Swift, who was at that time working in Congressional Liaison (Bureau of Congressional Relations, H), a wonderful woman who was one of the hostages in Iran. She is really a wonderful person. She'd come in after work every day when she was through with her things and show me how to read the cables and what they meant and the distribution system and how you got them if you weren't on the list. She gave me the most useful briefings in terms of the bureaucracy that anyone did. The reason that I made any kind of equation between Joan Braden's job and mine was that the people who were very resentful of Joan Braden assumed I was another Joan Braden. I always billed myself as a Mississippi housewife, which was accurate though my cook read it in the paper and called up and said, "You'd better stop telling people that or I'm going to come up there and tell them who's the housewife around here!" That was really wonderful! After a while, after I'd got the hang of things, I was doing intensive studying. In fact, in the first month sometime the Amnesty International yearbook came out and so I was sitting up in bed reading about awful torture with electrodes on the gums. About 3:30 or four in the morning I cut out the light and I went to sleep. I woke up having this terrible nightmare and I ran my tongue over my teeth and they felt like they were all broken and fractured. I knew that it was a dream but I couldn't shake the feeling. I put on the light and had to go in the bathroom and look in the mirror to see. So I decided I was going to have to read that stuff in the morning. It was really total immersion in all the horrors of the world.

Q: While you were settling into your job, let me ask, had President Carter or White House staffers like Hamilton Jordan, or anyone talked to you about what they wanted you to do or was it sort of, here's a job, go ahead and do it?

DERIAN: No, when I called Hamilton to tell him I was going to take this job he said, "We don't want you to take this job. We have something much better we want you to do." And I said, "Well, I'm sorry, I've given my word and this is very interesting to me."

Before I took the job, I had a long talk with Christopher, the Deputy Secretary of State, and it was an odd talk. He asked me about the civil rights work and essentially the methods of it. I was in a peculiar position because I was a member of the community and not somebody from another place. There weren't a lot of white people doing it then. So civil rights work was not a wildly popular job for a long time. But in any case, he explained certain steps in the outline of the issues that were involved in the human rights

aspects of it. I said, "You know, I don't want to come here if you want a magnolia to make it look good, you've got a sweet person doing the human rights job, I think you've got the wrong person and you need to know it. I'm not going to come here if I'm going to lose these bureaucratic fights every time." He said, "Well, do you have to win them all?" And I said, "No, of course not but I have to win most of them." So that's essentially the time when I decided to take the job.

As far as the president went, he and I had come to know each other very quickly at certain levels of ideas and thinking about the country. I expect he finds me as eccentric as I find him. He told me to go do my job.

Q: And what about Cyrus Vance, the Secretary of State? (Three minutes of indistinct recording)

DERIAN: Well, when I first got there I realized they were having these meetings of the Secretary, the Deputy Secretary, and the Under Secretaries and the Assistant Secretaries. So after I'd been there a couple of weeks I said, "I want to go to those meetings, too." So I then started going. It was that way. You had to apprehend what it is that…[Ed: Ms. Derian's nomination as Coordinator for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs was submitted to the Senate on April 29. Her formal swearing-in ceremony took place at the White House on June 17.]

Q: In other words, you had to say, "I want to do this." You weren't plugged in to anything.

DERIAN: Not in the beginning. Anyway, it occurred to me that somebody needed to get up every morning and just do refugees. So David Martin, my special assistant [Ed: from 1979 on], a young lawyer from the University of Virginia Law School. I asked him to draft the memorandum to get the approval we sought to get. It seemed to me this should be someone who could reach out all over the government, an interagency person, needed to have a much higher position. I thought if we wrote into it about having an ambassador or someone with a very fine title that somebody would want to do that and that it would be desirable. And of course it was really like putting the meat out for the rabid shark, whoever he may be. It was a good idea. People would come to see me and say, "You're making a big mistake."

Q: Getting rid of power.

DERIAN: Right, and money. I said, "No, no, I've got what I need already. I want somebody else to have it." So that got split off after a couple of years. Some people thought it had been taken away from me. I never made much of a thing about it. But if we're going to have a historical record, it was my idea to do it. Then Vance and Christopher both asked me if I wanted to do that. I think maybe with baited breath, hoping I wanted to do it. I did not want to do that. The others were so new and you had people like Shep who really knew the whole machinery of it. If something needed to be adjusted he could do it faster than anybody, including me. He was at the job a lot longer

than I was. While I was nominally his boss, the fact of it he was the guiding light in the refugee program. So in any case, then I made my office much bigger and that was really fun bureaucratically, getting space and getting slots.

Q: How does one go about this? Because office space in the Department of State is a big thing. I mean, one, it's more comfortable, but two, it also signifies clout. Tell me how you did it.

DERIAN: Well, it really started well before I got the Seventh Floor office. At some point, on the first day or second day that I was in the State Department, in Christopher's office, Don Fraser came to see me, who was the member of Congress from Minnesota who really devised the whole structure of human rights legislation and was the real founder of it, the real father of the thing, came to see me. He said, "Okay, we're going to get the title of this changed to assistant secretary." I said, "Please don't do it. They have no idea who I am. I'm trying to figure this out. I don't want to make any ripples. I don't want anybody to think I'm anything more than somebody who just stopped in here briefly."

But on August 17, 1977, in the warm weather, I was sworn in as an Assistant Secretary. [Ed: The State Department Historian's office notes Ms. Derian was originally commissioned as Coordinator for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs. In 2013 the Office of the Historian published the first volumes of declassified documents covering the Carter Administration; see Foreign Relations of the United States, 1977-1980, Volume 2: Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs.] I was sworn in at the White House, which I was a little bit sorry about, in the Rose Garden, with Eleanor Holmes Norton and somebody else and the President presiding. At first that worried me a lot because seemed to me that was a terrific boost in a way I was not ready for. But his people came to me and said, "He wants to emphasize the fact that he's appointing women to high positions." Eleanor was head of EEOC (Equal employment Opportunity Commission). The other woman was from Indiana and do you know she was the first woman U.S. Attorney in the history of U.S. attorneys. Can you believe that? It was deeply embarrassing, I thought. In any case, it was a good thing for him to do, for that reason. That was part of the reason.

So that happened and then, when my title was raised to assistant secretary, some people came to me from the front office and brought me a flag, which I had not had before, and I was happy to have. I asked them if I could put my own battle ribbons on it as they occurred. Then they asked me where I wanted my bathroom. I had this wonderfully situated, improbable office that had been decorated for a man who liked the idea of living in a cigar box. So it had brown and tan striped wallpaper and curtains and brown leather G.I. (government issued) furniture. Great big chairs and he had this huge chair he sat in and he was very heavy and he sat like this, not using the whole chair, just that cushion and the seat part. So I thought, well, one of the first ways to get in trouble here is to, you know, they come around, decorators come and they have all these colors and new furniture and wallpaper. I said, "No, probably not going to be here long." So I never changed anything.

I loved that big room. I even liked that it was ugly. When I went there I only weighed 104 pounds. I was lost sitting in that chair, I had to do something, so I brought my own cushion, from my own house. In any case, in order to get a bathroom, they would have to take some of the space out of that room. So I had them put it out in the hall, because we were a block away from the men's and women's restrooms, and anyway the other people in the office could use it. Well, you have no idea how many assistant secretaries and deputies said, "It's a big mistake. This is supposed to be your own private perk, not fair to the people who come after you." It was really very funny.

But, anyhow, here's what I decided after I'd gotten there and sort of gotten the drift of what it was going to be like. Which was adversarial and interesting and hard and important. I decided that if human rights was the policy of the United States and not just this president, and it was, because there was a body of legislation, then I had to do my best to insert it all over the Department. To get it in the machinery in every possible way so that when I left, I didn't want it to be Patt Derian's policy. I didn't want it to be, you know, a lot of time people have a great idea and they do a good job and then they leave and that's the end of it. It seemed to me that this had nothing to do with me personally. It had to do with the duty to the country and to upholding the law. So that meant that we had to get a lot of people around who had human rights as part of their portfolio. So had to work on personnel who at least while they might report through somebody else would also be reporting to us. That was one of the main things, to just get it in there and institutionalize it.

Funny, along about halfway through it, I guess, I ran into the president somewhere and I said, "You know, I really need to talk to you." And he said, "Well just come on over." I said, "No, no, I've got to put a request through. I don't ever want it to be back door." He would always say, "Just call me up if you need anything" and I never would because I wanted the bureaucracy to always be enfolded in the thing. About two years into it, I had seen him and I said, "I'm going to do it." And I sent a request for an appointment through and had a little trouble from the State Department Secretariat but it got through and then the meeting came. (Vice President) Mondale was there. The Secretary of State was there. (National Security Advisor) Brzezinski was there. I forget who else, but it was not the meeting I envisioned. So we were talking along and I said, "One of the things that concerns me is that when I send something over for your night reading. I don't think you have good information on the human rights issues. One of the things that concerns me is that when I send some things over for your overnight reading, it doesn't always get to you. In fact, rarely does it get to you." And he said, "Well, you send it to me directly." I said, "What do I do, put it in a brown paper wrapper?" And he said, "Sure!" I said, "No, I'm not going to do that. I want to send it through this whole system. I want the system to work." So things did get better, for a while after that.

Oh, and getting my office space. Well, you know, there was a lot of publicity about the human rights policy in the beginning. I think everybody was very nervous about it. There was a lot of negative press, op-ed and column stuff, much planted and some of it written. One person wrote that according to the letter of the law, it could bring on the nuclear

holocaust. It was really a very hysterical kind of time. I had personally always had very good press and I had a lot of it, what with one thing and another. So that made people in the Department nervous. They were always a little bit afraid that I might go "off the rails," I would leave. I never did anything to encourage that but I also never did anything to discourage it.

One of the other things I decided when I went there was I could never leak to the press. I called our group together and I said, "I don't know what your custom is. All I know is, when I read the paper I see a lot of leaks out of a lot of bureaus. Here's what I want to tell you. The only thing we've got here is integrity and we're going to be straight shooters, we are going to play by the rules. We're not going to knife anybody in the back. We're just going to go straight ahead. When we take a position we're going to stick with it 'til we're proven wrong or another decision is made." And I really believe that. If you cannot go along with a policy then you ought to get another job. That might be easy for me to say because I did not really need that job but I at least have had the luxury to feel that way. And except for one person, one time. This was a very able man who was close to retirement. Very energetic, smart, can grab a lot of ideas and what not and he was really opposed to the policy when we came there. He really didn't like working for a woman, as he put it. He once leaked a policy thing. As he was the only one in the office who really knew that, I went to talk to him and said, "I'm afraid you're going to have to go." He said, "Look, I was so mad." So, I let him stay a little longer. He had other stuff to do.

Q: Now, I suspect one of the key powers in the Department of State is the power to clear telegrams.

DERIAN: On power, let me start with a story I had to get Jim Wilson to leave, finally and here's what made me do it. There was a feature story in the paper about me, just a little squib, saying that I was so modest and humble that I never used a State Department car, I always took a taxi. They asked me why I didn't at least use my own car and I said well there was no place to park. So someone said, "You mean you don't have a parking permit?" I said, "No, I didn't know I got one." So they said, "Well, the office manager will have it." So I went to the office manager and I said, "Do I have a parking permit?" He said, "Oh, no, you don't. Mr. Wilson has it." I said, "I'd like you to tell Mr. Wilson that I'd like to have it." And he said, "Oh, no, I'm not going to tell him that." And I said, "You need to be looking for another job, buddy, but I also expect you to at least send him a memo saying that he is to turn in his pass." He said, "All right, I'll do it." So I waited a few days and called back and I said, "I haven't received my pass." He said, "I don't think you're going to receive it." I said, "Okay, you pack up and I'll go talk to Mr. Wilson." So I walked in and I said, "I'd like to have my parking pass." He said, "It's mine." I said, "Was it a birthday present?" "No," he said, "I'm in this office, I get it." I said, "Okay, you pack up and you put it on the desk. I don't like games like this. You had a chance to do the right thing. You could have offered it. You knew yourself and this is it for me." And so that was the end of the two of them. It's little things like that that keep you alert and also interested. It really is like the crossword puzzle to deal with the bureaucracy. It's a diversion, it's fun, it's puzzling, it's exasperating, always interesting. But that's not the point. The point is the newspaper. So, I always liked those little skirmishes.

So, the next thing that came along. About the second day I was sitting at that desk, which was two days later, this letter from an American man, now naturalized, who had been a Jewish refugee from Germany. He had been part of the recovery of assets thing. Apparently, they had reached a final conclusion or at least they said they had. He wrote saying that he had been treated unfairly, had quite a bit of information in it. I didn't know anything about it so I wrote a little note on it and said to send it to the right person in EUR (Bureau of European Affairs) and ask them to come talk to me and explain this to me so I could make a useful response. So it came back with a whole lot of paper appended to it.

It was clear one of the EUR officers wrote on the margins of the memo saying, "Who does this babe think she is? What does she know about this?" Just a really nasty thing. I thought, "Oh, I need one of these!" So I called up and I said, "I'd like you to come to my office." And he said, "I can't come." I said, "Well I can come down there and talk to you or you can come here RIGHT NOW!" He said, "I'm coming." He walked in like this. I said, "Don't sit down." I stood up to him and said, "What is this?" And he just turned purple. I said, "Who do you think you are? You wanted to know who I think I am? I think that I'm running this office and I asked you a question and I need for you to answer it. I need for you to go back to your desk and write it down and clear it and if there's anything else you can think of you might do, you better do that, too." So he said, "What are you talking about?" I said, "You can't figure it out, that's your problem." And so he called up and said, "It's going to take me a couple of days." I said, "Gene, you already used up your couple of days. It's now or never." So he rushed around, got everything and then called up and said, "Is that everything you want?" I said, "It's everything I need but you need something more." He said, "Well why won't you tell me? I don't like riddles and jokes." He's sort of half afraid and half aggressive. I said, "I think you'll think of it. You just put your mind to it." So in about two days I came back from lunch one day. I had an envelope with an apology. I know it wasn't heartfelt but at least his mother taught him the right stuff to do. But that was helpful because the note was publicly known in EUR. If you write something nasty like that and everybody in your office sees it and of course I see all the people whose initials are scratched through.

And I had another one, also in that early time. Art Hartman was the Assistant Secretary for European and Eurasian Affairs [Ed: from January 8, 1975 until June 8, 1977] and Joe Duffy was Assistant Secretary of State for Education and Cultural Affairs [Ed: Duffy held that position from March 30, 1977, until March 21, 1978]. His office was right next to Art's. Now the CSCE (Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe) U.S. part was supposed to have a board. You know we had a CSCE office; it's the Helsinki Final Act. It wasn't a treaty, just everybody agreed, the Europeans, Canada and the U.S. and the Soviets. So anyway Art stopped me in the dining room one day and said, "Gee, I wish you'd come up and see my setup and let me introduce you to some people and show you around." I said I'd love to do that. He didn't know that I knew anything about CSCE since we were still in the presumptive period where the consensus was I didn't know anything about anything. In fact, I actually had a lot of contact with the CSCE people and members of Congress concerned with it, before I came to the State Department. So I went

in and we had tea and Art talked to me and we had a very pleasant visit. A number of people came in to say, "How do you do?" Very civilized and friendly.

Toward the end he said, "Oh, incidentally, there's this thing called CSCE. There are three Administration people to be appointed to the U.S. board and one's to come from the State Department. There are three baskets, the politico-military dimension; the human dimension and I've forgotten the third. [Ed: The three baskets are also referred to as: 1) Questions relating to security in Europe; 2) Co-operation in the fields of economics, of science and technology, and of the environment; and 3) Co-operation in humanitarian and other fields.]

So he continued, "I know that you're too busy to fool with this. And I know Joe Duffy really wants to do it. So it's okay with you, isn't it?" I said, "No, it's not okay with me." He said, "What?" I said, "No, my first instinct, if I have to say now, I'd say no, it's not all right with me. Human Rights is what belongs on there, but I'll be glad to think it over. I don't want to make a rash decision." Then he gave me a big pitch about how you had to be experienced. Didn't say you had to be a man. So I said, "Well, I was glad he talked to me about it" and I'd let him know when I'd decided. So I walked out the door and realized that Joe's door was right next to his. So I walked in because I'd known Joe Duffy for a very long time

I asked him directly, "Oh, hi, Joe. Listen, you don't want to be the Department's CSCE representative, do you?" And he said, "Oh, well, no, I hadn't thought about it." I said, "Well, I can understand why because it's really the human rights position. That's going to be the big issue" not really what was in his portfolio. He said, "Oh, no, no, that's fine. Anything you want." And I said, "Well, I really think so." So then Hartman calls me up and says, "Well, I'm afraid that you're not going to be on it." I said, "Oh, gee, I'm really sorry to hear that and I'm surprised, too."

Shortly thereafter I had to go over to the White House for a meeting. We were talking about, maybe the Genocide Convention. And I came out of that meeting, which was extremely fractious. People had spent an entire lifetime working on reasons not to agree to it at the Justice Department. It was phenomenal. They could have filled the room with paper. Their concerns may have been a hangover from the old seniority system, where the Southern senators were afraid that black Americans would bring charges against them, with some legitimacy. I think that might have happened. But in any case, I came out and who did I run into but Dante Fascell (D-Florida), another old friend of mine, Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and very, very powerful. He said, "Well, we're going to be on the Committee together." I said, "Oh, you know, Dante, I'm afraid that I've lost out on that." And his face turned purple. It was so wonderful. He said, "What do you mean?" I said, "Well, Art Hartman called me up just today or yesterday and told me that somebody else was going to do it." He picked up the telephone and he called (Secretary of State) Cy Vance, right there on the spot and the conversation I heard went something like, "Listen, you know I want Patt Derian to be the State Department representative. Yes, I know, that's what I thought but I've just learned that, I thought you'd appointed somebody else. Well, you look into it for me, Cy." So by the time I got

back to the building, which was maybe 15 minutes later, Hartman on the phone saying, "How did you do that?" I said, "I didn't do anything." It's good, though, because he had been bragging all over that he had really just put me in my place. Wonderful to have those things happen.

So after we'd had enough of those little markers around, I called a meeting in the Deputy's conference room, which was not so grand and fancy as it is now. In any case, I told them that I'd been there whatever length of time it was, and that I wanted them to understand what I thought I was going to do and how I might interact with them and what they could expect from me. You could already see everybody's embarrassed. Everybody's sitting kind of like this *(Q: crossed arms…)*, because they know. It was really a sweet setup. So I gave them a brief outline of what the laws were that I was going to be trying to do my part on and that I intended to go to countries and visit and talk with the leaders. Just kind of a very straightforward presentation. Well, it was more and more embarrassing. And I said, "I want to tell you why I'm doing this. I'm doing this because I've spent my whole life working on these issues. We teach our children we're certain kind of people. So, we need to give expression to our democracy. One of the bulwarks of our democracy is, we all know about symbolism and the importance of that. We all talk about it endlessly, at least in public." So at the end everybody was ashamed to have been present at this emotional outpouring but they could never say I hadn't given them fair warning.

Q: Before we get to this, I want to come back to what I consider a very important thing. Either when it was the Office of the Coordinator for Human Right or the Bureau of Human Rights after August 17, 1977, was it usual that the office would be asked to clear on telegrams?

DERIAN: Oh, no, I forgot about that. No, it wasn't. In fact, on most cables coming to the building we were on information only. So I got somebody to explain to me what that meant. So somebody told me and I asked because something came through that was so obviously a human rights issue. What was the point of sending me things? I had enough to read, because I was reading everything. I was reading every minute of my life. Fortunately, I'm a fast reader and a quick learner. Might not last forever, but it's there when you need it.

Anyway, I have no idea what it was or where it came from. So I wrote a position on it and appended it. Also, enclosed a yes/no box for the Secretary. I just wrote a position. Well, some fellow came storming in there. It was really swell. There were several people there to watch this little performance. Saying that this was simply an information office. And I said, "No, I think you're mistaken." And he said, "It's always been an information office." I said, "It isn't an information office anymore. This is an action office and you're going to have to clear stuff with us and we'll clear stuff with you." He said, "Well, I'm not letting this go." I said, "If you don't, I'll just send my own." So that was the end of it. It was as quick as that.

I do know that there were plenty of cables, which were relevant to our issues, where they tried to go around us. Just a lot of people in there who wanted that office (not) to work. So I know that a lot got by. Especially at higher levels. For instance, in the Journal of Commerce a week or so ago there was a long article about Korea and Kwangju, which was a massacre. Wasn't '81, might have been '79. [Ed: The reference is to a popular uprising in the city of Kwangju, South Korea from May 18 to 27, 1980, while President Chun Doo-hwan was in office after the assassination of President Park Chung-hee on October 26, 1979.] (Crosstalk) it wasn't under Park Chung-hee? I'll look, since I have all that stuff. In any case, I was interviewed for the article. This author of the article had spent maybe a year doing Freedom of Information research and he'd gotten all of those cables between Holbrooke and Gleysteen and it's really very damning. I had the sense, I know that we didn't overtly say yes, that is publicly, but we gave assent to that and it's all kind of laid out there.

Q: Richard Holbrooke was assistant secretary for Far Eastern affairs and Leonard Gleysteen was the ambassador.

DERIAN: It was a shameful thing. So I know there was a lot of that but actually, you know, there was so much, so many issues, so much to do.

Q: Patt, in getting the new Bureau of Human Rights up and running, you did a lot of traveling. Let's start with Argentina because this was a pivotal time. Tell us when you went to Argentina and let's talk about it.

DERIAN: Okay, let's do it. You're right the Argentina trip was very important in getting that bureau established. That was the first trip, too.

I'd like to just add that little bit of background, because how I happened to go was really quite unusual in that when I first went to the State Department effectively in February, late January of 1977, everything was new to me. I was still trying to learn the bureaucratic ropes. I was always late until I figured out I was supposed to have a parking pass.

Now I could tell that the people from ARA (Bureau of Latin American Affairs) were quite nervous about my being there. Ignorant and from the country, right? Well, anyhow, one of the first things I started learning about was Argentina and the unbelievably calamitous events there. Argentina was just going through a horrible, awful military dictatorship. The dirty war had been on for years. So suddenly I was challenged by the assistant secretary. Was it Terry Todman? [Ed: ARA Assistant Secretary from July 1976 until March 14, 1977 was career Foreign Service Officer and former ambassador Harry Shlaudeman. Ambassador Terry Todman, also a career FSO, was Assistant Secretary from April 1, 1977 to June 27, 1978.] He said, "We'd like you to go down there." I realized I didn't want to go because I didn't think I was ready but I realized if I didn't I would make a terrible mistake within the bureaucracy. So to his surprise I said, "Oh, fine."

Q: How early on was this?

DERIAN: It was either late February or early March.

Then I got challenged. The junta had in maybe March, I can't remember when I went, March or April.

I knew it for what it was. It was a challenge and also, I think, from the briefings that they gave me that what they thought would happen is that I would understand the terrible "problems" that the junta was having with the terrifying guerillas and that I would understand no matter what they did they had to do it. So I said okay. Then there was a wonderful woman. I'm not sure if Michele Bova went on this trip or not. We had several trips but who did go was Fred Rondon, who was an officer... [Ed: one minute plus of indistinct tape.] [Ed: Fernando Rondon was the Deputy Director of the Office of East Coast Affairs in the ARA Bureau from 1976 to 1978. He has an interview on file with ADST and speaks about accompanying Ms. Derian on her first trip.]

In any case on the way down, I think this is the time, this is my first visit. I went to El Salvador, at the same time something called the White Hand was threatening the lives of all foreign Jesuits. It was a good hook to hang on deep concerns about what was happening in El Salvador. So I met first with the Chamber of Commerce, which is always useful and interesting, because that's where you hear the line. They had a stack of photos which they showed me of rioting and they spun a big story all about these snapshots. Then I spoke to the general, who was also named Romero, as was the archbishop and the Minister of Interior. Three or four of them and we talked for many hours. They also dealt out the same pack of pictures. So I looked at them and heard their story, which was not consistent with the story that I'd been given. So it was a wonderful moment because I didn't say anything until the very end. Then I asked them some questions and they embroidered and elaborated on the terrible things that had been done. It was just an entirely different story

They did terrible, frightening things in this society. Actually, what it was, was a demonstration around a statue in a plaza and the demonstrators made a mess. They dropped their banners and ripped things up and maybe had a little fire, not connected with the statue. It was a certainly disorderly kind of event. So then I told them that I had seen them before and I asked them questions from the answers I had been given at the other place. No, no, they said, those were all wrong. So it gave me a little leg up and was what extended our conversation for so many hours. At the end, and this is the significant part, it had been a very, very difficult discussion for the military men at the table. The general put his elbow on the table and showed me his hand and he said, "You know, it's a good thing they send a woman to talk about these terrible matters. A man's voice is too hard." It had really nothing to do with men and women but this was the most important piece of advice I ever got. Because I noticed, almost everywhere I went, that when men talked about this, it was very hard for foreign service officers and particularly ambassadors to talk about torture and summary executions to people that they stood in reception lines with and ate dinner with and went to dancing parties and played golf and all of these

socializing things with. And generally the idea is to make a good and smooth relationship. And when you're talking about this kind of thing and holding the person you're talking to responsible for the act, about the only way that most men could do that, at that time, which is kind of pre-human rights time frame, trust me, they're getting it now, is to get mad. The macho kind of thing, like arm wrestling. I watched several of our people get red in the face and raise their voices. I think it just was that it was so horrible for them to have to do it. So anyway, then we went to, well we stopped at a couple of other places but we got to Argentina.

Q: Before we move on what was your impression of the problems in El Salvador. How did our embassy brief you, respond? Were they uncomfortable with you?

DERIAN: Well, the ambassador wasn't there which happened sometimes when people were very nervous and other times when he simply had something else scheduled or I dropped out of the blue. [Ed: The Ambassador from August 1976 to June 1, 1977 was non-career appointee Ignacio Lozano.] So the DCM [Ed: the DCM in El Salvador in early 1977 was Earl Lubensky. With the June 1977 departure of the Ambassador Lubensky became Chargé.] picked me up at the airport. I was quite tired because we had flown straight through and we'd left after I'd gone to work at five o'clock in the morning and worked all day. So I was sitting in the back of the ambassador's car, just kind of leaning back in the corner, and he was briefing me in the most candid kind of way. Also telling me who some of the actors were and what kind of people they were and some of the embassy. It was a very full and useful briefing.

As we approached the ambassador's residence, which was where I was staying, there were fences up because there had been an attack on the ambassador's residence just early before and there was a labor dispute going on also. The government was mad because the ambassador had privately invited some of the labor leaders there. Now as it turned out, they were part of groups in the FMLN movement. [Ed: The Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (in Spanish: Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional), or FMLN was not organized until October 1980.] In any case, it was hard to know who had been the aggressor in the thing but most likely the government. Any way, we pulled up and all the lights were on along the fence, which was new and not very big and not made of stone. Our Marine guard were in the road with their guns pulled. What had happened is, two terrible things. One, when I leaned back I pressed on a button I didn't know was there.

Q: It was a secret alarm system in case the ambassador was kidnapped.

DERIAN: It was and it had broadcast, on the loudspeaker, everything that was said to me. That was terrible. I felt so sorry for him and I was so guilty but it was one of those wildly funny things. Nothing ever came of it that I knew of.

Q: I just have to mention here, there is a story that one of our ambassadors in an unnamed country took a girlfriend out in the car and apparently activated that while he was enjoying her in the back seat. The system was designed to, if somebody was

kidnapped, they could innocently mention "We're going past some palm trees" or this type of thing, but it had these other consequences.

DERIAN: Awful. Well, I felt so sorry for him, just humiliating. So, it was late in the evening. I don't know why Fred (Fernando Rondon) wasn't on that leg. Yes, he was there because he was the only person I had who was really familiar with the idioms that I spoke and that everybody spoke everyplace that we went. He was unbelievably adept. You can read whether people understood what you said or not by the look on their faces and how they move around. Then the next day we had the sort of standard embassy briefing. Everybody was helpful and matter of fact and somewhat puzzled by my role and what it was we were about. So they were pretty much interested in what I had to say, explaining my presence and the job. I think it was just before our military became the primary actor there because that is what happened. Ambassador Bob White [Ed: Ambassador from March 1980 to February 1981] was I think about the only one I could think of now who really at least was on an even par with our military, in terms of representing the United States. Part of that, or at least it was enhanced by, the murder of the three American nuns in December 1980 and the bizarre reaction that came from Washington.

But in any case, people were helpful. Now, it was time for me to go to the airport. And throughout, they were very anxious for me to talk to some American businessmen and because the trip was tight there wasn't really a lot of time. And the man from a spice company, an American spice company, an American man, was very anxious to talk to me. So I said, "Look, we seem to be running out of time. Why didn't he just ride to the airport with us? We'll just meet and give him a ride out and ride back and we can talk then." So that was arranged. We had just gotten in the car and pulled away when I said, "You know, I never have seen any poor people there. I have no idea where people are." Whoever was the embassy escort and I believe it was the DCM, said, "We'll pass right by and we'll slow down." What happened was, it was a busy street and then there was sort of an end of the world looking place and there were dirt roads going downhill and he said, "They're down there." And I said, "Well, let's go down there." And he said, "We didn't want to go down these dirt roads. It wasn't really safe." I said, "People don't know who's coming. Let's just drive down there." He said, "Well it wouldn't be good for the car." I said, "Okay, you guys wait here and I'll just take a walk." So we drove down and it was a remarkable kind of moment because between the residence or the embassy whatever place we embarked the man from the spice company was telling me that he employed a lot of women and what they paid, which was well below what you could live on, even in El Salvador and how happy the workers were. It was a thing that was quite shocking to me. It was so contemptuous.

Q: You must have heard this in Mississippi before.

DERIAN: Well, that's right, not just Mississippi, either. Oh, dear. In any case, it was that same attitude toward others. I think that was the main part of it. And he said, "Look, they live in wonderful houses and they could support themselves." So as we drove down I said, "Have you ever been down here before?" He said, "No." I said, "Well, they're pretty terrific." They have a hole for the door and a hole for the window and the car is so

wide and the road is so narrow that people stepped back into their house. There were huge gullies and water running down. It was really a good place for me to go. People would hold their children up to the side of the car so they could see their reflections. It was really cool. So we got out of there and journeyed on. He was the first of U.S. executives stationed outside of the country for their companies who gave me the spiel. I have to say that by and large businessmen like this were one of the biggest disappointments I had in terms of my fellow countrymen, almost in every place.

In any case, I'd say by and large that that embassy was small. It grew enormously. You have to see it now. Looks like a federal penitentiary. It was full of very energetic officers, the ones that I saw and spoke with; and serious about the issues. There was no knee jerk in that place, except for the spice company guy and the DCM. I was quite impressed. Actually, almost everywhere you go there's a kind of real energy that comes from people who chose this kind of work and like to do it and are interested in the places that they are stationed.

Q: I would add: this is why people stay in the Foreign Service. It's challenging, you're learning new things. This keeps people coming back. You don't have to tell them to come in on Saturdays and Sundays. They're usually there.

DERIAN: I know, well some of them are working all the time. It was a universal thing. Then again there were some places where the people who ran the embassy, the top people, really were appalling. In Nepal was one place; and in Pakistan. [Ed: one minute of indistinct recording.]

So anyway, then we went to Argentina and Argentina at the time had for years had a military junta with the army chief, (Jorge Rafael) Videla, as the chief of state. They had overthrown Peron's widow, Isabel. [Ed: Peron died on 1 July 1974, and was replaced by his vice-president and third wife, Isabel Peron, who ruled Argentina until overthrown in March 1976 by the military.] She had fled with a man described as Rasputin, who gave her horoscopes and bones and all those things and helped her make her decisions. My own take on the advent of the guerillas, since it was largely composed of college-age people, far as I could see or learn, and some of their mentors, who were not much older, on balance, was that they were nihilists. So they had no program to offer as a counterpoint. They had mostly destruction in mind, to no end. I suppose, I've often wondered if Isabel had stayed in the job if they wouldn't have done the same thing. In fact they started during her time.

These were really naughty kids. By the time I got there they had kidnapped a large number of people, mostly wealthy men, for ransom. They had whole sections of the highway system where they simply stopped cars and shook people down and took all their money and jewelry and things. They were thieves and kidnappers.

Q: This was the situation when you arrived?

DERIAN: Right. So they were, however, had been under attack by the military government for quite a while. They were sitting pretty, financially. The story was put out by the military, by our embassy, and by the guerillas themselves so I think it was confirmed all around but I never did see the books that the kids had more money, more cash, more capital than the government had. That was probably nearly right because the government was still in the hands of the wealthy people. People with big capital, Argentine citizens with big capital, had moved their money right out. So there was no civilian oversight on the military to sort of review what it was doing. They had disbanded the legislative bodies. They had kidnapped and killed, I think, the vice president who was left over when the president was deposed and the Supreme Court was in a state of terror. [Ed: minute and a half of indistinct recording.] In any case, the place was in great disarray.

On their own part, the military had pretty much beaten down the insurrection and they were definitely in control. There were still incidents. Right before I got there, I think it was on this trip, a general's daughter came home with a schoolmate for the weekend and the roommate placed a bomb under her father and blew him up, which really touched the hearts of the military. It was such an appalling, terrifying thing to do. It was really kind of interesting.

This was when the embassy was downtown, in just a regular office building on a crowded, busy street. There was lots of street life in that area. Now, I never kept any files where I slept. I was staying on that trip in the Sheraton because I knew that wherever I went anywhere people were looking. So I never kept the names of any local people or briefing material. So we stopped by the Embassy because I just wanted to glance at a file that we had brought down from Washington and so I guess it was Fred (Fernando Rondon) who went upstairs to get it and I waited in the car with the bodyguard. Who was an enormous man with the biggest beard I've ever seen. I've always been a person who's interested in anomalies of that type. So we were sitting there and it was lunchtime and he was in the car. All these young people were walking down the street. He had once tried to have a little conversation with me. So I said, hoping to continue this, "Young people here are so good looking." It was true, the best looking kids walking along. He said, "They're all bad." And I said, "All of these young people?" He said, "Yes. A lot of them have been killed." I said, "Well I knew that. You can't kill a whole generation." This is a U.S. government employee who couldn't have been more careful about my person. It was just a chilling moment to realize that this is an upright citizen, a person with a good job and that was his view.

So in any case, before that, when we first arrived (Robert Charles) Hill was the ambassador [Ed: He served from February 1974 and departed post May 10, 1977]. He was a Republican appointee and he was a real inner and outer. Whenever the Republicans were in office he served as an ambassador. I think he was a wealthy man and might even have had some foreign service training, I'm not quite sure. His favorite post had been Franco's Spain [Ed: Hill served as Ambassador to Spain from June 1969 to January 1972]. He was scared. He was a man who had a child of marriageable age and I can't now remember but I believe it was his son, who was engaged to a young woman of the

town or a young man of the town, whichever it was. He had asked President Carter if he could be kept on through the wedding. It was going to be a large wedding and the events of it and Carter said, "Sure!" But he was going to host the wedding at the residence, a lovely house, with a lovely back yard but the next door to it was a high rise. Not a super high rise but it was maybe 12 or 14 or 20 stories high. And all the windows looked right down in the embassy yard. So the way he was living was something that really got on his nerves, in that he had a lovely garden, a place where they'd had lots of nice events kind of thing but he couldn't go out in it. When he went out, men with machine guns went with him and faced the apartment building. It was just a terrible situation.

So anyway he and his wife were there and we had tea and he gave me an extremely detailed briefing. Now I may be getting into sensitive stuff. Hill was explaining how he had been carrying out the human rights policy. What happened is, when prodded by Washington, or some terrible event, he would get mad and go and raise hell with them. [Ed: tape indistinct]. As he was telling me this he got red in the face and struck the table. Then I said, "Well just tell me about, what was our role? Did anybody ever come from Washington?" He said, "No." In fact, that had been a great disappointment to him, because Kissinger was supposed to come. Kissinger was making, maybe an ABC [Ed: Argentina, Brazil and Chile] tour.

Kissinger had gotten to Chile, I think maybe that was his first stop. And somewhere along the way had sent a message that he was sorry but he wasn't going to be able to come to Argentina. Junta was very, very unhappy and they pressured and acted annoyed and begged and pleaded. So Kissinger finally said, "Okay. If you come over here to Chile, I'll let you fly in the airplane with me to Brazil and we can talk in the airplane." So I don't know whether they all went or just two or three. But in any case, off they went. And I'm not sure who else was in the party. I'm not even sure that Hill said and then that I had the wit to ask. But in any case, their story when they came back, which Hill believed, and I'm not sure but that he might not have had it corroborated

But they explained why they were doing the really terrible things they were doing and they wanted U.S. government approval. I'm told that indeed he (Kissinger) gave it and he gave them one year. Fred (Fernando Rondon) was there while I was talking to Hill and actually wrote a memcon (memorandum of conversation). I ripped off the top of it so that nobody would know that Fred had written it and I have it somewhere, should have brought it today. In any case, that was a great shock to me. It was the first footstep, in a way. Almost everywhere I went I was walking in Kissinger's footsteps. He let an awful lot of stuff go by.

Q: Well when you arrived in Argentina, you must have been about the first ranking person in the State Department in the Carter Administration to show up there.

DERIAN: I don't know if (ARA Assistant Secretary)Todman had been there or not. He was very keen on them. The position of ARA at that time was that you have to understand the junta's problems, you the Administration, that they have to do anything they have to do and actually they're not doing anything anyway. And that lasted for

almost two years. It was unbelievable, absolutely. They were always trying to get military stuff for them. Just amazing!

Q: Were you getting reports from the embassy, to the effect what they actually were doing? How did we become aware? [Ed: for background see: http://www2.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB85/]

DERIAN: This was generated by the news, by reality. When things came in about Argentina, at the time, in cables, it was always about the military having to react. But when I got there, it was still, they practiced a very sophisticated, only by sheer thuggery, a form of terror on the people. That is, they'd stop a whole bunch of cars and pull people out. In fact I got up one morning in the Sheraton and you know how these windows, you open your curtain and there's just a solid piece of glass? There were people going to work and there were probably fifty soldiers and a whole bunch of Ford Falcons, unmarked cars also and they were pulling people out of cars, you know, making them spread out on the road, that type of thing. There was always dead bodies in the street. You'd find a naked body in a garbage can. Almost unbelievable when you look back at how grotesque and awful it was. Students were being taken away in the night. People who were in the address book of people who had been taken were brought in and kept. All of them were disappeared.

Q: These victims became known as the Disappeared Ones. Later there were demonstrations for years about this.

DERIAN: Right, right and they were just beginning. I met the mothers of the Plaza de Mayo who were known, in Spanish, as "the madwomen of the Plaza de Mayo" and they were relatives, mostly parents, of young people, but not always young people, who were taken. And they're still demonstrating, because a lot of the young women who were taken were pregnant. Many of them had their babies which were taken away from them and adopted by people in the military. The junta by then was pretty much in control.

Q: Well now, you arrived there. Here is this horrible thing which you are told is the fault of both sides. You're new to this whole situation. As you first approached this issue, what did you think? What would have been a solution or a method of operation that would have been acceptable to you in dealing with this problem?

DERIAN: When I spoke with them, the discussions were very interesting in these places. I think I saw Videla first. Actually, maybe, they had a team of people from their Foreign Ministry, I've forgotten the name of the man and maybe we saw them first. Can't remember but it was one of those wonderful situations, a thing you love the theater of. Long, long, narrow table, many chairs. Everybody has an ashtray, everybody has a glass, everybody has a carafe, everybody has a tablet and you are sitting across from your counterpart, all the way down. And then two people talk. Just the two of you, nobody else talks. I'd start out and say how happy I am to have an opportunity to talk to them about some serious matters and make just the sketchiest little, maybe five or six sentence thing, which touches on the real names of the real things you're talking about: torture, execution, disappearance, all of that and acknowledges, acknowledged in that case, that

they had a serious problem. Then whoever that other person was talked. And he explained their constitution. I'd always read the constitution before I'd go and try to get as good a fix as I can on the system of the administration of justice, because that's the nut of the thing. So they explain their history and their constitution and that usually takes 20 minutes, half an hour. I never look away from the person, I maintain eye contact the whole time because I don't want them to play off of somebody on my side who frowns if I say something or is writing frantically or off their own people, if they glance to the side. It's one of those things where you just want them to focus and pay attention and you don't want anybody else screwing up what you're doing.

So then they would get through and they deny everything. Nothing is going wrong here. There are terrible guerillas and those things, but we're taking care of them in a perfectly reasonable way. Then I talk about torture. When you go to a place like that, I think before I saw anybody in the government, I talked to maybe 50 or 60 people of every kind. The general rule of thumb, which perhaps doesn't apply in Singapore, was that people would express a variety of opinions, and maybe I told you this before, from one extreme to the other. That is, some would say nothing's wrong here and at the other end others would say everything's wrong here. And in between you get a core sampling of things. You try not in any way to lead them with your questions. You just say, "What happened to you? Where were you?" Ask those blunt questions. "Who did that to you" and "What was it they did? What time was it?" All that kind of stuff. Then you have a real sense of it but you also ask the bellhop, the man who sits next to you at the dinner party, every person you see, you ask what it's like to live there. I asked a young woman who sold me a handbag. She said, "Well, we're Irish." I said, "When did you come?" "Oh, four or five generations ago."

The dilemma that kind of thing causes in a country is just astonishing, the reach of the thing. Also, the reach on specific people. Going somewhere and finding an address and parking, breaking the door down and dragging the people out. Everywhere you go, and Argentina was a great place to learn because it was almost the worst of everything. Everywhere else I went was kind of a variation of that. Circumstances were different. Practices, the doing of the thing, just the same things the Soviets did, really intriguing. But in any case, you would have this long, long conversation and I liked it to last long. When I would say things like, "Well, you know, the government is responsible for this. You're the Minister of Interior. You're responsible." I never insulted them. That seemed to be a difference between what I did and what ambassadors did. They would be mad at the person. I'm not interested in insulting the person. There's nothing, probably, ultimately, more insulting than being accused of summarily executing people and torturing them. But there is a real distinction between you and your person. You don't want to use their tactics. You just have to be very matter of fact and say, "I know you're doing this." And then they say they aren't. What happens is you try to get them, through a long, long session, you lay down a marker, about torture, for instance, and they respond. And you remember what they say. You're tying a loop around every leg of the centipede. You get to the end of a whole session like that, even if it's only an hour, you summarize, doesn't match your constitution, all that sort of thing. The exercise itself is sort of interesting and it helps you not fall into a kind of despair about here are two human

beings talking about unspeakable acts on the part of certain people unspeakably inhuman acts on the part of certain people against other people. And it's unbelievably sad, horrible, but you have to remember what it is you're doing there.

Q: Now, you're talking about a technique that you had developed. Where'd this come from?

DERIAN: Well, I think part of it came because when I was in nursing school there was no specialty. The only specialty for nursing school were anesthesiology and somebody might be an OB (obstetrics) nurse, you might go off and do it but there were no advanced levels. But psychiatry was what I was very interested in. I was taken under the wing of the medical people, the physicians who did that. So I got a lot advanced kind of training. It was in the days of locked wards and it was of course like the filthy. So the people you were dealing with were psychotic, had no relief from the psychosis. You'd become sensitive to it when you're looking at people in anguish, what it is you're doing there. Are you just going to cry because they're so sick and scared or are you going to try to think of ways to help them. So I think it springs from that and also I have a very high regard for people. So I'm always surprised and puzzled when they do horrifying things. And in this case, I was an agent of the United States government. So I had a responsibility to what it was I was supposed to do and I didn't want to impose myself on the situation because we had the law.

Q: Now if I understand you were sent out with the thought, "Won't you go out and take a look?"

DERIAN: Yes. "We think it would be really helpful to you if you saw the place and understood it and knew what they were up against."

Q: But you weren't sent out on a crusade, so how did you know how you wanted to approach this human rights issue?

DERIAN: I knew what I had come to do, which is uphold the law. In any case what I say is, "This is important to us because we have a great deal of legislation that bars our having a warm and good, cordial relationship with your government and we'd like to have a good relationship with Argentina but we're not going to be able to continue military training or spares or sell you weapons or be participants in any way with this because the law requires it. So it's in our interest to try to see if there's some resolution to the problem and here's what the problem is." That was the, if you thought of the law as the base of the statue and then the thing that connects the base to the statue itself is that little plank of bonds or whatever it is, that was the law.

Actually, it was really interesting that, it was a little bit like the image of the cobra being enticed out of the basket by someone playing the flute. It's almost as mesmerizing for them. They couldn't believe they were hearing this. It was always very matter of factly put forward and they kept responding. There's a real sort of pattern to it. They deny everything at first, then they concede something. Usually they say, "Well, those things

happen but they're irregular. They only happen at the lowest level." You get a long story about why the lowest level is doing that. Then, gradually, you get to the point where, on the last visit. Well, let me illustrate.

Max (Maxwell) Chaplin, that's the name of the DCM, one of the times I was there. [Ed: Chaplin served as DCM under Ambassador Hill and later Ambassador Raul Castro from March 1977 through to the summer of 1980.] He was the person who didn't like the policy. He went with me to see (Admiral Emilio) Massera on one of those visits, who was the head of the navy and we went to see him at his office at the Naval Mechanical School, which was also a place that used to be a big torture and interrogation place, in the basement there. Massera and I were having this talk. Massera was a real piece of work. Big, brilliant politician's smile, twinkling eyes, very neat and tidy and sort of square in his sailor clothes. Shall I tell you all of Massera right now, while I'm thinking about it? He'd always been very cordial in all the group talks and things. Once was driving in the car with me and we went by the waterfront and there was a huge sailing vessel, three masts and a million sails, crosspieces and things. And I said, "Ah, wonderful boat." "It's our training ship," he said. "Our trainees tie themselves to the masts and they hang upside down." They have more than a hundred sailors on it when it's in full sail and went on and on. I said, "Gosh, must be wonderful." By the time I got back to the hotel, had a formal note inviting me to a personal, private, full rigged, sail on that boat. So I called Massera myself and told him no, I was really sorry, I couldn't go. He insisted and I said, "Look, you must think I'm crazy. I'm not going to have my picture plastered all over the world sailing by myself on a private cruise on your death ship. Not on your life!" "Ho, ho, ho," he said, "That's very funny" and he let it pass. In any case, we went to see him, Max Chaplin and I, at the Mechanical School and he and I are sitting in leather chairs, side by side, not facing each other. Max is sitting across the room, sort of "I'm not really here, I'm not part of this." Massera and I are looking at each other but I'm keeping an eye on Max, too. So I talked to him about throwing people out of the airplane. The nuns by then had been thrown out and all their little hands had been cut off. That's how they found out that the nuns had been thrown out of the plane, because their hands floated up on the beach. People started finding these tiny little hands. French nuns, I think there were 17 of them and maybe one of the 17 was not a nun and not French. She was taken up with them. He says, "Oh, that's the air force. The air force does that. The navy does not do that." He was utterly guileless seeming and as scheming and evil a person as you'd ever want to meet. So I glanced at Max, who has not batted an eyelash. I said, "You're holding all these labor people out on the ships. He said, "I go out to see them once a week to tell them I'm trying my best to get them released. I go to see their families." Now, the biggest, I'm sure he went to see the families and I'm sure he went out there. But nobody's fooled, those were Massera's ships and his sailors and his prisoners. In any case, I said, "As for torture, I know people are being tortured right here under this roof. I have a map of that floor" which did cause him to blink. I said, "In fact somebody's probably being tortured right under our feet right now." He goes, "You remember Pontius Pilate?" with an enormous smile, rubbing his hands together. I glanced at Max. He had turned snow white. It was one of the most unbelievable moments of my life and I'm sure that Max probably feels the same way about it. Here is this bald confession. I testified to that when I went down to the trial.

Q: How much do you think Max knew?

DERIAN: I'm not certain but I had the impression the whole embassy believed that they understood the problem of the military and that things weren't as bad as I thought. Now I know that they knew better, because they were wired in. Our security people and the Argentine security people were very close. There was a man I liked a lot, he and I disagreed on nearly everything, his name was Kelly and he was the chief security, probably the wrong word for what he was.

Q: Are we talking about CIA station chief or the regional security officer?

DERIAN: Well, he was not a Foreign Service officer. He was his special thing. I don't think he was an Agency guy because what he was really in charge of was two fold, at least. One, make sure that the plans made for the protection of the embassy and ambassador and all of the people in our chunk, including me when I came, were right. The property we owned and all of those things. But also he was a liaison with whatever his counterpart would be, which would probably be their intelligence people.

Q: I'm pretty sure he probably was the security officer. The security officer can have a multitude of roles. The whole main thing about a security officer is, they have these liaisons with other intelligence agencies to make sure that the embassy and the personnel don't get blown up.

DERIAN: He knew an awful lot, I mean a terrifying lot. He kind of thought that what they did, interrogations and stuff, was not so bad. He was very candid with me. I said, "You know, I get the sense." 'Cause he said he had been told many times before a big operation. Now, I don't think he kept that to himself. I don't know who else he told. I know that whoever he reported to in Washington knew. Should ask Hal Saunders some time. I think Hal understands all that stuff more, because he was doing INR then and he might have known who in State knew. [Ed: Harold Saunders was Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of Intelligence and Research from December 1975 to April 1978.]

Q: Possible. I wonder, could you tell us a bit about the role of Fred Rondon (Fernando Rondon) *at this time, because here is somebody who is sort of with you.*

DERIAN: Here's what happened. We worked from maybe six in the morning 'til after midnight, every day. And all we did was talk to people. We saw mothers, we saw people who had been disappeared and weren't, we saw Chamber of Commerce types, we saw bankers. We made as good a survey of the population as I think it's possible to make. With the proviso that it was all within the city limits of B.A (Buenos Aires). On that trip we never went out of there. Most of the people were there. So we saw a lot. It was an exhausting thing for a Foreign Service officer to do because he translated all day. I can't remember if Michele Bova was, Michele must have been there. She is now retired, also. They, then, were note takers as well because I can't do it and take notes; you lose eye contact. Absolutely, you really have to just do it. Also, they're distracted because they

stop and think about what they said and wonder what you're writing down. So it's much better to never have a pencil or any paper or anything. So he was with us through this all.

Michele would cry when we left places, it was so nauseating, really so horrible. We talked to an old woman who was the young wife of the first democratically elected Radical Party president. Her granddaughter had been disappeared and she got a phone call after some long period of time saying that her granddaughter's body was going to be delivered to her house. And they came with a naked body and put this kid down and left her with this old lady. When she called the funeral home they called up and told her that she had had a rat sewn inside her vagina which killed her by trying to eat its way out. It was so horrifying, so incredible, that it took a lot of thinking to say, "What's your duty here?" She's telling the story. You don't get to cry when someone's telling the horrible thing, you've got to listen. It's not an emotional game you're playing here or a field that you're acting on. You have to ask questions and make sure you've fully understood. There were so many equally terrible stories. People were being tortured on bed frames and all of those.

So Fred (Fernando Rondon), anyway. I'm not sure how many days we'd been there but we'd been there several days. He and I were in the car, in the back seat, just the two of us and he said, "Look, I'm going to tell you something privately. This trip was planned so that you would be on the side of the military and I really believed, too, that you didn't understand. What I know now is that I didn't understand. These conversations with people have convinced me. ARA is not going to be favorable to a changed point of view." These are not his exact words, I don't want to overstate it. He said, "I can't really go in and make the case for you but if you ever need anything, you call on me and I'll help you privately." A wonderful outreach. I often thought that if people could just go on a trip like that, with me or just go see the same people and have the same talk, they'd have a different understanding of where our interests would lay. The embassy was in a state of denial, just plain denial.

Q: Could you expand a little as far as the embassy's attitude. You say "denial." Could you tell us about that a bit?

DERIAN: That's what it was. It was denial in the office. Now there was a nice fellow, Tony Freeman, who was the economics officer and he had seen a lot, in that position, of the labor movement, such as was left, so he seemed to be understanding this was not a good idea and the wrong thing for the embassy to be doing. Fred (Fernando Rondon), he didn't have a lot of time but he did have a lot of contact with them back and forth. Tex Harris had a good fix on this; not at this time but later.

I will tell you that we had an embassy meeting; everybody in the embassy was invited, not just the country team, in an auditorium. And the military guys came, too. They were just overtly hostile. I got up and made my pitch and when I got through there was question and answer period. I never will forget it. A man in the middle of the audience stood up and he looked like my friend Diane Pratt's father, who was a colonel in the Air Force when I was a kid. He was a military officer and he had a mustache. He actually

looked like Diane Pratt's daddy. So he stood up. I had a very pleasant surge, seeing Diane's daddy again. And he was so mad, he was outraged. He hated this. He said that I was incoherent, long list of complaints about me, causing people to look embarrassed. I was really so well prepared for this. I would always pay five dollars to get a heckler. I mean, just really, does everything you want done. I said, "What is your question?" He said, "My question is, what does this mean?" And I said, "Oh, it means we aren't gonna sell thumbscrews to them anymore." And he just sort of collapsed into his chair. Everybody looked very uneasy. I don't even remember that there was a ripple of laughter. And the consequence of that was, though, also a big help to me. That is that someone in that group leaked it to the newspapers. So it appeared in the Argentine press, which was useful, but it also finally made its way to the U.S. And I don't really know where the leak came from. I'm sure that it went, every time I talked at one of those someone wrote a cable on what it was I had said. It was the first leak they'd ever had from…maybe it was the country team.

But they had never had a leak from one of those. Everyone's deeply embarrassed, particularly as the guy looked really dumb and bad. So at Christmas time I came into my office in Washington. Had a little package, like this, all wrapped up. It said, "Merry Christmas from a bunch of us." Opened it up and you remember the IBM correcting Selectric that had the little white erasure things in it? Well, it was a box, I guess six or eight came in that box. What it was was sea clams, obviously the closest that they could find to thumbscrews, then inside it a little note that said, "Thanks!" It was very funny, very sweet, liked it a lot. In any event, I'd say, in the country team meeting, when I got there, they were closed up, condescending, and I didn't talk much in the country team meeting. I only asked questions and I didn't have a follow up question.

Q: Was this the general reaction you had?

DERIAN: Well, I never categorize everything, so I'll have to think. In almost every place there was someone who was thrilled that I was there. Not because of me, but because they'd been worried about the human rights situation. People like Charlie Runyon (Assistant Legal Adviser for Human Rights, Office of the Legal Adviser), who really had kept it on the table the whole time even though it didn't get to go very far. So, yes, in most places, that's true. Not in Bolivia, for some reason.

Q: I would imagine the first thing you have to do is establish yourself and the new political direction the Administration wants to go. While the Foreign Service serves all administrations, it still needs to understand the new direction. Just about the time you're talking about I was in Seoul, Korea on the country team. I think you came there one time. I remember our ambassador was not very forthcoming, let's put it this way.

DERIAN: He was terrible. He came around, later but only in personal terms.

Q: So how did you get the new policy known throughout the building?

DERIAN: Most of the questions that people asked were good, they were really useful. This was not a question. This was an outburst of outrage. You know, it's always useful to have a safety valve. He let off a lot of steam for a lot of people, probably. I always found that the staff personnel, not the Foreign Service officers, other people, were always interested in the policy and very helpful and friendly. Junior officers, particularly women (were) curious about me. One time I went with (Secretary) Vance to NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization). We were all staying on the same floor in the hotel. On that floor was also the Executive Secretariat control room with Coca-Colas and goodies and fax machines and stuff. And so, late in the night I went there to get a Coca-Cola. There were two women Foreign Service officers. They said how thrilled they were to meet me. One of them said, "You know what, we just paid you a real compliment, because we needed a role model and you're our role model. You can't say you're not our role model! Don't do that!" I realized, there's always another role to play, not just for women.

Q: In these early trips how about the media, both American and Argentine, Latin American media, how did they treat you?

DERIAN: U.S. had a lot of people down there and by and large they bought the Argentine military's point of view. So we had a little dinner, I guess, something. [Ed: two minutes of indistinct recording.] They were very assertive, "Well, how do you know?" kind of response. I would assert something and then I would have to back it up. I'm always very cheerful when I'm out traveling so I would say, "Look, I'm here because I'm on a mission to find out things and to discuss with the government and I don't have any conclusions. All I'm doing now is taking in and then I'll synthesize it and then I'll put it out" and that's the way it was.

I saw a pattern, starting with this trip where the press is controlled. Where if I speak candidly and they publish it, they will be penalized for doing it. I don't talk to the press. I just smile and walk by and say, "You'll have to call the embassy" or something. There was one headline that went all the way across the page with a picture of me walking out somewhere and it called me "Her Majesty Patricia." That's kind of funny because I'm often criticized in the United States about talking about people publicly. [Ed: one minute of indistinct recording.] My penchant on that first trip was, one, we knew everything. Two, it was going to affect the relationship. Three, that yes it was my passing observation, that they had been, on that first trip, in power for a year. Only two weeks before I got there they said that they had broken the back of the guerrillas, which was true. They had pretty much stopped all acts of terrorism, which were awful acts. When you start out, particularly there, everybody's kind of macho and on edge and want to be tough guys. You want to take 'em as far as you can get 'em. You can see how angry somebody's getting. Then I dropped my papers and everybody has to scramble around. [Ed: one minute of indistinct recording.] You just need some tension breakers. A cigarette's great, if you're a woman. Everything stops, five hundred Zippo lighters would suddenly appear. This is an old courting trick which turns out to work in diplomacy as well.

Q: I've been thirty years in the Foreign Service, mainly in totalitarian states, why were the Argentineans, who after all were of European heritage, German, Italian, British types, why were they as nasty as they were? Was it that the government didn't really have control over their own military?

DERIAN: No, the military had taken power once before, years before my time, but not too long before. They had been castigated by the populace. Spat on them on the street, cursed them. They went back to the barracks and swore that no matter what happened in the country they would never take the reins of government again. So in that first meeting they told me all about that, how pathetic it was, people spit on them, this sort of thing. I said, "Well why did you do it this time?" "Well, we had to, because our country was being ruined by this know-nothing leader." Those weren't their words. They felt that they had to do it.

I said, "Well, you did it and you did everything wrong. It's the first instinct of whoever throws another one out from the time of emergency to do the wrong stuff. But now you've had a whole year and it's my experience that electors, people in a country are forgiving, unbelievably forgiving, if order is restored and the parts of the government are restored. And here they were, they had done away with their legislative body. They'd killed some of the most visible and important and attractive officials themselves. They had wrecked the university. They'd really torn the whole place apart. What the guerillas didn't destroy they destroyed. And so here you are at the end of the year and you said you'd broken the back. So why don't you now go before the public and say, "We came into office not wanting to do that, wanting to keep a democratic government. We have had to dismantle every agency of government and now we've broken the back of the guerillas. We are going to restore the judicial system. We are going to return to legislation, you know, an active legislative body. We are going to phase ourselves out, return to regular civilian rule." It was very interesting because they listened with great absorption and they kind of looked at each other and they referred to it several times, about "What you said before." And I went back to that kind of thing. I kept saying, "Take a chance, because if you ride it to the end, it's going to be disgrace and humiliation. So why don't you take a chance? You're in the driver's seat, what have you got to lose? Give it a try!" But they were really afraid to do it. After I said that, then they began to talk about Nuremberg trials. It's very interesting.

Q: You might explain what the Nuremberg trials were.

DERIAN: After World War II, the Allied nations formed a judicial tribunal and brought to trial many of the prominent Nazi officials who committed atrocities during World War II, particularly concerned with the annihilation of six million Jews, gypsies, prisoners of war, and occupied people. Those trials were made public and people all over the world, particularly in Europe and the United States, North America and South America saw the pictures in the newsreels.

Q: And of course the Argentine military came out of the German-Italian tradition really, within a couple of generations.

DERIAN: Argentina declared for the Axis Powers until just before the war ended and then they switched sides and joined the Allies. Some of the Nazi leaders were executed and some were given life imprisonment, mostly Hitler's inner circle, Hitler was not included as he killed himself at the end of the war, this was the end of the war. What struck me is we'd be talking, members of the junta and other high government officials, we'd just be talking about some other topic and they would say, "Nuremberg trials." It was like a verbal tic. There was nothing in the sentence or the paragraph or any part of the topic about those trials. But their thesis was, when I would stop and pursue that subject, what they said was, if Germany had won World War II, the Nuremberg trials would not have been held in Europe. There's a kind of psychotic element that ran through that.

They also said that most of the trouble at one period they were going through, most of the trouble in their country was caused by Israel because Israel wanted to occupy Patagonia because they were running out of land and there wasn't enough room for all the Jews. And when they told me that, it's my first real miff, I laughed because I thought they were joking. Whereupon, they had a little interval while we waited and in came this enormous blown up photographs from the newspaper. This was in the day when newspapers were not made with printing presses we have now but where every picture was composed of dots. And if you used a magnifying glass you could even see the dots. I forget, they were called pixels. I forget how many you got to an inch. But in any case, they were close-ups, larger than life, this enormous thing, they hardly reached between the ceiling and the floor. They were shown to me as a crowd scene of riotous crowds in Argentina and they showed the Jews in that picture. It was absolutely impossible to see that and later I saw the real picture that they had taken it from. It was from an Israeli newspaper of a religious observance in Israel. They had stolen this thing, blown it up and were offering it as proof that there were Israeli agitators. [Ed: one minute of indistinct recording]

Q: All of us know a lot more about Israel than they probably do, whereas if you could raise the subject by saying, "This is Soviet inspired" that might, this is Cold War. I would think trying to play the Israeli card wasn't very smart with an American.

DERIAN: Oh, I don't think anybody ever said they were smart. They were just powerful. They were armed and nobody else was. That was pretty much it. These weren't the world's brightest guys. The whole time that they're railing against communism they were always doing business with Cuba. They never, ever stopped their trade with Cuba. It was bizarre. That's when I started thinking that I hadn't stopped nursing at all, the second time. When I got to Mississippi I thought, "This is a psychotic situation we have here." And then I got to Argentina and it was a whole nation in this bizarre state. And I kept saying, "You believe that? Do you really believe that?" "Yes," they said. [Ed: one minute of indistinct recording]

Q: Now when you came back, tell me about your reception in ARA and all that. You were sent on this trip, in part, with the thought you would come back and say, "I see what you mean. They've really got a problem and I guess they're handling it as best they can."

DERIAN: I didn't talk a lot there, but I did say the things that I believed that were wrong and they knew them. Now back in the ARA Bureau, there was a man who was a deputy. He was highly regarded as an intellectual, who had a Latin name of some sort, maybe Italian, maybe Spanish. [Ed: Luigi Einaudi, Director of Policy Planning ARA.] He was kind of the bureau thinker, the bureau intellectual. I got the sense that he was disdainful of my concerns. I don't mean my personal concerns but my professional. In any case, I sensed that they were not prepared for me to have any sense at all but there are some things that I'm good at. That's what the people who asked me to take the job saw. It's a simple technique, anybody can do it. They were not expecting me to come back with so much material that was hard to refute. We had seen too many people, there were too many memcons (memoranda of conversations).

The one thing I left out, in every place that I went, and this may be the trip where when I got back the CIA invited me to come over and answer questions. We were in a room not much bigger than this room.

Q: We're talking about a room about 25 by 15 feet or something like that.

DERIAN: Just about this size, almost completely filled with a giant table and chairs all around the wall and chairs all around the table and a lot of closed faces. I had no idea why they had asked me but I was curious to see what it was they wanted. And I went and they said who they all were, I mean they didn't but they said what their interests were. And then somebody started asking me questions and they were interested in who I met with. And I characterized the kind of people I met with and they said no, specifically who. I said that I was sorry, the things that had been told to me were told in confidence and that people's lives would be in jeopardy and that I never would tell identities to anybody and I had them expunged from all my records, that that was my obligation to them. If they were gonna risk their lives to tell somebody from the United States government what had happened to them I certainly wasn't gonna put 'em in any more peril. And then I said, "And after all, you're the CIA. I figured you probably figured that out yourself." Well, arms folded around the room. This look of great hostility. And I couldn't believe, you know I said, "I can't believe you asked me over here with those kinds of things."

Actually, when we got past all of that, they were interested in the observations about the dictators, 'cause dictators are interesting. Hardly anybody gets to talk to 'em for a long time but because this is such a hypnotic topic I probably spent longer in each time with those people than most people get to do and I'm very interested 'cause I'm watching all the time. So after that a group of psychiatrists would come when I got back from someplace. They were interested in me going over that kind of thing. They certainly drew their own conclusions. After I came back from there I said in the HA bureau meeting that I thought that what we were going to have to do was to be like Caesar's wife. We were not going to cooperate with any intelligence service because it would debase our standing with other people. If we talked to people who thought that we were gathering intelligence for intelligence purposes then not only would we be not getting anything good but as you

know it just would wreck the whole relationship and the idea of the thing. As time went on and people have been exposed, not any of the ones, to my knowledge, that I talked with anywhere, or anybody from my office, but too many people who have put their trust in people from our government have died of the consequence of sloppiness.

Q: You have to be very careful because there are people, without either thinking or malice aforethought, will trade names and information or what have you.

DERIAN: Yeah well, see, that's bad training. That's what they use as currency. I know that that's true. And it's not useful to us in the long run, or the short run. It's like torture. Really you don't get anything because you don't know who you've got, what you wanted.

Q: Anything on Chile?

DERIAN: Only that I refused to go there because Pinochet was very anxious for me to come. And I decided that I didn't want to go at his behest. You know, Patricia Derian has accepted an invitation. The human rights person is coming here at the invitation of General Pinochet. I do have a funny aside, which illustrates the history of the time. I think in about the third or fourth year of the Carter Administration a group of Chilean expatriates, remember a huge portion of the intelligentsia left and a group of about seven or eight people, my memory's so bad, but it was more than a couple, came and said that they were going back to Chile because they had noticed that the only political entity from pre-Pinochet that was active and organized was the Communist Party. Because the party members had never left. They met all the time and sometimes they got thrown in jail but they were highly organized. They were going to go back for the democratically organized one. I said what a good idea that was. The most highly organized political state in Latin America had absolutely shut down as soon as the dictator came on the scene. So they talked and explained what their points of view were and how they were going to go about it. I said, "That's great! Thanks so much for telling me." And one of them said, "Well, we came to ask you something. We need your help." What it was, they said, was, "Who do you like?" And I said, "I don't know what you mean." "Who would you all support as our candidate?" And I said, "We don't have a candidate." And they said, "Well you always have a candidate." I said, "No, we don't have a candidate. Our idea of democracy is that you organize your own people and you pick your candidates and you have an election. I know that it's not always seen that way but that's the way it is, in this room, today." He said, "But if you'd just tell us who you'd like us to support, then we'll do it." I want to tell you my heart sank; that was one of the saddest moments, you know. These were educated people.

Q: Today is the 4th of February, 1997. Patt, we wanted to focus on Latin and South America, we've done Argentina. Why don't we start with Mexico, where you said off mike that's where you didn't do a good job? What do you mean by that?

DERIAN: It means essentially that while we wrote a report on it, we really didn't do anything much there in our office and God knows ARA didn't do anything there. You

know, there's all sorts of rationalizations about why we didn't - the Southern Cone was aflame and El Salvador was a mess. There's a lot of excuses that there were other places that were really in such horrible condition. But the fact of it is that Mexico has been in a horrible condition for God knows how long. I don't know if the PRI (The Institutional Revolutionary Party (Spanish: Partido Revolucionario Institucional) started out as a kind of straight arrow, real reformer group or whether they just turned into insiders overnight. But the PRI has been the ruling party since the revolution. It's a place we did not do.

Q: I suppose Mexico is such a touchy place that if we were to try to do something, not only would it make the Mexicans mad but it would probably be counterproductive.

DERIAN: It always seems that way. When a place is bad enough to require a real... You know, I don't know if we talked about this before but this is a logical place to talk about this bit of policy making. And that is, after I got there (the human rights office at State) and learned a little bit, by July, I guess, of the first year I was there, it seemed to me that the thing we ought to do, having these human rights reports and the amount of reporting I'd been able to read, contemporaneous reporting, that we ought to sit down and think of what we were going to do about human rights in the places that we were going to do it. Not a hit list, not the ten worst or something like that, which I wanted definitely to avoid. But within the confines of our policy process.

That we might just outline ourselves, in our bureau, which we really could have pulled off 'cause it was a non-leaking bureau. Even the people who were not in favor of policy, one man who hated working for a woman that he told me. Even so, nobody leaked. To plan what we were going to do. There was absolute, stone wall refusal on the part of Christopher. Vance was sort of amenable to it but it was really sort of Christopher's call, 'cause he was the person who was the most direct. And the reason was that he had talked to the bureaus and they of course didn't want the human rights policy at all, let alone anything that had been thought out. It was a little bit like baseball practice where you're hitting fungos and they liked the things that came out of our bureau to be like fungos, just batted away as quickly as possible.

In any case, Mexico is the perfect example of a place where things are very touchy, we wanted to be on wonderful terms because there was so much going on between the countries. That was the place where we could have worked out. We did a lot of very, very "aggressive" human rights, in terms of doing it often and thinking about it, simply because that's the only way you can do it. It was never made public. It was not something we talked about. People talk about quiet diplomacy but hardly know what they're saying, because what they mean when they say it is no diplomacy. But sitting down at the table and talking things over is a technique and it is not hard to learn. And you can go an enormous long way with people who are thought to be just too self-consciously sensitive about criticism. It's just a phony rap. Israel is the other place, I think. Well, we certainly had a lot of internal discussions and battles, but we'll talk about Israel another time. But in Mexico, we just didn't do anything.

Q: Before you took up your duties, what had you thought about Cuba and from 1977 to 1981 was Cuba raised or was this just sort of off the radar?

DERIAN: Yeah, you know Wayne Smith (Chief of the American Interests Section in Havana) was down there. He was very good about keeping us posted on the realities of the situation. Castro had a pretty tight clamp on the human rights people, who were not well known outside of the country. And the only one at that time that became well known was in and out of prison. He had publicly started a human rights group. I've forgotten his name of course. He was described by the people in ARA as crazy, that he was mentally ill. Now, I don't believe that Wayne had that feeling about him, can't really remember right now. But we had quite a bit of information. We had extensive contacts with the Cuban-American community in the Miami area, which taught us that they were unreliable reporters about what was going on there. It's such a, like the Palestinians and the Israelis in a microcosm. Everybody's got their own axe to grind.

Shall we talk about Cuba, because I did not go there until after the Carter Administration? What happened was, that some sort of non-governmental delegation went to Cuba. I forget what they were doing. Essentially it sounded to me like they were sight-seeing. And one of the people on the trip was Kathleen Kennedy, one of Robert Kennedy's daughters. It was quite a long time ago. She wasn't married and I think she now has a child in high school, so it's been quite a while. Human rights was not on the agenda. But during a coffee break she was talking to Castro and asking some rather pointed questions privately, not in front of the group and he had a temper tantrum, just had a fit, raised hell, complained, shouted, gave a long diatribe in the meeting. So the delegation was offended and I'm not sure how they resolved all that.

In any case, sometime later, maybe a couple of years later, after that, he put out the word, somehow, I don't remember, that he would entertain discussion of human rights if the agenda for such a meeting included the debt, the Latin American debt to American banks. I'm trying to think who went. Johnny Ochs went, Arthur Schlesinger [ED: Harvard professor and Democratic party activist] went, Michael Posner [Ed: who later served as Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor since early on in the Obama administration] went and an economist named Brown, very nice fellow I didn't know before then and bump into from time to time. I don't know how many others there were, but we sort of, half were doing the economic side, half the human rights stuff.

Q: This was, what, the mid-Eighties?

DERIAN: Yeah. When the debt was a really hot issue and Castro had already put his marker down, saying, "Don't you guys pay it." That was causing a lot of uneasiness in New York. In any case, just as an insight into Castro, very interesting. There was a great big room, as long as these two rooms, with a long, long table and it was some government room and the person who was called the president. What's Castro called? Is he called the president? [Ed: Fidel Castro was Prime Minister of Cuba from 1959 to 1976 and President from 1976 to 2008.]

Well, he took us into this room and we were seated at this gigantic table and it was extremely cold in there. So someone welcomed us and then he asked whoever was speaking for the economists a couple of questions. And then he asked me, he said he didn't understand, really, what sort of discussion we wanted to have. So I figured that Castro or somebody was listening for Castro. Obviously, he was trying to get some hooks, perfectly reasonable thing to do; people do it here, as well. So I launched into a very cool and detached discussion of the human rights issues that I wanted to talk about. And I talked about five minutes when someone came in and said that Castro was ready to see us. So we went in, he was very cordial.

I think dictators are intriguing. They are all actors. So we sat at another long table in a cozier big room. I can't remember which one of us went first. But then he called on me. It was the first thing because we had been told and all had read a million times that before you ever got to talk to Castro he delivered a speech of twenty minutes to two hours and so we were all geared up for that. We sat down and he looked at me and he said, "Well, what's on your mind?" It was wonderful. I get so restless when they do that usual thing. And so I started speaking, with him very attentive. He certainly understands English and I suspect he speaks it but he had the woman who's his sort of famous interpreter there. I had noticed that when we first came in, when we sat down and introduced ourselves, his eyes had been darting everywhere, which made me remember that when you're talking to someone about these things you have to keep constant eye contact, 'cause you don't want them playing off of anybody. I probably told you that in the beginning. One of the real secrets to talking about awful things is to just make a space where only the two of you exist.

So we got to a very tense part in our discussion, which was extremely long and he said when I was talking about mistreatment of political prisoners, "I can tell you we don't do that here." And I said, "Well, I don't wish to be impolite but I want you to know that you have no standing on this issue." A prolonged silence. I thought, "Well, this is it!" but you have to say it, that's a fact. Who's gonna believe a dictator. It didn't make any sense at all. I'm not sure how long it was. It seemed like a very long time. Finally, he said, "Go on" and didn't respond. It was just an intriguing moment. And one of the things that made it intriguing was that he is such an actor. Almost nobody says anything negative (to) people in positions like Castro's. They never are contradicted. Nobody ever says, "That's not an issue." If they bring it up, it's supposed to be an issue. It was a wonderful thing. He and Lee Kuan Yew [Ed: Prime Minister of the Republic of Singapore] are the two smartest of all the dictators that I talked to.

That was the essence of our trip, we went ahead and covered a lot of stuff. We went down there with a big long list that Mike Posner's organization, the Lawyer's Committee for Human Rights, out of New York, not the law group here, long list augmented by the Miami Cuban community's list. And that turned out to be something of an embarrassment because that was the first time anybody had had access to the actual records of who was in jail and the jailers and people who put them there. They had hours and hours and hours of meetings with Cuban officials where they went over the list and who was in and who was out. Some of them had died. Some of them had been sent to

Miami years before. So we came back with a much better list. They actually supplied the names of some people that we didn't know. So it was a very useful trip.

But Castro is intriguing because his beard is trimmed so that it fits just into the space of his open collared shirt. And his khaki clothes, his casual khaki clothes, are starched and spotless. Someone told me that, in fact he might have said it to me himself, that everyday he wears new clothes, all new clothes, because of the CIA trying to poison his beard, speaking of dementias. No wonder those guys have trouble! In any case, he also would turn his way in the old time acting style, peeking at you out of the corner of his eye. He never did break eye contact. A lot of them see it as a kind of macho thing. I certainly did! Macho stands for, if you look away, you lose. So that's essentially all there was to it. But during the Administration we were monitoring Cuba carefully. We didn't really have any access. We officially were unable to do anything or get around. If someone got out we often talked to them. I do know that not long after or just before the end of the Carter Administration I went down to Miami to make a speech to the Cuban-American community. They were not thrilled, they are not interested in what is. They are selling all the time. Makes it rather difficult to have a substantive talk where you expect to get anywhere.

Q: I found in listening to the Greek Cypriots, they're the same ilk. They won't. This, of course, is always one of the great problems of the United States, dealing with immigrant groups, or people who represent, which would include the Jewish lobby and the Greeks are prominent. Pretty soon we'll have the Koreans and the Vietnamese but today those are some of the. Before of course we had the Irish who gave us all the. It used to be twisting King George's tail.

DERIAN: Well that's exactly right but what I find that we do, over and over again, is we really do pander to those groups. The most successful, the most powerful, are the people who have spent their entire adult lives working on behalf of Israel. So this is a lifetime passion and it springs from perfectly understandable causes but the fact is that you find that the Americans are more unreasonable than the Israelis.

When a couple of years ago in the 1990s Soros funded, through what is now called the Balkan Institute, small delegations of people to go to Macedonia and to Greece, when the Greeks had closed the border again, to see if you could find any kind of way to get through this. I'll tell you about that when we get to Greece. No, I'll tell you right now because this is what we're talking about. We walked into King Peter's summer palace.

We walked into the giant hallway. On either side are two huge, huge rooms. One of them probably twenty yards long. We're standing in the archway, Hodding and I and the other people in our group. And from the absolute far wall a voice says, "Patt! Hodding!" Comes racing towards us and I said, "Who is that?" Hodding said, "Somebody you know." I'm trying desperately to remember and Hodding says we were on the DNC (Democratic National Committee) together. So we got up, this fellow from New Hampshire who's been on the DNC since I went on in 1968 or maybe his son has taken his place.

In any case, there is such close contact that he had heard we were coming and came from New Hampshire to be present for this dinner. So he was sitting. A great long table and a huge lot of people, probably sixty people at this dinner, maybe eighty. I was sitting next to the local governor. And the table wasn't one of those great wide ones. It's just not too wide but wide enough that he and I can talk privately. And this man from New Hampshire is sitting across, directly in front of the governor. They were chatting over there and were having an interesting conversation. Then we got to a moment where logically those people would be brought in. I said, "Well" speaking to the other side of the table, I mean the man on the other side of me, I said, "Well, is anyone here willing to go to war over this issue of the name Macedonia and the symbol on the flag?" which was nominally their great problem. All the people who were Greek citizens currently or living in Greece full time drew back. It was a wonderful one of those physical reactions, all shaking their heads, except for the guy from New Hampshire holds his two fists up in the air and bangs them on the table and says, "Yes!"

These identifications are interesting. I had an Armenian father in law. If you think they're fierce! The poor Turks are never gonna have a chance. Let's go back to Central America.

Q: Let's talk about Central America. When you arrived, was Central America at all on your plate or how did those issues evolve?

DERIAN: It jumped up pretty quickly. The main thing on the plate that was acknowledged and that Congress had passed this specific piece of legislation about was Chile. Everybody was kind of in agreement that there were problems in Chile under Pinochet. We're talking about what was on the agenda. Chile was, and ARA was desperately trying to redefine what was going on in Argentina. Saying nothing about Brazil.

But what happened was that Argentina was just so terrible. It was there for us to deal with. I was going to Argentina but about the same time that I was going an organization in El Salvador called the White Hand had issued a death threat for, had given a date certain by which, they were foreigners, those foreign Jesuits had to leave the country. So I decided that since I was going that way anyhow I would go to El Salvador first. So I did and that was the first country I visited after taking up my duties at the State Department. We've already covered that.

Let me add one thing about Mexico, because we're thinking about El Salvador. One of the things that was curious, in a sense, to me in the beginning, anyway, was that there were a lot of El Salvadorans that really had to leave their homeland and where did they go? They went was Mexico, 'cause Mexico gave haven to anybody from anywhere, no matter what they were accused of. Very interesting, they just were stashed all over the place. And something that should be noted, that it really was an open country. All right now, let's see, there's Guatemala. Want to talk about Guatemala?

Guatemala was on the edge of the radar screen. Terrible things were happening there. A woman who worked in our bureau told me a stunning story. When she entered the Foreign Service and completed whatever that orientation period is, she was sent as a consular officer to Guatemala. She was a young woman and lived alone in the capital city, which very few young women did. She made a friend of a Guatemalan young woman who also lived by herself. She was from a fine family and it was somewhat scandalous that she lived alone but she was protected by her family name. The two of them usually walked to work together. They didn't live far from where the downtown was. In the course of the walks everyday they became very familiar with each other's lives.

The Guatemalan woman had a housekeeper and cook about whom she talked a lot and mentioned, very frequently, about the fact the housekeeper had an abusive and intrusive boyfriend. So as time went on the American Foreign Service officer said one day, "You haven't mentioned the problem of your housekeeper for a long time. How are things going there? What's happened to the boyfriend?" She said, without pausing or stopping, "Oh, I had him killed." The Foreign Service officer said first she laughed, because she thought it was a joke. Then her companion said, "No, no, I had him killed." She had that really sinking, sickening feeling and said, "How did you do that?" She said she paid someone a miniscule amount of money, like five dollars or 15 dollars. "He just became too annoying, disrupting my life, and bothering me and hard on my housekeeper." So that was the first bit of information I had that things were sort of loose there.

What else should we cover? Nothing much in the Caribbean. Oh, there was Panama. Oh, gosh. That's where President Carter's aide, I forget what his job was, maybe chief of staff, Hamilton Jordan said as time went that Noriega was his favorite dictator. That wasn't a funny thing to say. Silly, that was a public comment and probably true and he's not a stupid person. So I mean it was a stupid thing to say but it was a sort of thumb your nose kind of thing to say. It was bad. Things were terrible there. Richard Koster is an American from Brooklyn who had taught in universities in Panama for a long time and is also a wonderful novelist, married to a Panamanian woman who was a ballet dancer and the daughter of the woman who invented Panamanian human rights organizations and things, can't think of her name now. Interesting her daughter, who grew up a wonderful and well known dancer, when her mother died a few years ago stepped right in and continued it. But things were really terrible in Panama. I'm trying to remember how many…I went there a couple of times.

Q: Panama, of course, traditionally, we had tremendous investment in Panama, in the Canal and the military there. The Carter Administration had launched three major initiatives: working on the Panama Canal Treaty, there was Camp David or Middle East peace, and recognizing China. That's a full plate.

DERIAN: Also some people think human rights was one of them, too. Of course, when I first went there they hadn't really geared up yet. It was intended but it was not a full court press…

Q: Well, given all the U.S. equities in Panama did the Pentagon tell you to lay off because of the press of other interests?

DERIAN: Actually, I never telegraphed much there through anybody else. I didn't go talk to the people who were responsible for the human rights abuses. I talked to a number of people who were the recipients of the abuse. After I came back from that first trip, I'm trying to remember if I stopped there or whether I went back but I believe that I added a stop and I went to the Canal Zone.

Do you remember, from your interest in history, in World War II, (Brigadier General Anthony) McAuliffe, the 101st Airborne general who said, "Nuts!" to the Germans who had encircled Bastogne? Well, his son was the SOUTHCOM commander. I stopped to talk to him on one of my trips and I believe it was the first one because in the places that I went and I went to four countries, I guess, on that trip, the military people in our embassies were actively opposed to the human rights policy and were subverting it. And I used that word coldly and deliberately. What they were saying varied with their audience. One, Carter is inexperienced and just starting out and you don't have to worry about this human rights policy because he'll quit it. Or, don't worry about it, he's only going to be here four years and then he'll be gone. It's nothing, just sort of coast through it. Which turned out to be true, sadly enough. The other one was, can't remember what the third one was but it was of that ilk. The common thread through all of it is, don't pay any attention to this. And it was subversive and it was deliberately subversive.

The thing of it is it was very damaging to those governments. In fact, here's the way it was. The first human rights reports were written by the (Ford) administration before the Carter Administration. When they came forward, I may have told you this, there was some question about my going through them and seeing if they were all right. Which was patently absurd, I'd just arrived there. We were just assembling our office. We had one human rights officer when I arrived. The rest was all refugees. So I said, no, they were not our work and we didn't want to claim it as ours, in case it had been well done, which it could have been 'cause the fellow who was doing it was really a top notch fellow. But we would write our own. That first one only covered places that we gave foreign aid to.

Someone was not thinking. Obviously, those are our allies, people we care about. It was just a real blunder. In any case, the Brazilians, having been warned that there was nothing to all of this, raised unshirted hell and said, "We are not taking any more military stuff from you. We will not buy any more." They said it on the basis of being given bad information. I was told by such a large number of respectable people within the Foreign Service that David Rockefeller had traveled down through the Latin American countries to tell them not to be concerned about it, that everything was going to be all right. I don't know if that's true or not and I've never spoken with him about it, but that was definitely the rumor. Plenty of people

Q: How were you getting information that our military was saying this about human rights?

DERIAN: Oh, they'd tell me. They told me. They told the people that they talked to in the government. They told me as well. There was no hiding it or anything. So I went to see General McAuliffe about it and said, "These are your guys and I don't think you know that they're doing that." I found him so open and straightforward I believed him and do believe him now that he did not realize that they were doing that. We talked about it for quite awhile and he promised that he would send out a directive and outlined what he was gonna say in it to me, which was wonderful. He really seemed to feel that they should have known that. I actually thought that way but I was interested that he hadn't sent it because he assumed that they understood this was the policy of the government they represented. So I think he was somewhat annoyed. I know he was really irked they were doing it and he did send the cable, new instructions, real stern ones. I forget the form in which he sent it but the form was somehow significant, like an order. I don't know what it is.

Anyway, I also went down to the Panama Canal, which was a great adventure. I can understand how the Foreign Service would really get in your blood. I would never have gone down to that place from World War II. You walk in the water, practically. It was interesting, whole thing. In any case, I went there to talk to them about the School of the Americas and the things they were doing. [Ed: In 1980, the School of the Americas introduced a human rights course, and HA was invited to help develop and review the curriculum.]

Q: Could you explain what the School of the Americas is.

DERIAN: Well, the School of the Americas was an embarrassment to begin with and is dear to the hearts of the American military and the Latin American military. It was to teach professionalism of military tactics and strategy and training. Also to encourage people to want to buy American weapons and equipment. It was a school for the elite from the Latin American military and most of the governments of the time were military governments. It was a big sugar plum. It also taught interrogation, counterterrorism, intimidation of both individuals and populations. It had such a vile and evil component that nobody in this country ever ought to make fun of any of the things that the Latin military does. It's really terrible and disgraceful. I had never even heard of it when I came to the State Department. I would venture to say that hardly any Americans knew anything about it. It was pretty much an undercover kind of thing. It was there and nobody knew exactly what it meant.

In any case, I wanted to see the curriculum materials for the counterterrorism and that whole body of things that wind up on the black side. And they just looked me right straight in the eye and said they didn't do that. There was no question in my mind that they did. It was offered spontaneously. I never, ever inquired of any government person of another government about their participation or the participation of their military in that. And almost every place that I went, trying to think where I went that it wasn't mentioned, they told me. It had already been exposed in a book that I had not read but which someone in the State Department gave me which was a sort of civilian component of the same kind of material and that was the training of police officers in torture and

interrogation, intimidation and abuse of crowd control and of the terrible consequences in Brazil. Wasn't it the American ambassador to Brazil kidnapped? I've forgotten now. [Ed: Ambassador Charles Burke Elbrick was kidnapped in September 1969.]

Anyway, that incident is what is counted as the beginning of U.S. instruction in these kinds of matters. So they lied to me. Something "X" turned out to be its code name in the School of the Americas. In any case, that was Panama during the time of Trujillo.

Q: Moving down to Nicaragua, when the Sandinistas came in in July 1979 after years of bloody civil war, there seemed to be a certain amount of feeling from American liberals that maybe these are reformers. What was your understanding?

DERIAN: I can tell you, I am a Southern liberal and we didn't have much to do with foreign policy. There's a real difference between Southern liberals and Eastern liberals. Southern liberals, to a person that I know, got to be that, each person alone and we got to know each other after we had made that leap from the way we had been raised. In the East, it's the whole life, it's a life system. Maybe not as much as it used to be but when you read about it and talk to people whose parents were communists and Stalinists and then when the revelations came, that schism. When I was at the University of Virginia, in the Virginia Quarterly Review, and that was in 1949 and 1950 and 1951, in that time period, a man who had been twenty years or so since that information, maybe thirty years, about what Stalin was doing and the schism came, this man wrote in the Quarterly this heartfelt, heartbroken piece. Incomprehensible to me how, of course I was, what, twenty some years old, how could anybody be upset about something that happened thirty years before. I remember being shocked that he was still, his life had been ruined by it, that was the thesis of this piece. That his children had nobody to play with, they weren't invited to parties anymore, husband and wife had no friends, they had lost their job, they had to move out of the neighborhood. Everything in their lives was absorbed into that. While those people are not thought of as liberals, they are people who became American liberals, the ones that broke off. I don't know what happened to the ones that stayed Stalinist.

In any case, I didn't come there with a foreign policy position. The things that I knew about that I hated, I hated the war in Vietnam, I hated burning villages to save people, those kinds of things. And I hate dishonesty in government, which I saw a lot of and see a lot of today. In any case, when the Sandinistas came along I'm sure, in fact one of the people in my office had known Ortega and spoke of him as Danny, which is probably his name. I don't know if it's Daniel or not. In any case, he was kind of a counterbalance to my reaction. I'm not keen on people who do harm to civilians if they've declared war. So I wasn't pulling for anybody. I would actually, thinking in the beginning when I knew about it and not understanding the almost total corruption of Somoza, that he could be persuaded to change his way. It didn't take me too long to understand that that was not an option.

The plan was, you know there was a very elaborate plan devised with the Secretary of steps that would be taken to get Somoza to step down. It was, if he does this, then we'll

do this. If he doesn't do this, then we'll do this. Well, what happened was. Did I not tell you this? It sounds ludicrous. It was wildly funny, at the same time that it was just absolutely maddening, exasperating and bad to do.

I think Larry Pezzullo was our ambassador then. [Ed: The Carter Administration ambassadors to Nicaragua were Mauricio Solaun (non-career, served from September 1977 to February 1979 and Lawrence Pezzullo (career FSO, served from July 1979 to August 1981).] So the Ambassador had a meeting and I have no idea who it was in that group, that small group of people who worked out this policy, called Charlie Wilson and that fellow named Murphy who later went to jail. But when Larry Pezzullo walked into the meeting with Somoza, Charlie Wilson, Democratic Party congressman from Texas and heavily backed and supported by some lumber barons who had a lot of interest in Nicaragua and (John) Murphy Democratic Congressman from New York, who was Somoza's roommate at West Point, and who later went to jail for some other criminal act.

There they were, both of them, and they are sitting on either side of Somoza, on the other side of the table from the American ambassador. One of the most outrageous things I ever, ever heard of. Just a physical representation of utter corruption. Disgraceful!

Q: From your part, was this pretty much an ARA show? Because things being chaos, there really wasn't much to work with on the human rights, was there?

DERIAN: Oh, well, human rights violations tend to thrive in chaos and the fact is we had a huge lot to do. If you start with the fact that someone murdered Allende and just maybe, maybe. It was when we were there. I can't remember where it happened. The fellow that had been his ambassador, Letelier and a young American woman, named Ronni Moffitt were murdered by a car bomb explosion on September 21, 1976, near Sheridan Circle here in Washington. That was Chile, but there was a lot on the plate.

In any case, what happened is we had a great deal of human rights business there. In Nicaragua Larry Pezzullo was one of the few ambassadors who in the beginning seemed to get it from the start. And it wasn't some kind of knee jerk thing. It's an important and substantive issue and he treated it like that. When you start in a place in a circumstance like that you start on summary executions, torture and detention without charges.

Q: Was this on the part of both sides or this is on the part of Somoza? Both? Even when the Sandinistas came in, it continued?

DERIAN: You know, I just want to tell you an aside I thought was instructive for someone engaged in human rights, certainly, but almost for anybody dealing in a country like that, because we did tend to stir around and mess around in places. I went there on a dreadful trip, the only time I have ever been snookered by Americans. This was after the Carter Administration. Anyway, I was talked to by a woman who was the translator and interpreter for most of the news organizations.

Q: This was, the Sandinistas were fully in place by this time.

DERIAN: Yes. I was talking to this woman who was working for us and she said, at a reasonable place in the course of the conversation, "Don't talk to me about democracy. I don't want to hear about democracy. I grew up and So and So was the dictator and there's been one after another. So don't talk to me about democracy. I'm not interested in democracy. I don't want to hear anything about government. Here's what I want from government. I don't want 'em to know my name. I want them to leave me alone. I don't care what kind of government we have. I just want to be left alone by the government to live my life, raise my children." A woman educated in France at the Sorbonne, highly regarded, a real intellectual and she said, "I don't know anything about democracy and I don't want to know."

I think there are a lot more people around the world who are like that. So it makes me a little leery of this idea that we are going to impose democracy. We have a very specific thing we mean by democracy. I've just gone off the board of Freedom House. Always a little uneasy about it because they're the ones who put out the map about free and not free countries every year and their standard is essentially based on whether there's more than one party and of course whether people can participate. And they're becoming much more sophisticated. They have a wonderful executive director now that really has more depth than that, although he's kind of stuck with the form. It's an important aspect in thinking about what you're doing, what is the purpose of the United States talking about human rights? What are we aiming for? And it's not the mirror image of us.

Anyway, so for Nicaragua we did a lot of stuff and on the day-to-day human rights kind of abuses. And when Larry walked into that situation, we didn't go to the next step we had planned. There was such chaos and disorder within the building that was sort of "We made a mistake! We shouldn't have tried that!" kind of thing. And part of it is that I'm sure that through the generations, the Department of State has had wonderful people in the legislative liaison office. But I think it has institutionally had the most naïve and unsophisticated idea of what that office is for. It's almost as though people who work and are supposed to be politically astute know nothing about their own. It was fascinating to me, you've got smooth operators who could go up there and schmooze everybody but there was no institutional idea that they were fulfilling. They were just like freelancers, in a sense. That is, the Secretary would want this or that and so they'd go up and see if they could sell it, like Amway, which is a commercial firm which sells home products. But it also sells character and substance and turns people into super salesmen.

Q: Getting back to Nicaragua, early on the Sandinistas were seen as an improvement on the Somoza dictatorship and they attracted what I would call the glitterati, show biz people and they had all a favorable press.

DERIAN: They called them the Sandalistas. Did you know that? The Nicaraguans called, mostly those of European heritage, absolutely enchanted with what they thought of as this wonderfully successful children's revolution and the Nicaraguans named them "Sandalistas." I thought it was so wonderful.

Q: I suppose in this honeymoon period did we back off our human rights views? After all in time the Sandinistas weren't that much different from Somoza from a human rights point of view.

DERIAN: They were different because once they got in office they didn't kill a lot of people but they were certainly human rights violators on other scores. Also, over in the realm of confiscating people's houses and making themselves a big compound of the finest houses with guards around so that people couldn't go in.

Q: This was the upper, the inner circle of the Sandinistas.

DERIAN: Right. They were as venal a group as you would want to run across. But when they first came to power they came to the State Department and two or three of them came to call on me. Generally, my view of government is if they can go wrong they will. It's almost impossible to wield that power without overstepping. I'm definitely the eternal vigilant kind of person. So I was talking to them which was basically the standard discussion with people who have just come to power and often wanted to come and talk to me because of the name of the office to explain that all the U.S. government's worries were over because now they were there. So they told me that and I said that everybody always said that and that it was very important that the organizations which had been formed to try to help people do human rights. Anyhow, that the United States government was very interested in making sure that groups that had been formed and groups that would be formed to discuss human rights issues inside the country would not be harassed or shut down or in any way bothered by the new government. That in fact they would be free to operate, not that they would be taken over by the government.

Well, by the time I finished my little spiel all these heads are shaking negatively, "No, no, such organizations won't be necessary." Which is the standard answer. "We won't need those, we will take care of those. There won't be human rights violations and if there are we will have an office to take care of them." So then comes the little free people lecture but the handwriting was absolutely on the wall from the moment I saw the first little negative look to the frank statement that they won't be needed anymore. They were not ever respectful of the human rights organizations. Many of which had some people in them, not many because there weren't very many down there, but some of them really hoped the Sandinistas would win. That didn't last too long.

A funny aside. When they got up to leave, they were all pretty young looking but to the youngest one, I said, "Good heavens, you could be one of my children!" One of those shocking moments when you realize that this warrior, they were all dressed as though they had just stepped off the battlefield, instead of out of the Wardman Park or wherever they were staying. One of the few times when I just absolutely let myself get ahead of myself. And I could see that he was offended. I said, "It's just that you're so young and I'm so old. I can hardly believe how the world." Blunder, blunder, blunder. I was deeply embarrassed by that. They lived right down to their reputation. We didn't have an easy time with any of them.

But on the general situation of Nicaragua policy I was very disappointed in our government. Having worked out a thoughtful, serious group of steps to be taken, I think we could have headed off an awful lot of stuff if we had really stuck by it. When I heard that we were not going to take the next step, which I believe was breaking off relations, maybe, bringing Larry Pezzullo home. I'm not even sure that's exactly what one of the options was but whatever it was was carefully thought out by such a disparate group of people who were not in fundamental agreement on many aspects of this stuff.

[Begin Tape 5 Side 1]

Q: What caused the backing away from this plan? Was it just the situation?

DERIAN: Oh, walking in there with Charlie Wilson and Murphy. That was the thing. It was an incredible shock to find two members of Congress.

Q: On human rights in Nicaragua was anything coming from Secretary of State Vance, the White House, Warren Christopher, or were you kind of on your own?

DERIAN: In terms of trying to get Somoza to step down, that was full court press of the whole government. In terms of what we were doing about human rights violations... each embassy had a human rights officer and sometimes they were burdened with it and suffered mightily in terms of embarrassment that they had been stuck with this. Usually they were very junior officers and didn't know very much about the Foreign Service, diplomacy or human rights. But, they were often eager until they realized that it was a shady kind of business. A little bit like being the street walker in front of the Sunday school.

But things went on. We had discussion back and forth with Larry Pezzullo who is a very powerful kind of individual, experienced, brash, wise, smart with a whole lot of assets. I think that is why he was sent there because this was a real pain in the neck. He also understood the genesis of the human rights policy and the ideas that were its companions. Because he bothered to know all of those things he was able to enact them significantly. I wished we had more people who understood what we were doing and weren't reacting to the propaganda about it without thinking it through.

Q: Let's move through some other ARA countries. How about Colombia?

DERIAN: We did virtually nothing there in terms of a policy that I was engaged in. We had reporting back and forth between us and the desk and the embassy, but essentially there was nothing I was engaged in.

Q: Bolivia?

DERIAN: Bolivia I got into which probably would have stayed a routine office kind of working on human rights problems except for the person who was head of consular affairs, which is also the office that deals with Americans overseas?

That was an interesting sort of byway in the human rights policy and after I had been there a little over a year a delegation of parents of Americans in detention in Bolivia came to see me. Their children, who were all young adults, had for one reason or another been put into Bolivian prisons with no hope of getting out. It was all drug related. All of these people were there because they were charged with drug crimes. Some of them were actually mules. There were no high rollers involved. The parents before the Carter administration and in the early months of the Carter administration had been trying to act through the State Department and the consular office and the embassy to have various representations made on behalf of their children. Of course, they all wanted their kids to get out. They wanted charges filed, trials, lawyers, records and some sense that justice could be done and that the U.S. government would do what it could to obtain it. It seemed to me an extremely modest list of things.

They were quite realistic too. They didn't all come there with their hands on their hearts saying my youngest was innocent. But, some of them really were. One young man did not have a family member present because his only family member was his grandmother who was quite elderly and lived in California. But, the other parents were so concerned about his situation that they undertook to speak for him.

I saw everybody who wanted to see me and listened sympathetically. Since it wasn't my area, I didn't make any comment except the fact that I would, indeed, follow through because they had talked to the people on the desk and all sorts of people in the building and pretty much gotten the cold shoulder from everyone. The assistant secretary for consular affairs told them that it was too bad. When you went to a foreign country you had to obey the local laws and that was all there was to it and there wasn't anything that could be done.

The embassy was really keeping track of all the Americans jailed, although the parents were not told this. However, some of them knew it because they were dealing by telephone with the consular officers. But, they really got the cold shoulder in the building.

I can't remember if this was part of my first trip down there or during my second trip, but I decided we should go to Bolivia. Michele Bova and I think Fred Rondon were on the trip. In any case we went to visit the American prisoners in three places of detention. One American was in Santa Cruz and he was the lucky one. If I ever get detained I want it to be under the same circumstances of living on the main square in Santa Cruz, a sleepy, high humidity, warm, green place. Living with a pretty young woman of the town in a place of his own but he was under detention. I don't know if he was a high roller, but he was one step above some of the others' circumstances.

One of them was the son of some phenomenally wealthy American couple who had delivered him into the world and into the hands of an army of servants. The parents were almost always gone, leaving him with no real upbringing. He was a cocaine addict and had, in addition to an army of servants, an ocean of money at his disposal. He was into

the scene, I think he was in his mid-twenties, maybe a little older. I saw him in the hospital. He arrived in the place where we were to meet in the hospital with a red silk ribbon right under his nose to demonstrate that he had destroyed his septum with the cocaine. The ribbon could go into one nostril and come out the other. He was psychiatrically impaired. He was really mentally sick, in addition to being a coke addict.

The Bolivia system at the time had been altered. The DEA (Drug Enforcement Agency) had proposed a whole new set of statutes dealing with their interest. They had a very elaborate setup. After a lot of effort they had gotten Bolivia to change its drug laws. They also had DEA people in international airports along the southern border who would call up and give the names of people on the flight that they believed were coming down to buy dope or were drug addicts. At the time it was extremely hard in the United States to apprehend American citizens on cocaine charges. Sometimes the DEA was right and sometimes they were wrong, but whoever they fingered from Texas or Louisiana, or wherever else they flew in from, was picked up by the Bolivian police with the help of DEA agents at the bottom of the steps or at passport control. They would be taken to jail and usually mistreated. There were credible stories of DEA agents being in the room or just outside the door while they were being mistreated.

So, you had all of these people who if they had been transported to American jails under the same circumstances would have to have been released because of malfeasance on the part of the police, everything had been done wrong. That was the majority of the Americans. Now, the kid that only had a grandmother in the world had been in the Peace Corps twice and learned, as they all do, that when you come home you can return by going around the world if you want to. He was worried about his grandmother and felt he shouldn't take the long trip. In talking to her about it she said, "Well, if you don't want to go all the way around the world why don't you just come through South America." He decided to do that and was very excited about it. In Bolivia he went to a youth hostel where he met some people in the hallway and they got together. One boy played the guitar and they sat around, told stories and introduced each other. When they got ready to go to dinner, the guitarist said he would like to leave his guitar in the American's room and several others also left stuff of theirs. When they came back to his room, he was arrested because there was stuff in the guitar and backpacks that had been left. Some of them were actors or models who were cocaine addicts, because they had started to take the stuff to stay thin and were being used as mules.

Q: What could you do?

DERIAN: Well, the Bolivian legal system case materials was at that time written by hand by someone and when enough pages were gathered it was sent somewhere to have holes punched in it and a ribbon threaded through it and it was tied up. Their court system was moribund. So, the Americans might have been there 15 years or so. When I went to see General (Hugo) Banzer, president at the time, I raised it with him. [Ed: Banzer held the Bolivian presidency twice: from August 22, 1971 to July 21, 1978, as a dictator; and then again from August 6, 1997 to August 7, 2001, as constitutional President.] I said that as they had mostly been arrested at the behest of American agents and put in jail in Bolivia,

they could be tried in the United States since there were U.S. laws that had been broken as well and that we were very interested in having something move along. If a court could be convened to charge them, so they knew what they were actually charged with and if they could have lawyers to represent them, and a speedy trial (some of them had been there several years). If there was some hope for their families, who lived far, far away, that they might get a trial and serve a sentence if guilty or be able to leave the country if found innocent. We had an extremely reasonable discussion about it. I said that if the Bolivians would like to get the American detainees out of their hair since they were getting a lot of bad publicity over this issue, I could get an airplane here and just take them with me. If I could spring 30 or so that would be a big plus. The DEA was trying to impress us with the good strong cases they had against these detainees, but obviously not. They couldn't bring charges because the detentions had been compromised. It was an interesting kind of entry to a larger discussion, because you can't go to a country like that without finding out everything possible about the human rights practices, so after we got through talking about the Americans we drifted over into talking about Bolivia.

I was having altitude sickness because we had left El Salvador, got stuck in Panama and had to spend the night and sleep in the lounge which we didn't realize had no curtains so when we woke up in the morning there were 400 Panamanians peering into the plate glass window. Then to Bolivia where we got off the plane and immediately began visiting jails. We really had not slept and the altitude in La Paz is high. In the middle of the first night I woke up with crushing chest pains. We were in a brand new hotel but the phones didn't work. I thought I was having a coronary. They had had oxygen in the room but I had asked them to remove it because I was smoking in those days. I finally realized I had altitude sickness and was not actually going to die. However, the meeting with Banzer was the only meeting I ever had where I took a piece of paper with me because I was seeing double. I was so dizzy, I don't know what made we think I could read from it. I thought I might forget what I was doing there. When I first sat down, Banzer was like the Alfred Hitchcock movie where the faces are melting into each other and rotating. He asked if I was feeling well. Was I having any trouble with the altitude? I said, "Yes, I was." He said he would get some tea for me. Of course, I discovered later it was tea made from coca leaf, but it certainly did hit the spot for about fifteen minutes.

After talking about the American detainees, I told him that I would like to talk about human rights here in Bolivia. He leaned forward with a very friendly expression on his face and looking off into the middle distance he said, "When you go to other countries and talk to their presidents, are you ever told that you are interfering in the internal affairs of their country?" I said, "Why no. Would you like to tell me that?" He said, "Oh, no, no, no. I just wondered." It was a very sweet moment and we chuckled.

Then we did have a substantive talk and a very useful one for me because we were talking about elections. He said that we had to understand the peculiar circumstances that they had that made it virtually impossible for an election to do any good. That was that they had a phenomenal number of parties, a small population scattered throughout the mountains, and no way for anyone to get a majority and there were too many for any dealing or alliance making.

The conversation was helpful in many ways. Some Bolivians believe that the visit was kind of the beginning of an effort to get their act back together and start trying again. There is a much better chance in a smaller country once there is an opening, but making the opening is really hard. Paraguay was the perfect example of it, with a small population in spite of the dictator's statement that the country was surrounded by enemies and they had to put Paraguayans in jail. Once there was an opening, change came.

Q: Let's take Bolivia. When you go there what do you say?

DERIAN: I don't feel I have to say anything. It is not like a SALT (Strategic Arms Limitation Talks) treaty. Have I ever told you what I say to them?

Because I think there is a lot of misunderstanding on the part of Americans about what this policy was for and the idea of the policy which was really a direct consequence of the television coverage of the war in Vietnam. Folded into that was the United Nations Human Rights Declaration, the Nazi and Japanese, all the bad things that had happened before. But you could say that the real impetus was a tape of a young child running naked and on fire down the road in Vietnam. That's what made us establish a human rights policy. We looked at ourselves as a people and we were shocked. Nothing that we thought about ourselves as a people or taught our children about ourselves was apparent in that picture. Everything went out the window that we would be willing to put children in that situation. Nobody had seen a war before every night at dinner. It was a reasonable reaction that we were not ever going to be party to, much less do it ourselves, was to be the starter for the people who were our allies. So, you look at the Argentine junta not as an ally we needed. But, if you think of Latin America as a kind of farm team for the American military, in between wars when you have nothing for them to do, you turn them into diplomats.

Q: Military advisors.

DERIAN: Right. Or as Kissinger said the Southern Cone was like a bag of onions at the heart of Antarctica. That was not a bad description and it gave me the opportunity, when they were getting excited about El Salvador, to say that El Salvador was a butter knife armed at the underbelly of Texas. Well, we decided that American citizens did not want their tax dollars used for human rights violating governments to control their own people. And that essentially was what the beginning of it was. Why should we give them any kind of financial or military aid when, if any thing, it was making enemies for us? It was not what the American people wanted to do with their money.

That is very easy for them to understand and is a much shorter spiel when you are sitting there doing it. You talk about the various pieces of the legislation, many of which they didn't know in the beginning. This is what caught the Brazilians out. They had no idea that military spare parts were included in the law. It was a wonderful, wonderful moment after they had made this big, worldwide pronouncement about spurning American

military aid, they discovered they were loaded with American military equipment and couldn't get any technical support or spare parts.

Q: Before we leave Bolivia, was there any follow up during your time on those American prisoners?

DERIAN: I've forgotten how it was resolved, but it was all over within a year, the sentencing.

Q: Part of it was getting a series of treaties whereby Americans could serve sentences in the United States.

DERIAN: We already had that. When I said that we could bring them home, we could have, although I'm not sure they would have sent me an airplane. The ambassadors and political officers who have these jobs, particularly at that time when the policy was so new, consisted of a lot of holdovers from those realpolitik days when one had extremely cordial relations no matter how much you might despise a country's leadership because it either concerned American security or money and those were your two interests. This made it much simpler until you had a dispute, to dance and stand in reviewing stands, carry on commerce and help American businessmen. We were just looking out after our own interests. As far as I can see, that was the basic premise of diplomacy and realpolitik. It didn't matter who was running the country. That really started changing after World War II and was unrealistic for a democracy of this size. Some of the changes have been wonderful and some were demented, I think.

Q: To complete the Latin American circuit, what about Paraguay and Uruguay?

DERIAN: Most of what I did in Paraguay personally, you know Bob White was in Paraguay [Ed: career FSO White was Ambassador in Paraguay from November 1977 to January 1980.] and he was on their case every minute. There was a lot of stuff back and forth between our office and the embassy. When I went to see Stroessner after the administration was over a year or so, I found it wasn't necessary. He really had the picture.

Bob White was gone by the time I got there in a visit with Americas Watch. Stroessner was certainly well informed, although utterly corrupt. That was a wonderfully intriguing trip for me. We had steady work finding out about people and people who were being tortured and talking about it. There wasn't a straight line ever over intensified violations in the country, which is what happens if there is no interruption in the thing.

In Uruguay, I didn't actually want to go there, but we had an ambassador who was a political appointee who loved Uruguay [Ed: Ambassador Ernest Siracusa served from September 1973 to April 22, 1977]. Uruguay had a wonderful geographic position and was a democracy until the military took over. They were really a nutty group. In any case, one of the reasons he loved it was that he collected antique automobiles and Uruguay only had antique cars because for some reason they hadn't been able to import

any for a long time and were very proud of their old cars and drove around in them. He was a big time executive of some sort with a massive amount of money and he absolutely would call me up in the middle of the night; he would call Hill who was the Ambassador in Argentina, he called everybody to tell me that I absolutely had to come to Uruguay. Hill was a Republican, Spain was his favorite embassy. In any case, I said, "Okay, I will come if I can get a seat on the airplane." So, of course, two people were bumped, which I didn't like.

In any case, the ambassador was very interesting. He wanted me to talk to them about their practices and he was the best briefer on what was happening there. He liked the country so much and admired the earlier democracy so much, he was really outraged that the military was doing the bad stuff they were doing. In a way it didn't make any difference that he cared that much. These people, it was almost like dealing with make believe people when dealing with the Uruguayans. The military didn't have to be clever to do what they did because the people were innocent of the sort of stuff that they came in and did. So, there was no frame of reference for anyone to deal with. They tortured people, children, killed them, put them in detention. They were part of that underground of security people that operated between the ABC (Argentina, Chile, Brazil), Paraguay, Uruguay, Chile and occasionally Bolivia. So you could get snatched in Rio de Janeiro and fetched up in Asuncion or wherever they wanted you. Those people knew each other and our people also knew them. They were not party to them in terms of being participants, but they knew when they were going to meet and where they were going to meet and who they were going to snatch and who they weren't going to snatch.

There was a wonderful man that I liked a lot who was the fellow in Argentina, a very smart man. He and I had really great discussions about that practice of U.S. security people being essentially complicit by knowing and not reporting. Usually the ambassadors didn't know unless you had somebody like Bob White who was on the case all the time. The Uruguayans were just bad. They didn't have a philosophy. It was almost as if they had been recruited, taught to salute, and do what they were told. There was not a lot of thinking that went on. They didn't really know what they were looking for.

There was one instance when someone at a newspaper setting type in the middle of a classified ad wrote two words in Spanish, "military queers" and nothing else. Two people were killed, the paper was shut down, the publisher and editor, which may have been one person, had some terrible sanctions imposed. They just went berserk. Almost everything they did had this quality of madness about it. They came to the UN and I met with them up there. It was absolutely fascinating. Among other things, we talked about military queers and how that made them the laughing stock. They absolutely couldn't deal with it. You were not supposed to call people names like that. They were offended. I don't feel we got anywhere there because eventually, what always happens is they are thrown out by their own people. I never had any illusions that we were going to make a revolution anywhere; we were offering a framework for a way out. Most of the people who could have done everything that I could do being present on the scene were handicapped by the old method of always being polite. So, the only way the old school could come and talk about torture and summary execution and really terrible things – you can't just assert it,

you have to prove it, so that they know you know - was to get mad. Then the environment becomes I am mad at you, not just at what you are doing. I'm convinced you absolutely cannot be personal and attack people that way. You shake hands, you smile, you don't get red in the face, you don't bang on the table. In fact, the cooler you are the more likely you are to be able to say your whole piece.

Q: What about Brazil?

DERIAN: Brazil was really a fulminating horror story in terms of violations and the integrity of the person. They were the only technological innovators in the field of torture. Torture is pretty much the same the world over with people using more or less the same technique. But, the Brazilians invented a number of things. For instance, they are the people who invented the refrigerator where you have a big refrigerated room like a place where you keep a whole lot of meat, with special light and sound capabilities. They would take people into that room and secure them to a chair, sometimes just a stool with no back, and with no clothes on. Sometimes they would throw water on them and some times they wouldn't. They would lower the temperature and make it very, very cold. There would be lights that flashed and huge volume control of sound. One of the people who asked to come and see me came to tell me about the one person, as far as anybody knew, who had been through that and who had not been psychotic when they emerged. The person was not in good shape but his cognitive abilities were working. I have no idea if the torture rehabilitation place in Sweden or the one in Minnesota ever gave him a helping hand.

There were a couple of other innovations. As far as I know, no one has picked up the refrigeration room technique, probably because it would be very expensive. In any case, they were very bright and very, very bad and cruel to the people they detained. Looking over the field, I think that they were probably the people who were the designers of the underground. It was like another level of government completely out of sight, these security people. Actually, it went on after Argentina elected its first president. I have no idea if it is operating now.

Q: What were you doing and how did the embassy play into this?

DERIAN: It was on the second or third trip and I went with (Secretary) Vance. Vance went to Argentina and part of it was the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the nuclear weapon thing and the other part was human rights. He did a good job, he saw a lot of those mothers. It was a really great trip and very helpful to me and certainly to the Argentine people who were in bad shape. He also had Brazil on the trip to talk about the treaty. [Ed: Secretary Vance visited Argentina once, November 20-22, 1977. On that trip he also went to Brazil, November 22-23, and Venezuela, November 23.]

In Brazil on that trip was a stopover, which included lunch, and most of the afternoon. Our talks were all at the luncheon table. When the Secretary travels you have a lot of people going along. I tried to go when he went, so that nobody would notice that I went because I never wanted any press. I really believe in quiet diplomacy. We were all seated

at big round tables. I was at the head table with the Brazilian Foreign Service people who were hoping to contain me and mollify me.

What happened was a very funny thing. They weren't used to dealing with women and so they had obviously planned their scenario very carefully of how to approach me. The man sitting next to me said, "Well, we know that you don't understand why we do what we do and why we have to do it." So, we talked about that for a little while. I stated my case and they stated their case. Then he said, "You know, I would like to tell you a story that will help you understand us better. It is an important story." He told me this long, long story, an anecdote not about human rights at all, but entirely about human rights and the problems between our two countries on this knotty issue. He said, "Do you understand that?" I said, "Yes, I do." I didn't say anything else. He said, "Maybe I had better tell you again." So, he told me the whole same story again. He said, "Did you understand it?" I said, "Yes, I did." He was waiting for me to tell him what I understood. He said, "Maybe, so-and-so should tell you, I don't think I have made it clear." I said, "Well, I would be glad to hear someone else tell the story." So, this other guy across the table tells me the same story again. Then they were all leaning forward waiting for my response. It was so much fun.

I finally said, "Well, here is what I want to tell you. I come from the southern part of my country and we transmit our most important information by telling stories just like the story you told me and I am not going to tell you what I learned from your story, but I will tell you that I understood it." We are all sitting there for a while and I said, "Oh, one more thing. We can't wait. We have to start now." That was the point of the story, if you don't say anything anymore about us and if you don't do anything then we will clean up our act. Everybody is struck dumb for a little while and I was calmly eating my dessert by this time, I think, and somebody said, "Well, we really need time." I said, "Yes, you do need time because you made such a mess here that it is going to take you a long time to clean it up. But, there has to be good faith and visible effort. There has to be markers put down so that I'm not the only person outside of Brazil who knows it. Those who live here need to know it, too." I thought that was about the most fruitful meeting I ever had in terms of the size and extent of the problem and it did take them too long.

Q: I suppose the Brazilian diplomats probably didn't have much clout with the powers-that-be who were mainly military.

DERIAN: Well, yes they were, but the people who were meeting with Vance were also military and I'm sure some of the people at my table were part of the regime. In fact, I know that the fellow who told me the story two times was a diplomat and I think the other guy was not.

Q: The Brazilians have the reputation of having the most professional diplomats which means whatever is said to them they make sure it gets up to the proper people. Whether anybody acts on it is another story.

DERIAN: Well, they did start.

Q: Today is June 12, 1997. Let's do a tour d'horizon of Europe starting with Ireland.

DERIAN: The main interesting thing I think about Ireland, in the context of that time and that office, is the difficulties between the IRA and their opposition and the British government. It was a particularly awful time. Many IRA people were in prison for their terrorist acts. We had an ongoing watch on that. The most interesting of those stories was that the prisoners had decided that they wished to be political prisoners and not criminal prisoners. They didn't want to wear the prison uniform so a lot of them were going around without any clothes on at all. It dawned on me because of a congressman who went to jail, a fellow from New York who had been a police officer and was from an Irish district but he was Italian, can't remember his name. Well, he started calling me up and telling me that if the Brits didn't do a certain thing and if we didn't cause the Brits to do a certain thing by a certain date then the IRA was going to act. In the beginning they were just vague threats that I took note of. Then he called me one day and said that if something wasn't done on their behalf there was going to be bombing on such and such a day, which was during the Christmas season. I said to him, "You know, you are required by law to report this to a proper official in the government even though you are a member of congress." And he said, "I am, I am reporting it to you." I said, "I'm not the right official and I want to tell you this. If you don't report it then I will report you as well as your story and even though you are in congress you will be in a lot of trouble." He was trying to squeeze me to be their advocate inside the building but I had decided some time before that I don't consider knee capping a little boy who doesn't want to join the IRA as something I could support.

Q: Tell us what knee capping is.

DERIAN: It is shooting, mostly children in this case, in the knee. When they are somewhere around 12, 13, 14, and the IRA wished them to be recruited, if they refused, they got shot in the knees. They were bombing buses and performing other acts of terrorism. I was not willing to be an advocate for our doing something to prevent them from doing something. I am not keen on blackmail.

Then he called me up one day and said he absolutely had to see me and that it would be a private talk. I went up to his office and he came out and shook hands and took me into his office. Then he said, "Excuse me, I have a telephone call," and he stepped out of another door and in rushed three Irish people from the IRA who were also trying to pressure me. It was a real setup. Then he came back into the room and as we were all standing there a photographer rushed in and took my picture with him. They were going to use it in their newspaper. I do not know if they used it or not, but I did say they were not supposed to do that. We had a terrible confrontation. Wish I could remember his name, because I would like to have that on the record. [Ed: Mario Biaggi, Democratic Congressman from the Bronx, New York, 1969-1988]

Also there was the question of legislation on military and police aid to countries that were gross violators of human rights. It was a very heavy handed period there for the Brits and

they had been trying to get a lot of weapons for the Ulster constabulary. Our office had been holding firm. Then the word came that Margaret Thatcher was coming [Ed: Thatcher was Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 1979 to 1990 and the Leader of the Conservative Party from 1975 to 1990.] There were great shivers throughout the building. Everybody was pretty much insisting that it would be really terrible, particularly the Brits, if she was not able to go home without the weapons order resolved. It was a wonderful duel. This was another time when it was really good to be a woman because I was getting a lot of talk about courtesies due and that kind of thing. It was really wonderful. She didn't get it. It was a great battle.

Q: You came from the liberal wing of the Democrat Party and there has always been an Irish ethnicity to the party. Did you get pressure from that quarter?

DERIAN: Well, don't forget my name is Patricia Sue Miriam Murphy. My grandfather came from Ireland and was a police officer. We have our standards, and hurting children for political reasons and attacking civilians are not condoned. I don't remember Teddy Kennedy pressuring me. Actually it was a little hard.

Q: Did you ever go to Ireland?

DERIAN: I did. Do you remember when the nuns were murdered in El Salvador [Ed: December 2, 1980]? One of the women [Ed: Jean Donovan] was not a nun. She was a very young woman who worked with the religious order. Although an American, she had gone to a university in Ireland [Ed: University College Cork] and had been highly regarded there and so as a memorial they started an annual lecture in her name. They invited me to come and give the inaugural lecture [Ed: 1983]. That is the only time that I have been to Ireland.

Q: Did the human rights portfolio cause you to get involved in London or Washington with the British on the problems of IRA prisoners?

DERIAN: The only significant time I remember is one I like a lot. When we put out the country reports, a man, who handled Irish affairs at the Foreign Office, called me saying "You really let us down. We were counting on your report to be so tough that we would be able to use it to advance inside our building." I was greatly impressed with that call. It was a very friendly call but a very serious point was made. I read the report over and realized that it could have been better. I don't think anybody pulled back on purpose. I don't remember anybody trying to do that. But, it was a telling moment.

Q: Did you begin to develop the feeling as indicated by the British civil servant that these reports were used as instruments for people within a government to use them against their own security forces?

DERIAN: Yes, there was no doubt about it. It came up over and over again. Someone would pull you aside and say, "I'm so glad you mentioned so-and-so." One man, a government official, said to me somewhere in Asia that he was so happy that we had used

the name of his friend because he thought he would never see him again and he was released. He thought this was due to the report.

Q: Well, it is an interesting phenomenon. The initiatives which come out of various branches of the American government which are often condemned but at a certain point they drive the issue forward.

DERIAN: Yes, that is true. For a democracy, though, it is more than that. If you are going to have standards by which you calibrate your relationship with another state or government, you pretty much have to, if nothing else, try not to get egg on your face like jumping in bed with Mobutu [Ed: President of the Republic of Congo, renamed Zaire], the Shah [Ed: leader of Iran until 1979], not counting the reasons for doing it. Those are dark marks in history and almost nobody acting on the scene wants to have a dark mark particularly of that type where you seem to be pandering. It is embarrassing to be thought of as a panderer.

Q: Okay, what about Germany? Any issues that came up about Germany?

DERIAN: There was the matter of the guest workers. During the Carter administration, the West German government was confronted with the fact that they had allowed immigrant people into the country for employment doing menial work. Germany had become so well educated, so rich, everybody was making a lot of money and there were millions of benefits and no ethnic German really was keen about sweeping the streets and doing those kinds of jobs. So, they imported a bunch of people from Turkey. What happened was they got married to each other and had babies who were considered Turkish babies by the Germans and German babies by their parents. There was lots and lots of verbal conflict which was a bad scene and I did discuss that with them. That is the reference on the last tape at the end of the other one where the man I spoke with who was maybe the under secretary for political affairs' counterpart was very cool to the idea that we would be having this discussion or even that the United States would be having something called the human rights policy and go around bothering everyone. He was very polite, but very cold and decisive about it. Then he came here and invited me to dinner when he was US ambassador and said that wonderful thing I mentioned earlier.

I had actually gone to Germany to discuss with them the idea of the human rights policy and our intent. What our law said. Then they took me for a helicopter ride along the Berlin Wall. It was several high strands of barbed wire and at each place where there was a fence pole there were rosette shaped metal objects about as big and round as a biscuit cutter. It was ploughed ground on the East German side which was mined, and you couldn't see the mines. When someone stepped into the ploughed part, the closest of those rosettes attached to fence posts would fly out sideways. They are called daisy cutters and would spin around and whatever they hit they sliced up. Out there in the middle of the most beautiful countryside where everything seemed so peaceful, where children played and dogs went by, it is really something that is hard to believe. It is really important to see them so they don't just become something you have read about over and over again. That was a wonderful trip.

I can't remember much else that we did there. I think when we went there it was to also ask them if they would cooperate with us in some endeavor, but I can't remember what that might have been or if they said yes or no.

Q: What about France? Any issues?

DERIAN: There were ongoing issues but none that I dealt with particularly. Algeria was over. France was pretty funny. You could drop a lot of people into France and they didn't seem to care who came. They have grown a little uneasy since the Ayatollah Khomeini visit and various acts of terrorism. But I don't think much was cooking with them then. I would have liked to have had a long talk with them about Zaire and I would also have liked to have many of our own people in the same discussion about supporting Mobutu.

Q: What about Portugal, Spain, and Italy?

DERIAN: Not much. I did go to East Germany. When I went there it turned out that I was the highest ranking American official to go there since Germany split. So, they were quite delighted. You know how the nuances are very important to European diplomatic services. We talked about the problem of the religious people there. There were only a handful of Jews and they could not practice in any way. They had had two rabbis from the end of World War II who had passed on a very short time before I got there. There were also certain other churches we talked about.

One of the most bizarre conversations I have ever had was an explanation of how they were building a godless society. You read about this stuff and it is hard to believe that anybody can sustain this political plan, and in the months before they had started to ease up. They told this story about rebuilding all these churches. On intuition or a shot in the dark I said, "That sounds like something the West Germans are paying for." Total silence. What that was was West Germany was buying people out of East Germany all those years and designating the money for the rehabilitation of churches and things.

The American ambassador had a dinner party at which the East German officials were insulting to him at the table. They would make fun of him. I think it was because he was a black man. He was having a very, very difficult time there. I was shocked and said to them after dinner individually that I had been shocked and ashamed of their behavior as human beings. There was a funny thing and that is there was a gnome-like man sitting next to me who complained because they didn't think the ambassador was distinguished enough, but at least he was complaining privately. I said, "Let's change the subject. I am not going to listen to you insult my ambassador and my country this way. You ought to be ashamed and should know better." He said, "Well, I'll tell you. My family is getting ready to have an enormous family reunion and there will be some huge number of people coming from all over East Germany." I said, "Oh, it's fun to have a family reunion." He said, "Yes, we are celebrating our 100th year of socialism as a family."

Q: Is there any point in raising human rights issues with the East Germans?

DERIAN: Oh, yes. I think it is sort of like wife beating. If nobody seems to notice, you feel you have been given permission. Someone who means it has to assert it. You can't go in and recite from the note in your hand and hope to make any impact. I must say I haven't heard from any of them since the change but I expect they are all getting rich and buying new furniture and clothes.

We had a chiefs of mission meeting pretty early on in London and I think in the morning part I did my little dog and pony show about the new policy. Then we broke for lunch. It was a very informal thing, sort of like leaving the office and going to the cafeteria in the same building. As I went through the line and picked up my food a bunch of men were sitting at a table and one of them invited me to join them. The man turned out to be Larry Eagleburger, who was outraged and declared that he was not going to fulfill any of the requirements of the Carter administration. He knew what he was doing. I think he was ambassador to Yugoslavia at that time. [Ed: from 1977 to 1980]

He was wonderfully offensive, so rude, so snide, so patronizing. It is always so refreshing to meet someone like that when you are going around being the world's sweetest, highest person. I always liked to let them go on until they run down before I reply. It was extremely exhilarating to me to discharge my daisy cutters, so to speak. It was a good moment and one I didn't forget. I actually never heard from him again.

What else was on the European horizon? There was also the CSCE (Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe) which was interesting. It has now become OSCE (Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe). In any case, when I got there someone in congress mentioned to me that there was a CSCE commission that had been instituted by the U.S. congress and was not bureaucratically linked with any cabinet level office. It was its own free standing thing. On the U.S. commission were two people from the House, two from the Senate, one from Defense Department, and one from State. And State's human rights person was supposed to be a member.

When you get ready to do something like a job that you don't know anything about, you hear a whole lot of things. After a few weeks, Art Hartman, who was the Assistant Secretary for European affairs, invited me to come to the EUR Bureau and have a look at it and meet the people. I was very eager to do that. At the end of a very useful explanatory discussion he said, "By the way, there is a committee [and he described the CSCE commission] and your office is designated but you have so much on your plate. The commission is full of economic and military plans and although there is a human rights component the most important, of course, is the cultural component. So, probably you wouldn't want to fool with that. You will be too busy. I think, Joe Duffy, with his USIA (U.S. Information Agency) background since he does the cultural stuff, would probably have more time and would be more useful." I said, "Well, that was interesting." He said, "Well, do you agree?" I said, "No, I don't think I could do that before I talk to my own people and see how they feel about it. I don't have enough background to decide, so I want you to understand that I am not agreeing to this." He said, "Well, we will talk in a few days." I said, "Okay, that would be good."

I walked out of his office and just realized that when I got into the hall that Joe Duffy's office was right next door. I walked into his office and there was his office door open so I marched in and said, "Hi, listen I understand you are just dying to have this job on the CSCE commission." He said, "Oh, no. Where did you hear that?" I said, "Oh, well, Art Hartman told me that you would really like to do it. That it would be a logical thing." He said, "Well, you know, it probably would be fun." I said, "Well, I believe that actually the human rights person is supposed to be on that, Joe." He said, "Well, listen...

[Begin Tape 6, Side 1]

I went back to my office and was really pretty irritated. I decided I would just put it aside for a few days and think about it at a later time. Within the next few days I had to go over to the White House and after I finished my meeting and as I came out, Dante Fascell, a congressman from Florida and the head of the House Foreign Affairs Committee was there. He said, "Well, how is it going?" I said, "Well, it seems to be going along all right. A funny thing had happened." He was also the father of the CSCE and originally the person in charge of it. I just gave him a brief summary and said, "I really think I am not going to be the person who does this." He had the most wonderful reaction. His face turned almost purple. He picked up a phone with a shaking hand and called Cy Vance. I stepped away; I did not want to eavesdrop. He hung up the phone after not saying much. When I turned around he said, "I don't think you are going to have that problem." It was serendipitous to say the very least. I would never have called him about it.

Q: When you are at a CSCE meeting, what kind of reaction did you get from the other members on the subject of human rights?

DERIAN: The Canadians, of course, had been having a human rights policy which they didn't talk much about but which they pushed with vigor. There was a wonderful man, Ambassador Bohlen, who was their great expert and had been doing it for a long time. That worked out fine. He had a big argument about putting human rights into the conference, so most of that was over. Most of them, particularly Europeans, never thought they would be called upon to actually do anything or say anything. They were not keen on cooperating in any way. I think their idea was that they would quietly assist individuals or if they had something, they might speak... The way it happened with the U.S. under Kissinger was that something would happen that was considered an outrage and the ambassador, if necessary, would be dispatched to raise hell with the government. That was kind of a global policy. Most ambassadors had had very little background training on the U.S. legislation on these matters or on the Universal Declaration or any of the structures that had grown up around the world, and consequently had to get mad to do it. These were people that they played tennis with, stood on platforms with, had dinner parties for and it was very hard. Human rights is the main thing that I think is missing from the Foreign Service training. For several years, I was invited to come over and talk about human rights, but a one or two hour lecture is not training. That's like reading about it in the New Yorker magazine. So, I do think there is a great deficit there and I

hope it is better now. Human rights diplomacy is not hard but it is definitely a separate entity.

Q: Yes, it is hard to have friendly relations and then all of a sudden go bouncing in and raise the human rights issue.

DERIAN: But you can do it. I watched several ambassadors try to do it. Ambassador Hill, who was in Argentina, just went in and had a temper tantrum yelling and shouting.

In any case the CSCE commission didn't meet much. The first follow up meeting took place, also in Yugoslavia. I went to that and then was called away, I can't remember why. May be it was the second meeting. There was a description of what I had said in a Soviet foreign affairs magazine (Literary Gazette). It was all wrong because I hadn't spoken at the meeting at all because I had to leave before my time to speak. A black woman from the United States spoke and they had simply switched our names. It was very funny and wonderful because for years after, whenever I saw any Soviets associated with it, I was able to twit them about the article.

Anyway that was a useful time, where meetings of the CSCE commission enabled me to meet a lot of contacts for the office and to talk to people so that they had a better fix on what we were doing. Mostly that was the effort.

Q: Let's move to the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania and Bulgaria.

DERIAN: The State Department had a big apparatus that was not confined to the human rights bureau because there was a great deal of activity in the European bureau and there was a great deal of pressure from the immigrant communities. So, there was lots going on, lots of information available, lots to gather and an enormous opposition about saying a discouraging word to the Soviet Union. It seems to me that in that earlier period under Kissinger that the U.S. attitude towards the Soviet Union was a lot like Jeane Kirkpatrick's and Ronald Reagan's. All that pandering to a lot of right wing dictators. Jeane Kirkpatrick said that we needed to be friends and shouldn't impose this terrible human rights policy on them because we needed their votes in the UN and because we needed them for allies in the fight against communism. Once you thought about what people here who didn't want to discuss human rights stuff thought about it, it mostly amounted to the fact that the Soviet Union was seen as invincible, inevitable, unbelievably strong and that there was nothing we could do but live with them as they were.

Q: Also I remember when Jimmy Carter came in he first appointed FSO Malcolm Toon (January 1977-October 1979) as Ambassador to the Soviet Union and then businessman Mr. Thomas Watson (October 1979-January 1981) on the assumption that maybe we can all be friends together. A lot of people think this is pretty naive.

DERIAN: It was pretty naive. What I suggested to no avail was that we were never going to get on a footing where we could have confidence in anything that we did with them or

they with us because we weren't straight with them and they weren't straight with us and that it might be at least a novel and not expensive thing to actually play straight. Not threaten to do anything we were not willing to do. But, that suggestion didn't go anywhere.

You know, it is really shocking to realize how much stuff we slipped under the rug in the name of national security. And the fact is our information was not good. It is the same as in Iran. We had no idea actually what the state of the place was. I don't understand how we got that way. But, in any case we had a lot of tension. Tom Watson came to see me and said he was not going to raise these issues because he thought that we should have a friendly relationship. I tried to persuade him that perhaps we would have a friendly relationship, a straight one, an honest one.

In any case, the embassy there did gather the information. Marshall Shulman from Columbia University was sort of the Soviet adviser who made what I consider a key error in organization, by commuting back and forth. He would come and stay in Washington, maybe Monday through Friday and then would return to New York. He wasn't attached anywhere and didn't have any apparatus. He had somebody who answered his phone and maybe a couple of young people who were assistants, but you have to be in the game. You can't stand on the edge and play, so he finally retired. He tried to explain the Soviet Union to me and why we couldn't raise these issues and why this was childish and naive. I have to say we didn't see eye-to-eye on human rights issues.

Of all the shocking things that happened bureaucratically, this is one of the ones that was most shocking to me. On the day that he delivered his farewell to his colleagues at the Secretary's meeting he talked about the Soviet Union. Then he said that the human rights issue is just pandering to the American public and is not reality. There is nothing to be gained for the United States by acting on principle.

I was carrying around a paperback mystery and I took out my pen and wrote on the back of it what he said because I didn't ever want to forget that in that place in this country at that time anybody would put forward an idea like that and not be challenged by anybody. It was shocking. But, it is an explanation of how it went.

We were extremely busy. We were busy on religious matters, on the people who were trying to work for peace and getting banged up, etc. Georgy Arbatov, head of the U.S.-Canadian Institute which was a big political and propaganda outfit, came to see me and acted like a tough guy, like Larry Eagleburger. It was the same general approach and also quite refreshing to me because he banged on my table and I got to bang on the table and we shouted and yelled at each other. The Foreign Service officer taking notes put his hand over his face as if to shade his eyes from the sun and wrote and wrote and wrote. I was never sure whether he was crying or laughing or just thought something would explode and he would try to protect his vision. It was a wonderful freewheeling time but utterly useless in the long run. He criticized our role in Jewish emigration, obviously a sensitive subject.

Also I tried very hard to see everyone who came out of there because I wanted to make sure that we weren't doing harm to people who were political opponents of the regime or whatever. I saw a lot of military people, a few dancing people. Rostropovich wouldn't come and talk with me. He was the only person who refused. We had a lot of dealings with the Sakharov family here. His step daughter and her husband were very active.

Yelena Bonner is the name of his wife and she was over there. Now, when she came to the United States.... she had been married before and her daughter from that first marriage but greatly loved by Sakharov was here. They were wonderful. There were a couple of families in the U.S. that if anybody ever snatched me I would want to be working on my behalf and the U.S. Sakharovs were definitely those people and a wonderful family in California.

When I was in East Germany, no, Vienna I wanted to see that place to where Soviet Jews who were being let out, were first taken to. All of their exit visas were phony. Instead of going from there to another airport, where they would just get on a plane and go wherever they were going, they were kept in a place that was an old convent or school that had barbed wire all over the top and looked like a prison and in fact was a kind of prison. What happened was that the Israelis had insisted that there would be an opportunity for them to persuade people who really wished to go to join their families in other countries, particularly the United States, that they should come to Israel. I was horrified by that. Here were these people who had escaped, and many of them were very comfortable where they were in terms of material things, but here they were ensconced in this place. When I asked about it they said it was to protect them against the local people. Now, this is wrong. They did have to be transported to a social service office. That was a nasty setup.

Q: Did you at this point, and we will come to it when we get to Israel, find yourself up against the American-Jewish lobby on this?

DERIAN: I never seem to have any real conflict with Soviet Jewry groups in the U.S. The reason is that many of them thought that people ought to be able to join their families here. I didn't have long talks with them either about the legislation which had created this business [Ed: Jackson-Vanik] and the diplomacy that went on between Israel and whoever else was involved in setting up a really unpleasant situation.

Q: It was really sort of collusion between the Soviets, the Americans and the Israelis and the Austrians. Were there any problems in southern central Europe? Romania, of course, was in a peculiar position where it had one of the harshest regimes of all but at the same time because it was showing in foreign affairs some opposition to the Soviet Union, it was our fair haired boy.

DERIAN: Oh, yes. We just dumped money all over. It was the dumbest damn thing I ever saw. I didn't get in to Romania. You can see I wasn't a success. I did talk about it. It was a policy that was set and it was like a boat in the harbor on its mooring. No one wanted to fool with it, they weren't going to travel in it. They were just using it to store

their money essentially. The organization of the Department is somewhat deceptive so that something called (Office of) Policy Planning is essentially a speech writing office. Policy Planning does not take place there. Policy Planning doesn't take place much of anywhere until somebody rocks the boat or somebody like Phil Habib, who was Under Secretary for Political Affairs, comes along. He disagreed with everything about the policy, but we really liked each other so he was very helpful to me. Somebody of his mental caliber making their way through the Foreign Service is the kind of person who can come forward with a policy that nobody was thinking about. He wasn't just a crisis only, rush to the side of the ferry boat-type fellow. A lot of what he did I thought was terrible, but... [recorder turned off]

Q: Did Phil Habib cotton to human rights as a policy?

DERIAN: No, he thought it was sort of an ornamental kind of thing as a concept. A lot of times I think that he would just go around me when he thought it was something I would probably try to muck around in. But, he was also extremely helpful to me. We had a good relationship. Here I was a newcomer dropped in with an idea to put forward and a whole bunch of legislation behind it that he thought had not been well thought out. He could make a good case for his opposition, but a lot of people couldn't.

Q: Today is September 30, 1997. Patt, let's talk about the Middle East. In some ways, I would imagine this would be one of the most difficult places to deal with because it includes Israel, which has tremendous clout in the American political scheme. How did you approach the Middle East and what was your impression of the Near Eastern bureau?

DERIAN: Before I really tried to think about that area I did a lot of research and talked to a huge number of people of all different points of view and there is not a person who deals with that area that doesn't have a very strong, passionately held point of view. If there is, I have never met that person. The more I thought about it, the more I thought it was like a game of monopoly. As a child the big kids got to play and the little kids, who were not quite old enough to play, would stand around and watch. It was really kind of like that in that the people who were the players were playing with everything they had against each other. The people who were the onlookers were tolerated as onlookers, but if you walked up to the table and said, "I want to play too" it would be like dropping another counter in, so everybody would say, "No, no you are too young." It was that kind of attitude that I got about Israel. By the time I was there Alexandra Johnson had written her famous cable, "Jerusalem 1500."

Q: Yes, she was a vice consul in Jerusalem.

DERIAN: She obtained an enormous amount of information about official Israeli mistreatment including torture and unwarranted detention from many sources as well as an impeccable source. In terms of the impeccable source, I never understood if that was anything but information gained from a warm relationship with an International Red Cross person who had made these people available to her.

Q: I want to return to this report, but what were you getting from other sources?

DERIAN: When I saw that report and realized I had another whole area to explore, I realized that this was a problem that nobody was willing to talk about. If there had been a hint in any publication it was just stomped on by people from all kinds of points of view that were pro-Israel. They argued whatever Israel did, because it had to.

I had met Averell Harriman long before I went to the State Department and we were always on opposite sides of every question but we were fond of each other. I was talking with him one time and he said, "You have to stop working on the Shah like this. This is not fair. " I said, "Averell, he has had people tortured." He said, "He wouldn't do it if he didn't have to." That was pretty much the attitude then and remains pretty much the attitude about what Israel is willing to do. It is very disheartening.

In any case, I asked myself how we could approach this problem. The first thing seemed to be that when we wrote the human rights report we would write it honestly and with information we had in the same way that we wrote about every other place. Israel had not been included in the first report because that was written before the Carter Administration. I knew that move would flush a lot of ulterior points of view out. But while it did, I was still looking at the whole thing and thought that human rights was really an important new addition here and I was not sure I was going to go at that the same way that I'm going in other places because I don't want it to become another counter in the game. That was what worried me. It seemed to me after looking at as much as I could find that whatever the issue was – water, housing, crossing a bridge – it was immediately tossed on the table as something else to be fooled around with. It was at a point then where in spite of the political stuff that seemed to be happening at the top, in the rest of it nothing had changed, it was still the game. I didn't see anything really serious taking place there. So, I decided that we wouldn't do that. I think that was the premier error I made in the State Department. I should have done it even though we wouldn't have succeeded. I should really have crashed into that barrier enough as we did in other places where people said there was no hope.

The thing that made me know it was an error took place after the Carter administration, when Sam Lewis was still the ambassador there [Ed: Ambassador Lewis was a career Foreign Service Officer who served as U.S. ambassador to Israel, May 1977 – May 1985], and I was invited to go to a conference and Hodding was invited to go to Israel. His father was one of the people who founded that newspaper. He had died and Dido had funded an annual lecture in his honor at the university. So, Hodding was invited to give that inaugural speech. I flew from Amsterdam down to [Tel Aviv]. I think it was the night of the speech, but one of the nights we were there, Sam had a dinner party for Hodding, to which I was invited. After the dinner when it got to be toasting time, I was sitting at a table with a bunch of high ranking, mostly intelligent Israelis who I had known a long time. I knew them well and liked them even though there was lots of fencing that had gone on. Sam got up and made a little speech about his proudest action as a Foreign Service officer was keeping me out of Israel. I could see Hodding's back getting

straighter and straighter. It is not a nice thing to do to Southerners because we are not restrained when insulted and for somebody in human rights work it is really liberating to have someone behave so badly that you do not have to be endlessly kind.

I was looking at Barron who was sitting next to me and I said, "If Hodding gets up before I do, I am going to run over there and knock him down. This is my insult and I am going to teach him something." The minute Sam began to lower his frame into his chair, I jumped up and began to talk. I thought that I really did a splendid job and sat down with everybody at the table smiling at me indicating I had done the right thing. Then Hodding leaps up and when Hodding does this sort of thing he loses it. I'm cold. Hodding is like daisy cutters at the Berlin Wall.

I responded at length in a very firm and accurate way. I said that I could see now that that was my biggest error to let somebody like him think that he had had anything at all to do with decisions that were made about Israel because there was never any opportunity for him to do so. I talked about people who bragged, were insulated, and were willing to do things for any reason including to promote evil. No, it was not nice.

In any case that was the decision. Of course, I never told anybody that was my decision. After I had been there a couple of months it was my idea that we would have a plan of action of how we would go about things in the various countries and not rank which was worse, but just country by country look at the situation and say what it is that we can do with this policy, what do we need to do. There had been such violent knee jerking reaction, all negative, to doing that, so I had to do it in my own head. Since everybody had been so stern about it I was not going to subvert the system by talking to Foreign Service officers. I don't think I was much help there. There were lots of things we did. For instance, we had a very candid human rights report and Roberta Cohen....did I tell you about Roberta?

Q: I don't think so.

DERIAN: Well, David Korn was the office director for Israel and Arab-Israeli affairs and Roberta was the deputy in our office who dealt with Israel. I told Roberta that she should go and reach agreement on things with the desk; but they were unable to. She came back from the first meeting with David and she leaned against the door. It was a wonderful moment she had a certain pallor which is a white line around your mouth which you get when you are terribly upset, either emotionally or physically. She said, "That is the worst man I have ever seen and I won't go talk to him anymore. He is absolutely untactful. I have never been so angry in my life." I said that I was really sorry and also sorry that there was no one else to talk to him and I needed to know what the desk thought. So, she went back. About three months later she came in and said, leaning against the door the same way, "You will never guess what has happened. We have fallen in love and we are going to get married." It was really wonderful. It was one of the best things that came out of the Israeli policy and maybe the only thing.

It finally reached the point and it was a very useful thing for me to understand. Hal Saunders was the Assistant Secretary and he came to see me about things that remained and things that he didn't want, and it turned out that Israel had been shown the report, which was not supposed to happen. When he called and made the appointment I sent for all of our files because most of the stuff we had in there was from State Department reporting. So, when he came in we had a little talk. I said that I thought it would be more fruitful if he read what we had from official sources and then we would talk again. He took it home and came back and said, "Okay. Here is the remaining one."

It made me realize that in spite of the fact that there was reporting from every embassy on human rights conditions and with exception of Iran, where Sullivan was, and a couple of other places, the reporting was very good and accurate. How the governments reached down to the citizenry and what happened to them when they did. He was surprised because the reporting was there but nobody read it and I expect if people went back and just read the cables you could revise everything about which you think about foreign policy. It was fascinating to me. That meant we needed to become a slight irritant so that people at the top would feel that they needed to read this stuff themselves. Anyway, we got a good report.

The rest of the Israel portfolio was just doing the routine things. For instance, there was a bunch of black people who said that they were Jewish [Ed: This reference is probably to the Falasha from Ethiopia]. Just in the last few years have they been allowed to come into Israel. I read a piece not long ago about what a difficult time they were having because they were black. There were a lot of isolated incidents of people in some kind of distress throughout the region. I talked to some people that I used to work with a few years ago and I said that I really felt terrible about Israel and the Middle East. They pointed out a number of things we did. For instance, we talked about water a lot. The Mennonites came with a fabulous map which was one of the best maps I ever saw. They had a base map which had everything on it and then they had indicated where every drop of water in the place springs from, who is using it, who has it cut off, etc. It was really an amazing study.

In terms of making a big impact on any part of the region we did what I think of as pedestrian human rights. That is things that need to be done but nothing that really changed anything. And, of course, it is vain to think that after all this time you can come in from out of town and make a big impact. But, I do feel that while everybody in our office who worked on those issues really worked hard on them and did make some steps that from my part in terms of being kind of a leader of the thing, I feel that I did OK.

Q: In the first place, you did do what you felt was a true human rights report. So wasn't this the main thing you could do?

DERIAN: No, that wasn't the main thing. That is an important thing because the original idea of the report was that it was for the members of congress to use when they made decisions about foreign assistance of every kind. And also the warmth of the relationship so that they would know what they were talking about so that they wouldn't stumble, like they are now all over China. So, that was an extremely important thing to do, but the

legislation is very clear about things that were supposed to happen in foreign policy in terms of military and economic assistance, loans from international banks, a very wide range of things.

Also using not only your vote in international organizations but also your voice in diplomacy. That was one of the hardest things in making a clear idea of what you wanted for human rights action in the Department of State, because it is so antithetical to traditional diplomatic training. It made a lot of people, ambassadors particularly, very uneasy to have to speak about terrible things. Generally, it was only in times of crisis and pending war, or when we really wanted something, that any muscle was applied. I noticed in the beginning the first few that I witnessed talking about human rights to their counterparts could only do it if they got mad, which of course means this is personal between you and me. This is not what I think of as orderly diplomatic exchange.

Q: Going back to Israel, did you raise the question of how come the Israelis had seen the draft human rights report?

DERIAN: Of course. It was a mistake made in the embassy and I really don't think Hal had anything to do with it. But, it wasn't really a mistake, it was a mistake that they got caught, but I hope that Hal was not part of it. But, he might be, all sorts of good people do weird things.

Q: It has always been almost a given in the Foreign Service that anything that goes to the State Department concerning Israel probably appears on an Israeli foreign minister's desk before it appears on ours.

DERIAN: Yes, and I think that that is still true.

Q: The human rights report on Israel is supposed to draw congressional attention and direction, yet congress has always been far in advance of any administration in supporting Israel. Were you getting any pushback from Congress saying don't do this?

DERIAN: No, they were very careful with me. The only person who ever really tried to put the arm on me for anything was that fellow who went to jail from New York who used to be a policeman and had an Irish constituency, an Italian. He really set me up and tried to black mail me.

But, on the whole Congress was very careful. You know, I came there without much information about me but a lot of members of Congress had known me a long time because of the civil rights movement in Mississippi. So, I came with a kind of aura of holiness and benevolence, which was extremely useful, but absolutely inaccurate and undeserved. That was a big help to me. Even (James) Eastland and John Stennis, the two Democrat Party senators from Mississippi who I had been fighting for years never raised a voice against me. I think their complaints went to Vance and Christopher, if there were any. Also, I don't think I gave them enough to complain about. They didn't like the

human rights reports and the Israelis hated the report but we didn't change them. They disputed a lot of things.

Q: I would like to go back to Alexandra Johnson who was a young Foreign Service officer.

DERIAN: I never met her.

Q: I just saw her picture in the paper. I recall at the time she sent this in and then all of a sudden there were reports that she had a love affair with such-and-such, and immediately it came to me that this sounds like Israeli misinformation.

DERIAN: And, our State Department was happy to use this against her. Then a rumor went around that they were going to kick her out and bring charges against her somehow. I made a few telephone calls and I believe I might even have written a letter saying that it would certainly be unfortunate. They were saying they were going do charge her for other failures, dereliction of duty and that kind of thing, nothing to do with the "Jerusalem 1500" cable. I'm sure I wasn't the only one, but I did make it clear that I would be obliged to publicly point out that this was entirely accurate. I think what they did was to hang her out to dry and she finally decided that she was never going to go anywhere and that this was the end of the road for her. I don't know what became of her. [Ed: Ms. Johnson was denied tenure as a junior officer and left the Foreign Service. She died in October 2002 at age 56. See: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexandra_Uteev_Johnson.]

Q: I don't either but in a way this was as appalling as what happened to our China hands by our own people.

DERIAN: Exactly. The system was mean over there. It was never mean to me, but for people who are in a career... I'll tell you it wasn't just the State Department that was like that in the U.S. government, when the "Jerusalem 1500" thing came to this country, someone in the State Department or maybe someone in the Red Cross, I have no idea who it was, but the contents of that cable was leaked. They went, for instance, to the Washington Post and (Executive Editor) Ben Bradlee called me up in February 1979 and asked me about it. I said, "I really can't talk to you about what is in it," and he said, "I know what is in it I have it here in my hand." He said, "What do you think of it?" I said, "I have to say that I believe it is entirely accurate. Things we have learned start to corroborate it and if you look at the contents you can see that this is good reporting, although you may not like the news." He said, "Well, do you think it should be made public?" I said, "Well, as a crusading newspaper, I should think you would want to do that." He said, "I can't do that." [Ed: On February 7, 1979, the Washington Post published a story about Johnson's cables.] The next thing I knew he or someone had sent it to Harold Evans, the editor of the London Sunday Times, and that is where it was published. He got a lot of flak for doing that, too. He is the husband of Tina Evans, who is the editor of The New Yorker, and is one of the chief editors of Random House.

Q: The interesting thing is here we are talking about a crusading newspaper being cautious when it comes to criticizing certain countries. They weren't afraid to publish the "Pentagon Papers." Dealing with Israel is just different.

DERIAN: But every country has a little cadre of protectors. I was talking to a South African government official long ago when I was there and he said, "I don't need to fear what you say about us because (and he named some newspaper and some member of the U.S. congress who supported apartheid)." It was one of those serendipitous moments when you think of the absolutely right thing to say that reaches beyond this moment and that is, "every damn fool and evil idea in the world has at least one newspaper, one magazine, and two members of congress to support it." He didn't like it very well, but I found it a very useful thought to have had. It is really true. In the case of Ben, I don't know and don't understand. He is a great friend of mine and I could not speak to him about what I thought his duty was, so I never really understood his stand.

Q: You didn't want to encourage him to breach the sanctity of our classified cables.

DERIAN: Right. I didn't want to do it anyway, because it seemed to me that that must have been troubling to him that he couldn't publish the information.

Q: Were you getting anything from the White House saying don't mess with the Israeli lobby?

DERIAN: No.

Q: They were afraid of you?

DERIAN: No, I think maybe they didn't think I was relevant. Although they often thought I was. I have no idea why I had no pressure from the White House over this. I spoke out very clearly in public statements and the only time I was chastised was on the SALT agreement when I made a speech and a reporter asked me at the end if I thought we should sign whatever it was. I said, "Well, what I would do if I were going to sign the treaty would be to look at the treaties I had signed before and see how they were doing on those." The next day Hodding, who was the State Department Press Spokesman, was obliged to say that that was my own opinion and not the opinion of the State Department. But, it made me a lot of quite unexpected friends.

Q: You say that Israel missed the first go round of these reports?

DERIAN: I think so. Wait, they were in the first one because in the beginning the only reports that were written were on those who got foreign aid or assistance of any kind which meant our allies were the focus of all this attention while the Soviet Union and all these other places were not, and, of course, they were really unhappy about it. So, it was enlarged to include every country in the United Nations which made it more interesting. But the first Israeli report, I expect if we looked at it, although it was not prepared during my time or by anyone in the office.

I think I mentioned there was a lovely fellow, a Foreign Service officer who was posted to Poland or Czechoslovakia and just had the scales lifted from his eyes and he volunteered to work in the human rights bureau before I came, in spite of Kissinger's enormous dislike for him. I think there was something said about the treatment of Palestinians in that report but it wasn't as exhaustive and it didn't contain as much information because there wasn't somebody in every embassy responsible for preparing the first draft.

Q: How about Saudi Arabia?

DERIAN: We had a wonderfully funny thing about Saudi Arabia. The bureau sent for my approval a request allowing the sale of buses to Saudi Arabia that would have three doors; the back door which would be for women. Here is a real problem for a southern woman who knows how cruel it was for black people. I decided that I needed to defuse this as best I could before I made a snap decision. So, I talked to endless number of people and I finally decided to say okay because until then women were not allowed to ride on the bus at all and could only go somewhere in a vehicle if some man drove them there. So, I was expecting to get some flak from that but it was not a big issue. I think that if I had said no it would have been a cutting issue and then it would have been too late to change your mind, too. So, that is one time that endless discussion finally pays off.

Q: You mentioned Iran and William Sullivan was our ambassador. You rolled your eyes up when I said that. I have talked to people who served in Iran during some of these times when we had reached sort of a deal with the Shah where he would basically be the political reporter in his own country.

DERIAN: That was pretty much it and Sullivan would be part of his court and maybe sometimes the Shah, himself.

Q: Could you explain how you and your bureau viewed Iran and the human rights problems there during your time?

DERIAN: Yes. There was good reporting from one outlying post and there was excellent reporting from all the Iranians that were here. But you know, when people are in exile you have to be very, very careful that you don't get sucked in as we have by the Cubans in Miami. My method, and the method of everybody in the office, was to cast a wide net. You want to talk to every kind of point of view. The people who think the Shah is great, for instance, and those who say he is a killer beast. Sullivan did not like our human rights report and the reporting from his place was impossible and not honest. We were getting reports that the Shah was in trouble politically with his previous supporters and particularly the market people, the bazaaris.

But Sullivan was saying no. Each time he came home he would come to see me just bristling with energy and outrage. He was always giving me lectures about my not understanding the Shah and shouldn't really be talking about anything going on in the

country that I didn't know anything about, which was the favorite line of the vainest. We were making a little headway.

The Shah came to Washington and I was invited to lunch, which was not a happy moment. Remember the State Department set up for me to meet some dictator, mostly because they thought if I saw such a nice guy then I would see their way of thinking. It was a very funny kind of thing. When Sullivan was in town he came to the Secretary's meeting one time and gave a long talk about how things are improving and how many women went to college in France, were driving cars, wearing wonderful clothes, and everything was really all right. He came into my office and gave me his little semi-annual lecture. He also wrote three op ed pieces about how terrific the Shah was. He flatly refused to raise any issues with him. Finally it got so bad that I asked Steve Cohen, who was the deputy that covered that region, and a wonderful reporter. A law school professor at Georgetown University law school, not the one up in Harvard who is the Soviet expert. Sargent Shriver invited me to dinner one night and he said he would also like to invite Steve Cohen who he understood worked in my office. When we got there and Shrive opened the door and looked at him, I knew he was expecting the Harvard Cohen. It was a funny moment.

In any case, I sent him over there and there was a little resistance to his coming at all. I asked him to go everywhere because embassy people were really taking all their information from inside the court. They were told that torture had stopped when we knew it happened. I told him to go everywhere, to talk to people on the street, talk to doctors, people in the bazaar, everywhere. So, he was there for quite a while. He called me up from the embassy in the middle of the night one night to say that he had prepared his report but that Sullivan wouldn't let him send it. I said, "Well, tell him that you talked to me and I want it to come and I want it to come right now. If that doesn't work out you call me back." He called me back and said, "No dice." So, I called Sullivan and said that I would like that cable sent, it is for me and I expect it to come to me. He said, "Absolutely not." That it is a dishonest cable and if I wanted to read his report, I could read it here. I said that I would be on a plane that evening to come and fetch it. He laughed and said, "Oh, you are not." I said, "Oh, yes, I am. I'm ready to go." So, the cable came.

Not only was that whole period utterly disorienting, I'm feeling like Lewis Caroll and Through the Looking Glass, that whole bunch of them. Three of them have now written memoirs highly touting their human rights activities. At Georgetown they have three self-serving revisionist memoirs of these people.

Q: Who are the three?

DERIAN: One is Sullivan and I forget who the other two are but they were his close people, probably a deputy chief of mission (DCM) or two. Obviously these memoirs are really appalling.

I have to tell you one other Iranian thing. Joe Alsop, a famous newspaper columnist and sort of a Georgetown icon, and I were really good friends for reasons unknown to both of

us because we didn't agree on anything political. He called me the person who brought the Shah down. He said, "This is the only insulting thing I am going to say to you." I said, "Oh, if you knew what words of praise they were. But, like all words of praise, not true."

I'll tell you how misleading that failure to be candid is. We were loading the place down with military equipment. I thought that we would get rid of the Shah by having the country just sink into the water with all our airplanes and military equipment. The day that the news came was a day of the Secretary's meeting and someone, maybe Holbrooke, walked in and said that the people in the bazaar had turned against the Shah with a vengeance. People were shocked. It was unbelievable. Bad reporting can cause a lot of trouble. We could have repositioned ourselves and had an entirely different relationship.

The other thing was that they had been reporting that while there were mullahs, who had been exiled all around in France and Libya they were of no influence at all. On the contrary, in Steve's report he says that everybody in the country had tapes from these men. The country had been inundated with tapes and that they were the most powerful force in the country, except for the military. And, we didn't know it or believe it.

Q: Did the issue of Iran ever come up between you and Hal Saunders?

DERIAN: I can't remember. I don't think so. We didn't talk a lot. The only time I ever had anything to do with the region secretaries was when we had something to settle between us. Otherwise, I'm sure that they were even busier than I was with things that they did. So, I can't recall anything right now. I hesitate to say no. We didn't lunch together to talk over the region or anything like that. Although I can't believe I didn't say something. I certainly said something to them about the bad reporting. I met with him with regularity alone. He absorbed all of that. I can understand that if you are in a place and in a system for a long, long time, new information comes as a bulletin of something that has just happened. It doesn't come from a new entity. So, I can understand why people didn't focus as much as many of them wished they had on these issues. It makes more ludicrous than ever the fact that they had been getting reporting all along in most every place except Iran and a couple of other places.

Q: During the Nixon/Kissinger time, there was more or less an explicit order from both Nixon and Kissinger not to report anything bad about the Shah. And, I guess that more or less continued.

DERIAN: Yes. I don't think anybody who came in as a political appointee knew that. Or maybe they did and didn't want to either. Everybody there was a player in the system, just about, and so there is no cold disengaged eye within the system. I think (Phil) Habib came closest to having a clear idea of what was going on.

He also was a friend and a real help to me, even though he hated the human rights policy. He was candid. He never lied to me and that can't be said about very many people at the top.

Q: What about India and Pakistan? There was the burning of our embassy in Islamabad, in which two people were killed, which took place just after the taking hostage of our embassy in Tehran in 1979.

DERIAN: Right. There are a lot of issues in the subcontinent and we plodded along with those. I made a trip to that region, and two of the oddest experiences the whole time I was there took place in the subcontinent. One was in Pakistan when General (Muhammad) Zia (ul-Haq) was president [Ed: visit may have taken place in May or June of 1980]. Jesse Clear was the Foreign Service officer who was with me. He worked in the bureau and was the subcontinent person.

When we arrived, they were still taking the debris out of the embassy. I went there to see it. It was so horrifying to be in the place when it wasn't rebuilt and see the air shaft where people hid, and how scary and horrible it must have been to be trapped in the building and not know when it was over and whether it was over and when it was safe to go out. It was a very, very effective thing to go up on the roof and look down and see where people were trapped. It was unbelievably horrible. It wasn't so much the destruction, but the fact that the people were in it. It was that kind of horrible assault on people.

Arriving just before lunch we went straight from the airport to the ambassador's residence for lunch [Ed: Arthur Hummel, career FSO was ambassador to Pakistan from June 1977 to July 1981.] along with the DCM and other top embassy people. I was surprised that there was a lot of drinking and a sort of soddened Irish-type maudlin devotion to the country and how wonderful it is, how impossible it is for people to understand it. That came on the one hand and on the other hand the evil in the country. It was as bizarre a meeting as I ever attended. As the hours wore on it was then explained to me what they had decided my program would be. Well, we had already sent them our program. So, we had a little tension about what it was going to be. The main thing was that they didn't want me to see Zia. We talked that over and decided that I would see him. I think it was the next day and I went around talking with people. I have to say that citizens to whom I talked, it was a real scary time then as Zia was squeezing anybody who seemed to have a political thought, were really scared when I talked to them. The embassy sent along one of their own people and I wouldn't let him tape anything. I never let anybody tape anything. The only person who had any notes was the Foreign Service officer with me. We saw a great lot of people and it was a very discouraging picture.

We were riding to see Zia the next day, the ambassador and I. The ambassador said, "Now you have to remember, this is only a courtesy call." I said, "Well, it might be a courtesy call for him but actually I had work to do." He said, "Well, he is not going to tolerate this. You are not going to be able to do this." We got there and walked in. The only defense these men had in seeing me was to be tardy. That was about as rude as they can be. He drifted in after about 10 or 15 minutes. They had a long, long sofa. It must

have been 18 feet long and maybe even longer because either one of us could have stretched out between us as we sat at each end. He said, "So, you are Hodding Carter's wife." It was so funny that I had to laugh. He meant it to be a I'll-put-you-in-your-place sort of comment. I said, "Yes, I am and I'm here to talk to you about serious human rights violations of your government." At this he plunked right down. We talked, and talked and talked for an hour and a half, which made me very happy.

Several months later I received a present from him. It was a picture, in a frame about four inches in size, showing us sitting knee to knee on the sofa. Obviously the photograph had been cut down. I thought, "Did they do it to make it look as if we were having an intimate conversation or did they do it because that is the size picture frame they have?" I decided it was the unusual picture frame that did it, but it is just wildly funny.

At that time, I would say that the ambassador was one of the most unhappy ambassadors because he had already told me that Zia wouldn't tolerate such a discussion. Our discussions in these matters are very matter of fact and very graphic and factual. So, there is not much room for diversion. Actually, these are grown men, by and large, who make the choices to have these things happen. So, they are not surprised at what you say, they are surprised at what you know which is why you can never gild the lily. I thought it was a very useful and effective thing and they made some gestures when we left.

The other event was on the same trip in Nepal.

Q: This is tape 7, side 1 with Patt Derian. The next time, we have already talked about Pakistan, we will talk about Nepal, and India...

DERIAN: I think Bangladesh. India is too big. We did our duty there. We talked to all of our people on a wonderful visit and we got a lot done. Also, Sri Lanka, even though that was during a period of war.

Q: Then we will move on to the Far East after which we will sort of wrap it up. What was accomplished? What did you feel was accomplished during your time there? Where didn't it work? Then I would like a little about any dealings you had with and overall impressions of President Carter, Secretary Vance and if Brzezinski comes into this at all.

[Nothing else on tape 7, side 1 or 2]

End of interview