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

THOMAS W. FINA

Interviewed by: Charles Stuart Kennedy
Initial interview date: May 21, 1992

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background
- Born and raised in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts
- Northeastern University and Harvard University
- Italian studies
- US Air Force, World War II
- Fulbright scholar to Italy

INR (Italian, French and Vatican Affairs) 1952-1957
- McCarthyism
- Communists and socialists in Italy
- Italian politics
- Labor attachés and the AFL
- Embassy Rome
- Ambassador Luce

INR (Special Assistant) 1956-1957
- Psychological intelligence
- Princeton polls
- Entered Foreign Service 1958

Paris, France 1958-1960
- OEEC staff
- COCOM

Bologna, Italy 1960-1961
- CAIS
- Johns Hopkins
- Monnet Plan and United States

Luxembourg 1961-1963
- European Coal and Steel Community
- European Courts of Justice

European transport policy

Brussels, Belgium 1963-1965
Political officer
European communities – unification
French diplomats and officials
Quality of European delegations
George Ball

EUR 1965-1968
Officer in Charge of European Integration Affairs
EFTA
Future of Germany
De Gaulle and European integration
Kissinger and European integration
US and European integration

National War College 1968-1969

ACDA 1961-1973
General Advisory Committee
SALT I
MIRVs
Kissinger and disarmament
The Nixon White House and State Department
Peter Peterson

Congressional Relations 1972-1973
President v. Congress
Soviet immigration to Israel
Stanton Anderson

Milan, Italy 1973-1979
Consul General
Ambassador John Volpe
Political activity
Ambassador Richard Gardner

INTERVIEW

Q: Today is the 21st of May 1992. This is an interview with Thomas W. Fina on behalf of the Foreign Affairs Oral History Program. I am Charles Stuart Kennedy.

Tom, I wonder if you could give me an idea of your background? When were you born? Where were you born? And a bit about where you grew up?

FINA: I was born in Pennsylvania, March 25, 1924, and attended public schools there.

Q: Where in Pennsylvania?

FINA: Allentown. Allentown is in the heart of the Pennsylvania Dutch country and when I first started to go to school up in the country, it was in a one-room school house built in 1863. There were a number of children in that school, which numbered no more than about 25, who spoke no English, only Pennsylvania Dutch. It was commonly used by the street car conductors, the hucksters, farmers - even many of the older professionals - my dentist. I would ask my grandparents and uncles, who spoke it readily, to teach me Pennsylvania German, but that never got very far. They didn't have the time and I got along perfectly well in English. So I grew up speaking the adopted language of the new world.

Then my family moved to Winchester, Massachusetts. I attended the Winchester high school, and then we moved again to Needham, Massachusetts, and I graduated from the Needham high school.

Q: What was your father doing?

FINA: My original father was an immigrant from Italy. He came here as an infant around the turn of the century. He died when I was quite young, and my mother had already divorced him. The Pennsylvania German-Dutch background which she came from, and the southern Italian society from which he came apparently didn't mix all that well. So, unfortunately, I've had very little to do with the Fina side of my family, although I discovered on the other side of my family (the Witmers) that some of ancestors came here in the early 1700s from Alsace Lorraine.

Q: In Boston.

FINA: In Boston. Well, after high school in Needham, I entered Northeastern University Business School. I only had one year, which was entirely liberals arts. But it was a wonderful year that excited me about history, government, economics, the arts. Then, I entered the armed forces.

Q: Oh, yes. What year was this?

FINA: This was in 1943, and I had enlisted in the Enlisted Reserve Corps which had some benefits. At any rate at the end of my first academic year I was called up, and brought into the Air Force where by virtue of their needs, and perhaps my aptitudes, I got into radio mechanics. So my career in the Air Force was largely as a radio technician, something which I actually enjoyed very much. That technical background is something

which stuck with me and been useful to my Foreign Service career. You'd be surprised how many places around the world you're the only one who knows how to fix an electric motor, or fix the refrigerator, or do other things like that when there aren't professionals available. Even though radio technology (this was before the transistor or TV or even tape recording!) has changed so fast, I still enjoy the technical side.

Then I served in AACS (Army Airways Communications System) with the Air Force.

Q: Down around Foggia and that area there?

FINA: I landed in Naples. Foggia was a big bomber base, and I was with the Air Force communications system (AACS - Army Air Force Communication System) which provided point-to-point communications for the Air Transport Command. And we also provided something called the Instrument Landing System--ILS- and radio range navigation equipment.

I ran the Instrument Landing System and radio range in various places. I opened up a radio range station in Florence as the smoke was clearing away, and had a wonderful winter in Florence--no lights in the city, no traffic. By moonlight one could imagine himself in Renaissance Florence. I made a Florentine friend there whom I have to this day although he is now a retired banker in Milan!. It was here that I started to learn Italian. He and I exchanged language lessons. To judge by his English and my Italian today, he had the better teacher and I the better student. During this phase of the war, I moved on first to Pisa to set up a radio range station there and then, when the Germans surrendered in the north, I was moved to Milan when the Po Valley was opened up. I set up our station at Linate, which was the big civilian airport in Milan, and established myself in the Castello Peschiera Borromeo which was one of a number of Borromeo castles, this one complete with a moat and drawbridge, on the eastern outskirts of the city of Milan. Fortunately it is directly in line with the main runway at Linate so I was able to put up our station there and at the same time live in this lovely place with a very wonderful old housekeeper, and deepen my attachment to Italy which had already become pretty pervasive.

When the war closed down, I was transferred to a base in the American Zone outside of Vienna- -(Tulln)--we had to go through the Russian Zone to get into Vienna. I had a wonderful couple of months during the winter of Beethoven's 125th birthday celebrations. Vienna was stark, cold, the people were suffering a great deal. The occupation was terrible for many of them although the war was finally over. It was remarkable that the Vienna Philharmonic went right on playing in the concert hall, and I went to concerts every time I could get into Vienna. It was there that I heard my first performance of Fidelio and I guess saw some of my earliest ballets (Coppelia). The Russians were enthusiastic about the ballet. I was sorry when I was informed that I was going home. I decided I was going to come back to Europe as fast as I could.

Q: Of course, our generation of the Foreign Service was heavily influenced by military service, once they tasted it. I mean, how do we get back?

FINA: Well, I had no particular desire to get back into the brown suit.

Q: Oh, no, no, no.

FINA: I was glad enough to say goodbye to the Air Force although it had been a very rewarding experience. Seeing these thousands of men working together with no pecuniary motivation to push them. They worked day and night. It isn't that they were particularly motivated by hatred or a passion for war. They were doing a job that they thought was important and they had a sense of participation in it. That was an unforgettable experience for me. Furthermore, the Armed Forces were the first real exposure that I got to the multiplicity and the complexity of our own society. I'd never known blacks before. I'd never known either very educated people, nor very uneducated people, and in the Armed Forces you got to know both. The racial segregation that existed in the Second World War was a real fact, and I kept getting into trouble because I was very much opposed to the segregation of blacks and whites. I remember in Caserta (near Naples) which was the headquarters for the European Command, or at any rate for the Mediterranean command for a while, there was a huge reflecting pool behind the royal palace...

Q: Oh, yes. In cascades.

FINA: Exactly. I see you know it.

Q: I was Consul General in Naples for a little while, yes.

FINA: In any event there is a long reflecting pool, and it actually had water in it--some things were still functioning in Caserta. And in keeping with the etiquette of the Armed Forces at that time, the reflection pool was segregated. There was an MP on either side, and on one side of the invisible line across the pool the blacks swam, and on the other side the whites.

Q: Incredible!

FINA: And ne'er the twain should meet because you had MPs separating them. Well, I'd gotten a taste of that in Biloxi, Mississippi in basic training and thought it was pretty awful. And then on various other occasions I went out of my way to sit with black troops at mess halls, and that got me into some trouble, but it was an eye opener to see that these other Americans--after all, all of them descendants of slaves not too many years before the Second World War, very few years, were still being treated in what seemed to me to be a way contrary to everything that we were out there fighting for. Well, that's an aside but it was one of the benefits that I derived from my military experience.

After being returned to the United States, I entered Harvard. I decided that Northeastern was interesting but not interesting enough. I had done well enough at Northeastern that I could claim to have the academic qualifications to enter a more demanding school. So I

started a campaign of sending telegrams and writing letters to the Director of Admissions at Harvard, applying for admission well before I knew when I was going to be mustered out, but when I could see that I was going to survive the war barring some accident, so I peppered them with my cable communications, and despite many discouraging messages, in the end they caved in, and admitted me.

So I went back to the university at Harvard. I must have gone back in '46 because I registered in Harvard the day my to-be wife graduated from Wellesley. I went to Wellesley for her graduation in the morning, and then zipped into Cambridge, and registered for my own returning to school. I remained at Harvard, where I majored in government, graduated magna cum laude and then entered graduate school in Arts & Sciences in the International Affairs Program, with a specialization in Italy. And that was really the course of least resistance because having been in Italy for part of the war, I had learned enough Italian that I could get around. I had known none when I arrived. I remember arriving in Naples, our troop ship had dropped anchor during the night. We got up on deck in the morning and there was Vesuvius against the morning sky. I turned to the guy next to me, Gene Edstam, (who is now an architect in Washington state), and said, "How do you say yes and no in Italian?"

So it was after having spent a couple of years in Italy, where I studied when I could, that I figured the easiest language to meet my language requirement in college was Italian, and having the language and being interested in Italy, I went on and on. Well, that got me to studying with Gaetano Salvemini.

Salvemini was a famous Italian anti-Fascist, and one of the leaders of the anti-Fascist movement, a great anticleric--I shouldn't mention that here in the halls of Georgetown University! an historian who came to Harvard during the Fascist period. I decided I'd write a paper, my honor thesis, I guess, on some aspect of Italian affairs. And my faculty adviser said, "Look, you ought to take this over to Salvemini because he knows more about these questions than anybody else around here." And I hit it off with Salvemini very well. He was an elderly man, already in his late ‘70s, a great scholar and a wonderful man. He had written one of the great books about the French revolution and knew everything about contemporary Italy. He was an acerbic critic of the policies of the United States with respect to post-war Italy. He and Georgio La Piana, who had been defrocked because of his support for the modernist movement in the ’’20s, were great friends. La Piana was Professor of Church History at Harvard, so I saw a good bit of them both and tutored with La Piana in church history. I was very much interested in church history and still am, although as an atheist, I came at it differently than La Piana.

So that led me to graduate from the International Affairs Program with a specialization in Italian affairs, European affairs. I then spent a summer at the Middlebury Scuola Italiana to try get my spoken Italian into more useful shape. By that time I was married--we were married in 1946. Then I got a Harvard traveling fellowship to go to Italy for the summer. My wife and I started in Palermo and worked our way north through Turin interviewing people from top to bottom.

Q: Did you have a theme, or purpose, in this traveling fellowship?

FINA: I forget what the theme was, it had something to do with the contemporary political situation. Salvemini had kindly written me letters of introduction to everybody who counted which was just an indescribable advantage. That included Don Luigi Sturzo, the founder of the Partito Populare the original Christian Democratic Party of Italy, and various anarchists, socialists, and people all over the spectrum as a result of that. And then it was a time when you could just knock on doors and introduce yourself saying, "I'm a student studying post-war Italy," and all kinds of people would let you in. I went to Rome, went around and knocked on doors of various ministries. I met all kinds of people and they were very, very nice. I remain friends with some of them to this day. They were a little surprised at this young student appearing out of nowhere, getting by the various portinai and uscierei, and other obstacles. I must have seen a couple of hundred people. I ran from interview to interview. My main objective was to get to know as many people as I could, and understand what they were saying. I ended up with a lot of stuff. Anyway, that was a very good introduction to Italy--for my wife too since she had never been abroad before.

Then I got a Fulbright scholarship, the first year of Fulbright scholarships to Italy. It made it possible for me to go to Florence in 1950, and Salvemini had then returned there and that's why I decided to go to Florence so that I could continue to work with him on my thesis. We set ourselves up there in an under-heated suite of rooms in an ancient palazzo (the palazzo Frescobaldi) which was a fantastic experience. I proceeded with my research on the Marshall Plan in Italy including interviews to get to know people, etc. I attended some classes but they were very disappointing because the quality of Italian classroom work at that time was not challenging for an American. It seemed to me that in intellectual terms their economics teaching was outmoded. Keynesianism had not yet been accepted in the Italian classroom or elsewhere!. So the few courses that I attended were on Italian history. The Italians knew more, and were a lot more sophisticated about their own history than they were on most other things that interested me. That was a good experience although I was handicapped by not having a really native command of Italian.

After my Fulbright scholarship came to an end, I returned to the United States, after having swung around Europe on the money we saved from our Fulbright stipend--we went to France, Switzerland, and Italy. I don't remember whether we hit Spain that time or not, and England, before we came back to the United States. By then, I had applied for a job with the Department of State in the Office of Intelligence Research--OIR which was descended from OSS--Office of Strategic Services, the analysis branch of OSS. OSS was split up after the war with the analysis branch going to State and the rest becoming CIA. And there I was hired by Clinton Knox, who was a black Ph.D. from Harvard, a very able man who later became an ambassador, and who unfortunately subsequently died at a rather early age.

My field was Italian and Vatican political and economic affairs. We were located in an old apartment building at 23rd and Virginia - now part of the access road. It had no air conditioning at first, but a wonderful view out over the Potomac River, and over what was then already New State.

There were two sides of the work. One was the so-called NIS work--National Intelligence Surveys--which were prepared under contract for CIA as part of its preparation of studies of all major countries of the world, particularly those in which we thought we had some geopolitical interest at this time of great agitation about the communist threat. The NIS work was the most scholarly and, for me, the less interesting in some respects. Most of my work was in the current intelligence field, that is, what's going on in Italy, and why is it going on. There were various formats in which that kind of information was conveyed to the Secretary of State, and presumably to the President, and other people. I worked primarily on that sort of thing.

The climate then was a very difficult climate. It was the McCarthy period. It was the period of Cohn and Schine, McCarthy's two staffers who had terrified the Foreign Service around the world.

Q: They had gone on a trip which was comic, except that it was so tragic with antics. They were two very young men who were attacking USIA libraries around the world.

FINA: It was the period when Mr. McCarthy was finding communists, homosexuals, and all sorts of other deviates everywhere. It ended up, of course, that one of his principal collaborators, Mr. Schine, who was busy rooting out homosexuals was a homosexual himself, and eventually died. It seems to me of AIDS.

Q: Yes, he did.

FINA: That was part of the incredible--I won't say cynicism-- but falsity of this period. We were all under the gun on McCarthyism. We knew that McCarthyism was blowing down our necks. And I came into the Department just before the change of administration.

Q: This was from the Truman administration to the Eisenhower.

FINA: And in the Department the transition from Secretary Acheson to Secretary Dulles. I remember, Secretary Acheson, in his final days, invited the staff to come to say goodbye to him, if it wanted to. He received people in his office in State and anyone who wanted to go over and say goodbye, could come over - which I did. I certainly had a very high opinion of Mr. Acheson. It seems to me he had spoken to Department employees in some way, I can't remember quite how it happened, but he had a very elegant, dignified, patrician approach to government and what we had been doing. So I certainly wanted to make my obeisance to the outgoing Secretary of State for whom I had very great

admiration. In the event, you had 38 seconds to shake his hand, and, "Wish you well, Mr. Secretary."

Shortly thereafter, the new Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, was installed, and he convoked the Department to a parking lot somewhere behind the Department of State at the time, a big macadam area. He announced his taking over the job in a rather unbecoming way. It was slightly menacing, expected loyalty from everyone, with the implication of a lot of doubt about our loyalty.

Q: He talked about "positive loyalty". That was a phrase that one remembered for years afterwards.

FINA: In some respects it was a chilling experience after what we had known with Secretary Acheson. In fact, later as I knew Dulles just a very, very little bit, he was a somewhat different kettle of fish, I thought. But this had a very negative impact upon all of us, I think, as he introduced his new team, or at least some of the members of the new team. I guess the thing that stands out best in my mind, is that he introduced some guy who was the chief executive officer, or senior officer, of the Quaker Oats Company, who was going to be the new Under Secretary for Administration, or whatever it was.

Q: His name was Stewart, wasn't it?

FINA: I don't recall. Secretary Dulles said that he was a great guy, with much experience, and had been a terrific quarterback on the somebody or else team. Well, I guess I, and I imagine a good many others, thought that was one of the funnier ways of recommending a senior officer for a high position in the Department of State. But it was sort of the tone of the new team which didn't generate much enthusiasm. He didn't last. I think he was there for a few months, and then he went back to rolling oats, or something. But the atmosphere was one of, how bad can things get? I remember one day when there was so much talk about things that McCarthy was doing to the Department--sending Cohn and Schine in to check and find all those commies who were around there--I went up to my boss's office, Clinton Knox, and said, "Hey boss, we're in trouble. They're back there in my office disconnecting the phone and taking out my desk. I think this McCarthyism has gone too far." And for a half minute I think Knox actually believed it, he was out of his chair and toward the door before he realized that this was a joke. But it was indicative of the climate of the time, where it just seemed that the craziness of these allegations was actually getting down to ordinary people. I mean us poor little analysts who were working on interpreting election returns abroad.

Q: Did you find, I mean Italy not too long ago had gone through this climatic election of 1948 where it seemed to be very much in doubt whether the communists would take over or not, and with massive infusion of American money and all sorts of assistance, and the formation of the Christian Democrats, they didn't. Looking at this, since we considered it a very touchy situation in Italy, but did you find this affected your reporting, this whole atmosphere, or how we looked at things?

FINA: My recollection, and in the absence of what I wrote at the time, one has to be prudent, but my recollection is that I didn't feel that the Communists were going to take over Italy. That seemed to me highly improbable. The only way that that might have occurred would have been if they had come to power politically. I don't think that I believed that a military threat was real at that time. And I don't think that I saw the possibility, or the likelihood, of their winning a majority. However, it was a very serious question, and there's no doubt that we were all genuinely worried about the Communist Party which appeared to be very closely tied to the Soviet Union through the Comintern, through the Yugoslav connection. There was no doubt in my mind at the time that Palmiro Togliatti and the other principal Italian Communists were linked to the Soviet Union.

I remember having interviewed one of Togliatti's close collaborators, one of his vice chairs, I guess, when I had been in Rome as a student, and it was a very conspiratorial business. I wrote a letter asking for an interview at the Via Botteghe Oscure, which was the headquarters of the Communist Party in Rome, and it took a long time, and many telephone calls before I was finally granted an interview. There were the usual security guards at the front door, and I was taken to a very small sparsely furnished little room, and eventually this unsmiling middle aged man, who I guess at that time was the number two in the party, appeared by himself, and wanted to know what I wanted. All this was conducted in Italian, my Italian was hardly...well, no one would have confused me for a native born Italian! Nevertheless, I was perfectly competent to conduct an interview. I didn't get much out of that interview except the feeling that these people really saw the world divided, and that they were committed to the Soviet Union.

(machine turned off)

Q: You were saying your impression was...

FINA: My impression about the Communists was that this was serious business and they were absolutely our adversaries. But the other thing that I came to early on in my experience in the Department of State on this subject was, that the Communists and the Socialists were not the same thing. And that is really the fundamental marker in my experience in the Department of State at that time. I concluded that the Communists and the Socialists could be split, and I thought that was the thing that should be done in the interest of the United States. That the main way to assure that the Communists would not come to power legally in Italy- -and I didn't think they could come to power illegally-- would be to deprive them of their alliance with the Socialist Party which gave them a very big hunk of the vote. I reached that conclusion on the basis of my interviews with people in Italy, my studies in Italy, my study of the information that was available to me as an intelligence research analyst, at the time. The key to all this was that the Communist Party had made an alliance with the Socialist Party in Italy, that those two would function as one in the interest of the working classes, and all the methodology, and all the serious commitment which they had to reform Italian society constituted a very large block of the

vote, very powerful. The question was, were they really the same thing? The position taken by the conservatives in the Department of State, and in the United States, and in the Administration, was that the Communists and Socialists were the same. Socialists were Communists.

This simplistic political analysis that was prevalent in the United States at that time, had antecedents in the Bolshevik revolution during the First World War. The Bolsheviks claimed they were socialists. That certainly put a cloud over the socialist movement which was by no means ideologically, authoritarian, dictatorial, or anything but democratic.

But what had happened in Italy by this time was, that the Communists and the Socialists had been the most aggressive and the most disciplined people in the underground fighting the Fascists and Germans. During the war the Christian Democrats, (the Catholics), were also active in the underground but perhaps not to the same degree of militancy, but nevertheless very important. These three had an agreement that they would work together in the underground, together with a couple of the minor parties, the Republicans and the Action Party, which was a very important group--small, but very influential in shaping the nature of Italy's post war system of government.

At war's end, the Communists and the Socialists stuck together and they split with the Catholics and other minor parties. We took the position--we, the United States, and our Western European allies, the two were now really the same thing: that the Socialists were simply Communist tools, if not willing, or crypto Communists. Well, I didn't think that was true. From what I knew of people in both parties, from personal experience, and from my readings on it, that was simply not true. There was no doubt that the Socialists were deeply committed to their alliance with the Communists primarily (but not only) because they had similar (though not identical ideas) about domestic reform. But it seemed to me the sensible thing to do in geopolitical terms for the United States was to work on separating them. The chance of reducing their votes at the polls I thought was very small. Worthwhile doing but still small. But what really would count would be to have them split. Once they were split the whole dynamic of the Italian political situation would change.

Those views were supported by, I should say, virtually no one whom I ever met in the Department of State. At a time when Mr. McCarthy and his buddies, the right wing of the Republican party, were taking the position that the Department of State was a bunch of pinkos, my experience was that it was filled with very, very conservative Foreign Service officers, and civil servants, who were if anything right of center, and not left. Now they may have had a much more cosmopolitan view of the world than the Republican and Democratic right. They had a much more sophisticated view of post-war collaboration, the importance of removing some of the causes of the Second World War. They were more supportive of the IMF, of the United Nations, of all those institutions that grew out of our analyses of the causes of the Second World War. And those things had not been

accepted by a large part of the Republican Party, certainly not by Mr. Joe McCarthy and his more or less respectable allies who viewed them as a subversion of American values.

So I thought this was somewhat of a joke. All these attacks on the Department of State for its wild-eyed radicalism, when my experience was that most of my colleagues were very conservative indeed. And therefore anyone who came along to question the orthodoxy of saying Italian Communists and Socialists are really the same thing wasn't likely to find it easy going, nor did I.

Q: Let me ask. Here you are sort of a young squirt in...I'll call it INR, I mean how would you make your ideas known? And to whom would you make these ideas known? And how?

FINA: That is one of the great redeeming features of the intelligence community in my view, a tribute to the intellectual quality of the Department of State, and of OIR at that time. My bosses didn't stand in the way of my expounding my analysis of the situation. In fact their position was, we want you to give us your best intellectual analysis of the situation. That's your job. Don't worry about the policy. We don't make policy, but we have an obligation to present the policy makers with the clearest, most objective, analysis of the foreign situation for which we're charged. And we have confidence in your intellectual integrity, and that you know more about it than we do. You write it, we'll critique it, and we'll send it forward. That's your job. You've got the job of the intelligence analyst. Don't worry about whether its politically correct or not. And so the Deputy Division Chief (Clinton Knox) and Dick Scammon (the Division Chief) and the two branch chiefs for whom I worked at that time, Eddy Schodt and __, and another very able economist, who were my immediate bosses, were very severe critics. They were very demanding and they were, I would say, very intellectually competent to question the views of this neophyte civil servant who said he knew what he was talking about in Italy. But they never tried to prevent my stating the views, they just insisted that (a) it be written in an effective way, clearly, unambiguously, and (b) that I be able to justify everything I said. So it was a very tough exercise.

But in terms of the system, the system said, yes, we want you to give us your unvarnished views. Well, the result was that as far as the intelligence organization went, I got good grades. The Assistant Secretary at the time, during the Acheson period, and maybe during the Dulles period too, was a man named W. Parker Armstrong. An investment banker, an East Coast liberal Republican, I assumed. A very impressive man. And pretty soon I began to get little notes back on my intelligence memoranda from various people higher in the organization, saying nice things.

Then, over the period of time that I worked there, little by little, I guess people increased their confidence in my work, and I was invited to be on the morning briefing team for the Assistant Secretary for Intelligence, Mr. Armstrong, who always had a briefing--I think it was 7:00 or 8:00 in the morning before he went in to see the Secretary, to gave him a morning briefing. That was an interesting experience too.

My entire period working on Italian affairs was dominated by the Communist Socialist issue, and while the intelligence people were willing to have this view presented to the policy people, the policy people did not want to hear of it. They not only didn't want to read it, they didn't want it written. So I was in constant, or frequent, conflict with the Italian Desk in the Bureau of European Affairs - the policy part of the Department.

Q: Maybe if you can remember any of the names, but other than that, how did they relate to...

FINA: Well, the Italian desk has the responsibility for backstopping the embassy. It was the policy side of the Department of State, staffed by career Foreign Service officers. I don't remember all the names, Bill Knight was one of the officers with whom I differed over a period of years, in a nice enough way. But he was firmly opposed to the views that I expressed about the Italian situation, and so was his boss who was a great deal more important. (tape stopped) Suffice it to say that Bill and I were at odds about this, but his boss, the Assistant Secretary for European Affairs--what was his name? He was formerly in Naples, his father had been a CG in Naples.

Q: Homer Byington?

FINA: Homer Byington. Homer Byington had, shall we say, even more conservative views on this subject than Bill Knight.

Q: He really wanted the King back.

FINA: He and Mrs. Luce. I don't know if you've ever seen Mrs. Luce's airgram--I think it was an airgram--in which she recommended the restoration of the monarchy. Anyway, we had a running debate with them, and then embassy Rome weighed in on the question because eventually they got hold...maybe I or, my office sent them, or my boss..sent copies of this heretical stuff that I was turning out. One of these main areas of conflict was the question of the trade union movement. The Italian trade union movement, at that time, was divided into three general...

Q: It still is.

FINA: Yes, they certainly are still there. The Christian Democratic trade union CISL, the Social Democratic UIL, and the CGIL, the Italian Confederation of Labor which was the Communist-Socialist labor movement and the largest. Well, I was very much interested in the trade union movement, and had seen a good bit of those people while I was a student and traveling in Italy. My impression was, wrongly, that CISL would never become a significant trade union organization because of its historical (pre-Fascist) association with yellow (Catholic) trade union movement.

Q: Yellow Trade Union means basically like company unions.

FINA: They were historically much too close to management, and my feeling was that they didn't have a future in Italy. I thought that the way to break the hold of the CGIL was by supporting the socialist unions, because the socialist unions had the best entree, it seemed to me, to the Italian working class. At that time the socialist trade union was the FIL, the predecessor of the UIL. I had written something about the importance of FIL as a counterweight to the CGIL, in fact I wrote a rather big paper on the subject. That hit the fan and got Tom Lane, who was at that time the Labor Attaché in Rome, to weigh in. Now, the Labor Attachés at that time, and for all I know to this day, were named by the AFL-CIO, but principally by the AFL, and by their very militantly anti-Communist people back here in Washington.

Q: His name escapes me right now, but who was an apostate of the communist party.

FINA: His name escapes me, he died just a couple of years ago.

Q: We can fill that in later.

FINA: Anyway, the key Labor Attachés around Europe at any rate, were all AFL people who had been chosen by the very conservative wing of the AFL. Tom Lane always half kiddingly boasted that he was a card-carrying brick layer. He was a charming man. However, in political terms he had chosen the Catholic union --he was a Catholic himself, if I'm not mistaken--and he was going to do everything he could to make sure that the resources which the United States controlled, and they were considerable, went into support for CISL.

Consequently, when my little paper came out analyzing the situation and disagreeing with this, that brought down the wrath of the gods on me for that as well. During a visit to Washington Tom dropped in to see me at the Department to straighten me out. He had various black loose leaf binders of clippings which he used for his briefings to show how the socialist union was really nothing more than a tool of the communists. He was quite wrong about that. That was idiocy. But nevertheless he was very successful in convincing the United States Government, and everyone who counted, that that was the case.

It was about that time, and it seems to me it was 1955, that I came up for an orientation trip. The Department of State--the Office of Intelligence Research--periodically was able to send its analysts to the countries for which they were responsible, for on-the-spot familiarization to get themselves freshened up, find out what was going on, etc. And by some miracle, my bosses decided they would send me to Italy. That required the clearance, of course, of the Italian desk which was very reluctant to see a person of such debatable intellectual orientation going to Italy. And eventually it had to be cleared with Mrs. Luce who by that time was the ambassador. But, nevertheless, it was approved. So I went to Italy on my best behavior. But I intended to see as many people as I could to ferret out what was going on, to inform myself directly, because I was not very confident in the reporting from the embassy, and much less from the consulates. Some of the

consulate reports were incredible. I remember one from the Consul General in Turin, in which he reported on going to the horse show and some comments by one of the members of the royal family who was there, that the women really should be wearing corsets. He was shocked at the appearance of these women. That was the sort of reporting that we were getting. But the consulates, of course, were not encouraged to do serious reporting. That got in the way of the embassy, but that's another story that I learned more about later.

Suffice it to say, I got to Italy. I had met Mrs. Luce back here. She was a very charming woman, funny. But there in the political section in Rome the deputy director of the political section was an officer with whom I had crossed swords back here on the Italian desk. He had been Officer-in-Charge of Italian-Austrian affairs. He was not, one would say, as civilized or gentlemanly as Bill Knight.

Q: Was it Wells Stabler?

FINA: No, this was before Wells, I think. Anyway, he was there. He wanted me to provide a list of the people I was seeing, and what I was doing in Rome. They really wanted me to spend my time in Rome where they could brief me on what was happening from the Embassy point of view. I'm by nature not one to want to be fed pablum, so I spoke to them, made my way around, met people there, discovered that the people in USIA were by far the best informed about what was going on in Italy. The political section certainly was not. I went around and interviewed people in the political parties.

Now, the CGIL, the Communist Party and the Socialist Party were off-limits. We were not, at this period, permitted even to speak to them. There was no way in which you could go to speak to those people even if you ran into them at a cocktail party which in the American circuit was so unlikely you hardly needed a rule. My impression was that you were to look the other way. Therefore, I made no effort, much to my regret, to see the Communists, or Socialists or the CGIL. However, I did go around to see the Italian Confederation of Manufacturers, which is the CGII. They are on the political spectrum somewhere to the right of the NAM in the United States.

Q: National Association of Manufacturers, a very conservative...

FINA: ...a very conservative organization nevertheless, very interesting. They had a good statistical office, and they were really worthwhile people with whom to talk. I always find these people have a lot of interesting things to say. The Italians are incredibly articulate, and normally very analytical.

Well, in reporting to my keeper in the political section about whom I had seen, I wrote down...Dr. somebody, CGII. The next day there was a summons from Ambassador Luce. I was called into her chambers, and she pulled out this piece of paper and said that she understood that I had been forbidden to speak with the communists. "Absolutely, Madam Ambassador, it's certainly too bad, but that's true." "Well," she said, "right here you've

admitted on this paper that you went to see Dr. somebody of the CGIL." "That's a mistake", I replied. " That isn't CGIL, that's CGII." Well, someone had changed the "I", that I had typewritten, to an "L" with a pen, because he, poor dear, had assumed it had to be the CGIL because he, I guess, didn't know there was a CGII. I don't think it was malevolent. I think it was ignorance. That hardly improved the attitude of the political section toward its young visitor from the United States.

I then went back to my interviewing, and seeing people. Mrs. Luce called me in again and said she didn't think I should travel elsewhere in the country; my presence could be misunderstood, and people would misunderstand. I was pretty mad but really had no leverage. So I asked if I could go to Sardinia? "I'll take a couple of weeks, or a week's vacation in Sardinia." So my wife and I went to Sardinia, which we had never been to before. I dutifully avoided politics, and we explored the ruins, and visited the beach, and did things like that, and came back to Rome. Then I may have been released to go to visit some other places, and I came back to Rome.

When it was all over Mrs. Luce called me in again. "Before you go back, what are your conclusions?" Now, talking with people around Italy hadn't changed my mind. It had reinforced my view that the Socialists were eager to separate themselves, or at least a lot of them were eager to separate themselves from the Communists, whom they disliked. And that Pietro Nenni, the head of the Party who was the key to all this, was interested in that.

Q: He was the head of the Socialist Party.

FINA: He was the head of the Socialist Party, a man of great repute, who had been Foreign Minister in the Italian government immediately after the war before the split came among the resistance parties. An interesting man, if not the most politically farseeing. While I was in Rome I was in touch with a number of Italian newspaper men. To my way of thinking, the are often the most interesting sources; they know everybody, know all the gossip, and are sophisticated people. Anyway, one of these journalists said that he had told Nenni that I was in town, and Nenni had offered to meet with me. That was pretty seductive. I would have loved to hear what he had to say to the United States. But the embassy answer was, "No," which didn't surprise me. It disappointed me, but it didn't surprise me. In any event, my impression through various newspaper men, and others whom I met, was that the Socialists really wanted out.

In view of my conclusions I told Mrs. Luce that I thought that the Communists and Socialists could be split. The alliance could be broken, and it would be in our interest to do so. It would solve this whole problem of whether they could gain a sufficiently large number of votes either to obstruct any movement in Italy, or to impair the ability of Italy to function in NATO. And it would remove the risk of the Communists ever attaining a majority. I said I thought that would be a very worthwhile achievement for the United States. If we could bring that off, we would have done great and good things in the interest of our country.

Mrs. Luce said two things in reply, as I recall: First, that was something that would take too long to do, and she didn't have much time; what was going to be done she wanted done in the short term. She wanted short term results because she was only going to be Ambassador for a short time. And secondly she said--I can hear her nasal little voice--"Oh, Mr. Fina, you may be a very bright boy, but there's no one else around here who believes that, and I guess we'll just have to wait and see." Several years later when the split did come, I had the satisfaction, (of no career value!) of receiving a telegram from the CIA Italian analyst to whom I had recounted this episode, that read, "Congratulations bright boy".

Q: You're talking about a policy thing that dominated our relations with Italy for decades. My Italian is off, but the aperatura a sinistra, opening to the left. OKAY, this sounds fine, but here's the United States which is not the sovereign power in Italy, I mean this is something for Italians to do. What could the United States do? We're talking at that time...let's say somebody says, "Gee, this would be a good idea," but what's the United States got to do with the Italians deciding how to configure their political system?

FINA: It's true, of course, that any of these things have to be done, or will be done, by the people who actually hold power in the country. But the United States there, and in other places in the world, frequently has what you might call the tilting power to shift decisions marginally one way or another. And we had resources at that time, financial resources, political resources, friends, the ability to blackmail, all the things that a great power at the peak of its power traditionally has done dealing with its friends and its enemies. We were placing military contracts, denying military contracts, subsidizing political parties, withdrawing money from political parties, giving money to individual politicians, not giving it to other politicians, subsidizing the publication of books, the content of radio programs, subsidizing newspapers, subsidizing journalists, granting and denying visas. All of the things both of a covert and an overt nature that a great power, at that time, and in the tradition of what the fascists, the communists,
the Nazis, the British, and the French, had done before, we were doing in Italy. Clearly we could not have placed a call to the Prime Minister and told him that we thought it was time for something to happen to split the Communists and Socialists. But we could have told him and other leaders in private and used the many means at our disposal to have made it easier to happen. Once we had told Mr. De Gasperi, for example, that we would support the elimination of the Communists and Socialists from the post-war coalition government and that is what happened.

Q: He was the Prime Minister, again, and again, and again.

FINA: Yes, a very able, exceedingly competent, politically astute, committed Christian Democrat, as well. If we had told him that we would support a governmental alliance, including the Socialists, that could very well have happened.
**

Q: It could have been almost as simple as Mrs. Luce having Mr. Nenni over for tea. I mean, its such a small society, this would have sent quite a signal.

FINA: That's right, and when you say it's a small society, it's true. Italy is an astonishing country in which a very small number of people make the decisions. They all know each other, half of them are related to each other, and even though they may be political adversaries, they may be personal friends, or family friends, for many, many years. So it would have been possible to facilitate this. You couldn't have guaranteed it. There was no button you could push that would change the screen so the Communists would come up by themselves. But with the increasing discomfort of the socialists in their alliance with them, and after the increasing demonstration of Soviet brutality in Eastern Europe, there was a willingness within the Socialist Party to realign themselves. And had we shown ourselves disposed to support that, I think it would have moved a lot faster than it did. Eventually, of course, many did split with the Communists, and we had something to do with that. That was during the Kennedy Administration. The Kennedy Administration sent Francis Williamson over to Rome to tell the embassy, "This is the President's policy, we are going to support the aperatura a sinistra." But I was out of Italian Affairs by then, long since burned by my premature advocacy of trying to split the alliance.

At any rate, after that interview with Mrs. Luce, I decided that I was wasting my time working on Italian affairs, that I was not going to change the views of Secretary Dulles, or Mrs. Luce, or the conservative career officers who were running our policy. So I asked for a transfer to French Affairs in OIR.

(tape stopped)

Q: It was about 1956, or '55 or so you moved over to...

FINA: This was '56 it seems to me, yes, when I went over to French Affairs.

Q: What were our policy considerations in France at that time. This was right after the Geneva Accords. I mean, Algeria was heating up.

FINA: That's right. I was not really very knowledgeable about France, and the only position I could move into in the French section was working on the National Intelligence Survey. There was a job to write a chapter on the French trade unions. I figured, this is great, I know nothing about them. I'll do a scholarly research job. And that's what I tried to do. In the process I became somewhat familiar with the French political situation, but I never really got involved in the politics of France to the extent that I had been involved with the politics of Italy because I didn't know enough about it. I only did this French work for maybe about a year, and then I became special assistant to the deputy director of INR--maybe it was still OIR at that time--for psychological intelligence, which was the administration, the liaison for preparation of reports for the President's Advisory Committee on Intelligence, coordination of OIR clearances of internal work. The Office of Intelligence Research worked with the rest of the intelligence community, and with the

Executive Branch. My job was to analyze pieces of completed intelligence which we received, represent OIR in inter-agency meetings to present our views, and to negotiate them into other papers, to write resumes of finished intelligence to be transmitted to the Secretary, or the President, when they were traveling abroad, liaison with CIA on various special projects. And I guess one of the most interesting things was, to work on the analysis of public opinion surveys prepared by outside contractors of foreign public opinion. There were periodic reports that were funded I guess by USIA.

Q: USIA did those, I think, mostly.

FINA: But they all came to the Department of State for our review of the analysis, and my job was to look over the analysis, and see whether we agreed with it, or didn't agree.

Q: How did one start? Did one start with how it should come out, and then look at the analysis. I would think the predisposition of any department would be to say, well, they really should be thinking of the United States as great, and what we're doing is wonderful and should support us. If you get a poll that says it isn't, then you re-analyze the analyses. How did it work, actually?

FINA: I'm happy to say, I don't think it worked that way. The people at Princeton were doing these polls, the questions were negotiated with the agency in advance, and I think we got a crack at the questions, and then the contractor wrote up an analysis of the results, and sent it around to us for comment. And as far as I can recall, our role in that was just to make sure that the analysis made sense in terms of our familiarity with the country in question. It wasn't trying to change the results. It was a case of trying to make sure that references to one party or another, made sense. There was a question of applying one's specialized knowledge as kind of an editor, or consultant, to somebody else's analysis of the meaning. And we probably also had some impact, or suggestions, about how some things should be interpreted in the light of the fact that some of us, as analysts, were experts on the subject. Because an expert on German affairs, or French affairs, or Italian affairs, might read something different into a series of responses to questions, than someone who is a pollster in Princeton. But there was...I can't conceive of our having tried to change the gravamen of an analysis like that because intellectually we were committed to trying to present what we though was the most balanced picture of the situation we could. That was, after all, our required professional justification.

Q: On these various interviews, these polls that were taken, would policy take these into account do you think, as a sounding of how we're going?

FINA: I can't really speak to that, because I was not privy to the policy discussions of those things. Although I attended staff meetings in EUR on the Italian desk when I was working on Italian affairs, I don't remember any discussions of these polls, although there may very well have been some. But the policy people normally, at any rate in situations where they were dealing with me, or I was present, were trying to justify what they had decided the policy was, and therefore they were mainly interested in justification for what

they were doing. I never could quite figure out when it was they stopped and thought about what they should be doing in terms of reexamining premises, and looking back inside the motivations for these policies. But that may have been because I wasn't involved in that kind of formulation. That may have gone on amongst themselves when they felt they were talking to people whom they could trust, and in whom they had confidence, that they shared an intellectual approach to these things. So I don't know what influence on policy those polls may have had.

Q: Did you join the Foreign Service sometime at this point?

FINA: It was at that time that the Wriston reform took place. Mr. Wriston, I guess he was then...

Q: President of Brown University.

FINA: His commission made a serious analysis for Secretary Dulles of how the Department of State should be organized. The result was that people who had been hired as Civil Servants, as had I, as an intelligence analyst, were given the choice of either becoming Foreign Service Officers, and therefore being willing to serve abroad, or being, it seems to me, put into a category of people who would serve only in the United States, but therefore had limited career prospects.

Well, I was glad to be integrated into the Foreign Service although I was unhappy at being converted at what I considered to be an insultingly low grade. I guess I took a salary cut to do so. In any event, I then entered the Foreign Service in 1958 as an FSO-6. And through the good offices of my then boss, who was the deputy director of OIR, a career Foreign Service officer, I was assigned to Paris, to our delegation to the OEEC.

Q: OEEC was what?

FINA: The Office of European Economic Cooperation which was an outgrowth of the Marshall Plan in which we had called upon the Europeans to work together to develop coordinated economic plans for the recovery of Europe. We were members of that group. It had evolved a great deal by 1958, of course. But the OEEC was a very lively place where countries presented their plans, and we talked about what was going to happen. We had a staff in the American delegation to the OEEC which looked at what the various countries said they were doing, and what their economies looked like, and critiqued them. Our job was to look at the Netherlands country report, or the Belgium country report, and say, "Ah hah, their GNP has been growing too slowly. They're not going to put enough into infrastructure, or they're unrealistic about this, or their hard currency reserves are growing too fast, and then in the course of the review of that country's report and plan, the United States as well as other countries would raise these questions. I found that a supreme bore because there were too many people in the delegation and I had nothing to do. It seems to me that I had a couple of countries, I had the Netherlands, maybe I had all of Benelux. But it wasn't a job, and while I liked the substance all right, I felt that I was

wasting my time. So I went down to see my boss, and asked if there weren't something else to do? He suggested I go to the library and study up on my countries and told me that in Paris there were are a lot of things that I could be doing. Well, that didn't satisfy me. I don't sit around doing nothing very easily. These were nice people, very competent, far better economists than I. They're still my friends. But about that time we had an inspection, and the inspector interviewed all of us peons, and when he got to me, he asked me things inspectors ask, and I said, "Well, I think my job ought to be abolished, because this is a waste of time. We've got too many people here doing this. My job could be merged with two other guys, etc." A couple of weeks later I was summoned into the presence of the Ambassador. "I understand that you said that we were overstaffed." He wasn't too happy. What could I tell him? I thought it was a disgrace to waste taxpayer's money in that way. So I told him that he undoubtedly couldn't know what was going on beneath the stairs, but there were just too many people there. Well, presently my job was abolished, which made me very happy.

But what I wasn't happy with, they transferred me to COCOM. COCOM was the so-called Coordinating Committee. It had a name which was supposed to be completely misleading to everyone. But it was a semi-NATO body, representing all of the NATO states, plus Japan. Its purpose was to maintain an embargo on the shipment of strategic materials to the Soviet Bloc and to China. It was a very busy place. I didn't know much about it, and I was dead set against taking the job, and I resisted. But the Chief of Personnel in Paris said, "You got the job."

So I went around and met my new boss, Hal Levin. He was a very nice and extremely able person whom I hadn't known before. I settled into the job which turned out to be terrific. I had a wonderful time. Not because I was convinced that all of our embargo items made sense. They didn't, but a lot did. But one reason that it was such a good job from my point of view, was that it was so filled with electronic and mechanical technology, all of which interested me very much. And practically no one else knew an electron from a hypoid gear. So I had a fine time. I was fascinated by what we were doing, and it was my first exposure to multilateral negotiation. A lot of language questions were involved too that interested me: what terminology to use in French, because all of our documents were in French and English. What are the proper French terms for the these various English terms? I had a lot of fun with trying to come up with what I thought were really the right French terms because the interpreters were...what shall we say, they were basically liberal arts interpreters. And they really didn't know anything about technology. I found that a very exciting job, and got involved in a very fascinating negotiation about the shipment of communications cable to the Soviet Union, which I guess was the high point of my career in COCOM.

The French were trying to sell some 16 or 32 pair cable to the Russians, and they were maintaining that it couldn't be used for strategic purposes while we maintained that it could. That went on for months and months, and finally I led the negotiation on a French train going down to Dijon, during which the French were going to demonstrate to us that this cable was used in their rail communications.

They brought a bunch of technicians from the railroad, and from the French PTT, the Post and Telegraph. We argued the case all the way down, and we argued the case all the way back. By the time we were approaching Paris they had given in. They agreed to our interpretation of what this communications cable should do, and could do, and what we shouldn't do with it. I think we got in at 3:00 in the morning, and I was absolutely elated because it was a big issue for us and something that I had carried through from the very beginning. As soon as I got home I called Levin at 3:30 in the morning to announce triumphantly that "We won." "Tell me about it in the morning." Anyway, that was a very good experience, I enjoyed that very much.

That assignment came to an end in 1960. Without my having asked, the Department transferred me to Bologna, to the John Hopkins Center of Advanced International Studies. They had a branch there, a school that specialized in European integration affairs, which was run by Prof C. Grove Haines who had been a professor at the School of Advanced International Studies here in Washington. Haines had created this idea of a school that would bring together graduate students from Europe and America in roughly equal numbers together with an international faculty to concentrate on the study of European integration. This was 1960, only two years after the signature of the Treaty of Rome.

Well, I thought going to Bologna was a great idea, but I didn't believe in European integration. I thought that it was highly improbable. The conflict between the French, the Germans, the Italians, the age-old rivalries seemed to me more likely to prevail than some idealistic scheme. It turned out that my experience in Bologna completely changed my views on that. I left Bologna convinced that the new Europeans really had something. The Bologna Center brought political and academic leaders from all over Western Europe, whom Haines had recruited to give regular lectures on what was going on. They excited me and thrilled me, about what they were doing to deal with the problems of post-war Europe. And since I had been very much interested in European history as an under-graduate student, what they were doing just made so much sense in terms of their interests, and the interests of the United States, that I got very excited about it.

After that assignment of an academic year in Bologna, I was transferred to Luxembourg, where the United States had a small mission to the European Coal and Steel Community which had been the first of the three community bodies that eventually became the European Community.

Q: Just to go back to this while you were as a student looking at this, but these are future leaders, I mean you were going to be involved in this. What was the view of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union as regards the European situation? Where did they fit in?

FINA: They were clearly adversaries. The Soviet Union appeared to be very monolithic. It was opposed to European unification. The Soviets saw it simply as a tool of NATO, or at least so they described it. They saw it as part of our aggressive effort to destroy, or at any rate to counter their efforts, whatever they may have been. From their point of view,

European integration was bad news. There is no doubt that our support for European unification was in part, but I believe only in marginal part, motivated by Cold War considerations. Maybe marginal is too small a proportion, maybe it ought to be half and half as I think more about it. Because our view at the time was, and it had grown out of the analysis of the causes of the Second World War, that somehow you had to find a way of avoiding the conflict between France and Germany. One way of doing this was along the lines of the proposals that had been made by Jean Monnet and picked up by Robert Schuman to create a united Europe. Secretary Dulles was a very strong advocate of that. He certainly was in every way a main supporter in the United States of achieving this goal. We did an incredible amount behind the scenes to try to grease the skids, and oil the wheels, and whatever else you had to do to bring this about. We were active behind the scenes movers of this activity. And we did it in part, and maybe in equal part, because we thought it was necessary to rebuild the world economy in a dynamic expanding way to benefit our own economy, and which would also would have a spin-off for the Third World which we were concerned about. A way of stimulating the entire world economy at a time that you had the Soviet Union, and China, sequestered over on the side, largely at their own initiative. And at the same time it was a way of making Western Europe resistant to the appeals of Eastern European Communists.

In the end I believe that was one of the most creative and certainly the most successful of all of the policies that this country has pursued in this century. Our support for European unification, and even before that, for the rebuilding of Europe as a dynamic, open, competitive, democratic society, was in the end, I think, the thing that destroyed Communism. Because as the Communists looked across the Iron Curtain and saw these Western European democracies which were, and are, in all respects, as democratic as any country can be that we know in our day. They had achieved standards of living which were still the theoretical (though elusive and distant) objective of Communist societies throughout the rest of the world. They had achieved their prosperity without sacrificing individual freedoms. They had preserved individual dignity. They had improved the standard of living. They had improved the quality of life for their citizens to an extent that left the Soviet world completely in the dust. And in the latter years of the 1980s, of course, this contrast between the incredible prosperity of a democratic Western Europe, and an increasingly impoverished, repressive and bureaucratized East, is what drove the East to its collapse. It was the example of successful mixed economy and democratic government.

All that, after all, was the result of the thinking of the post-war generation which analyzed why the First and Second World Wars had occurred, and what was needed to rebuild a world economy along idealistic lines. That concept of what the world should be has come to fruition in our period. But we now find ourselves without the kind of intellectual leadership, or intellectual foresight, about what happens next. The great promise of the post-war planners and thinkers has been realized and that cycle has come to an end. The new cycle now beginning is in many ways much more difficult to deal with, largely because there's a lack of intellectual preparation for what you do next. Anyway, that was the way it appeared at the time when I got involved.

Q: Still, but moving up, a youngish man dealing with this from the United States, you were talking to other people and all from the Western European powers, how did you see, again at the time, representatives of other Western European countries feel about the role of the United States? I mean, here we were sort of an upstart country over there, and there was a term coca cola colonization. But on the ground how did American representatives, and these Western Europeans at the working level, feel about this?

FINA: Well, I think one has to say to begin that from my point of view, I was working in a special community. Once I entered the world of European integration which began in Luxembourg after my brain washing at the Bologna Center, until I left the Foreign Service, I was pretty much involved with people who were intellectually committed to the achievement of a united Europe as a major benefit to the United States. Their views inevitably were somewhat different from those of the traditional state, or government, leadership. They were the people who had moved into this particular aspect of their government's foreign affairs because they were committed to it. So that's one thing to be said.

The other people I dealt with were just ordinary, non- government people, on a private basis. The reservoir of goodwill towards the United States that I found in Western Europe, and all my experience after all was in Western Europe, was absolutely astonishing. The people whom I have known in the United Kingdom, France, Italy, the Benelux countries, Germany, showed tremendous admiration for what the United States did in the First and Second World Wars, and what it did afterwards. That doesn't mean that there wasn't plenty of criticism, but the basic goodwill towards the United States was and, although it is somewhat fading, still is a very powerful factor in our relations with these people. Now, there's lots of criticism of specific US government policies. But there is a distinction between the criticism that foreigners have of a specific government policy, whether it was the execution of the Rosenbergs, or our intervention in Guatemala, or our intervention in Panama, or various of the other of our post-war adventures, or the criticism of a given president. Those things are at one level. But the basic approval, and admiration, for our society that underpins all of our relations with Europe, is at another level. This is a vast reservoir which one can always draw upon if one has the wit to do it, the understanding that it's there, and if one remains consistent with our own ideals.

So while there were lots of complaints about coca cola colonization, and while I was involved in the chicken war in which the European communities tried to keep out exports of Arkansas chickens, basically those were superficial matters. They never affected the fundamental stability of our relationship because of our agreement upon the real things that counted, the commitment to democratic government, the commitment to a mixed economy, a commitment to an expanded and reciprocal world trade, and a great commitment to human civil rights. So, yes, lots of criticism but all that stuff is sort of the day-to-day up-and-down that comes and goes with changing administrations. But did not affect the rock solid foundation of our good relations with all of the European countries. That would be my answer.

Q: In Luxembourg, you were there from '61 to '63, what were your responsibilities?

FINA: I had three responsibilities. One, I covered the steel industry and a colleague covered coal for the entire European Coal and Steel Community.

Q: This was the core of the entire European integration, coal and steel.

FINA: At the beginning. It all began with the concept of merging the coal and steel markets so France and Germany would not feel that they each had to own these resources. After this supra-national structure was created, the member states went on to broaden the coverage by adding nuclear energy, and then the European common market, and that all became the European Communities later on.

Well, steel is pretty interesting. The American steel industry was already having problems. I was fascinated by the problem. I went around and visited steel mills, I crawled around blast furnaces and met all kinds of people and talked to their experts. Anyway, it became very clear to me after a little while that we weren't going to be able to compete with the Europeans because they were making enormous investments in new steel making capability. They were making oxygen steel, and we hadn't even started. The Austrians were making oxygen steel, and some of the others were, too. They were beginning work on continuous casting, they were building brand new rolling mills that were very effective, a lot of the equipment bought in the United States, of course, but a lot of it also manufactured in Europe.

So I went back to the States on home leave about that time, and the Department, which has good arrangements for returning people, made it possible for me to go visit Bethlehem Steel. I thought, the thing for me to do since I'd seen all these European steel mills, was to see what my fellow countrymen were doing. Well, that shook me up pretty badly. I went to Bethlehem where they'd been manufacturing steel since the 1800s, and some vice president put a hard hat on me, and we went off to visit the steel mills. Well, my family had been involved at the labor level with the steel mills, I guess forever, and so I had an impression of a great steel company even if it was not loved by its employees. Bethlehem Steel was a big name when I was a kid. I got there and they took me around. I was absolutely appalled at what I saw. They had a mill where they were forging castings as the steel came out of the soaking pits. But the equipment they were using had been installed at the time of the First World War! There it was. They were still using the same stuff. My guide proudly pointed this out to me, "Boy, she works like a charm. We installed her in 1917," or something like that. In fact, all of the equipment that I saw, as I went through the Bethlehem plant, was old. It couldn't hold a candle to what the Europeans were doing. Well, you draw some conclusions from that.

Then the other thing that I worked on in Luxembourg was the European Court of Justice. And that had me very excited because the Europeans had set up a court modeled on our Supreme Court. The idea was that it would review legislation of the Community

institutions, their regulations, that is, as well as legislation of the member states to see whether that legislation was consonant with the Treaty. The Treaty overrode any national legislation. I went around and interviewed the justices on this court.

At the time the Chief Justice was a Dutchman with whom I had a wonderful meeting. I had always been moved by the dignity and majesty of our own constitutional law. I wanted to see how their philosophy related to our experience in establishing the authority of the Supreme Court to determine the constitutionality of ordinary law. I was delighted to discover that they knew all about American constitutional history. They knew about Marbury versus Madison. And they were very consciously shaping their rulings to try and create precedents which would give their European Court of Justice, and which would give the European Communities, the kinds of constitutional review which our Supreme Court has had in the United States. Well, it was one of the most interesting experiences I had, and I spent a lot of time documenting, reviewing, and reporting on it.

The other thing I did...well, I did some work on European transport policy, which I also felt was very fascinating.

But then my other responsibility was to go as an observer to the European Parliament, which met in Strasbourg. The Communities, like all political institutions, had to divide up the benefits and the rewards, and the French didn't have any of its institutions on their soil, anything. The Belgians had the offices of European Commission, and the Luxembourgers had the Coal and Steel Community. The French wanted something so they got the Parliament. It met in Strasbourg, impractical, but close to Luxembourg. So the US Mission to the European Communities in Brussels which supervised the office in Luxembourg said, "Okay, Fina, you go down and be our reporter and cover the Parliament." I was incredibly lucky. It was a wonderful job, because the Parliament was dealing with all of the issues of the Communities, all across the board: nuclear energy, market questions, coal and steel, political problems. And the members of the European Parliament were politicians from all of the parties, except the Communist as I recall, from all the Community states.

I had a wonderful time. I went around and met these people, I interviewed them, I wrote reports on the issues and proceedings, and telephoned the reports up to Brussels to be used there and cabled to Washington. It was a lot of fun for me, and apparently it was useful for my bosses.

Q: What was the name of the mission in Brussels?

FINA: The Mission to the Communities was called USEC. And when I arrived, the Ambassador was W. Walton Butterworth.

Q: Walton Butterworth.

FINA: W. Walton Butterworth. Although I only knew him from afar (Luxembourg!) he was a very impressive man, with a wonderful knowledge of the subject, a professional diplomatist, of whom the United States could be proud. He and his wife were regal figures but very considerate of staff and very kind to my wife and myself.

Eventually I was summoned to move to Brussels, which was where the main mission was located. I moved there in 1963 to become assistant to Jack Myerson, the very astute and experienced Political Officer, a career Foreign Service Officer. Jack was very knowledgeable about trade problems as well as about US-European affairs and enjoyed the full confidence of both Butterworth and John Tuthill who succeeded him as Ambassador just as I arrived in Brussels.

Tuthill, another career officer, had formerly headed our mission to the OECD, and had made some of the major changes in the OECD--in fact, changed the OEEC to the OECD. Like Butterworth, he seemed to be at the peak of his powers and authority during the heroic phase of the development of the European Communities.

In Brussels I had three main jobs--four main jobs. I was chief of protocol. That was kind of a funny experience, I enjoyed it very much at the time, and it suddenly came into its own when President Kennedy was murdered, and then I actually worked hard. I learned that questions of protocol are genuinely important not only to diplomats but in daily living as well.

More demanding of my time and stimulating, was that I served as speech writer for an Ambassador who had a lot to say and wanted it said well. Additionally, I followed political questions with the Commission, that's the executive body of the European communities. Political questions in the sense of, what the European communities were doing in the big political picture, what their policy objectives were, or what they were going to do. While my boss, Jack Myerson, was the overall political advisor to the Ambassador, he was especially focused on trade policy which, of course, was the center of our relations with the Communities. This was especially true during the Kennedy Round of GATT negotiations.

I tried to know people throughout the three Communities, the Parliament and the related bodies just as a good journalist would. They were a stimulating group of people, almost all men, excited about creating a new world. These were heady times. Perhaps my most useful and rewarding relationship was with Emil Noel, who was then the Secretary General of the European Communities, a French protégé of Guy Mollet. Noel was one of the most impressive, able, civil servants I have ever met anywhere, and we had a very good relationship. And I must say I benefitted enormously from my working with him.

So that was '63 to '65, and working for Jack Tuthill was just a continuous education. He was a very stimulating man who gave me lots of opportunities, gave everyone an opportunity, was appreciative and a good critic. I have been a great admirer and warm friend of his ever since. He was one of our great ambassadors as far I'm concerned.

Q: Well now, as you were there, I'm talking about you and the American delegation look at this, view the major countries as far as their cooperation? I mean were there some that gave annoyance all the time as far as where we felt things should be going? I'm thinking obviously of France, Germany, and Great Britain, particularly.

FINA: This was the period before the British had been admitted to the Communities and the issue of their admittance was a central political issue between the French (General De Gaulle) and the others.

Q: But they were a factor all the time, weren't they?

FINA: They were always the factor. They were always just over the horizon. We wanted the British in the Communities, and we made no bones about it. The French wanted them out, and made no bones about it, and they had a vote. The British sometimes wanted to be in, and sometimes wanted to be out. While I was in Brussels, we were still supporters of the concept of European unification. I might say that ended with the Nixon administration, but that's down the line. At this point we were committed to doing everything we could to bring about European unification, behind the scenes, before the scenes, while protecting our immediate political and commercial interests. Well, the French, the French Government, were always difficult from our point of view. French officers, who were seconded to the European communities, or who were direct employees of the European communities, were a different kettle of fish. the French had, and may still have, the most able, best prepared, cadre of civil servants of any of the European countries, as far as I could see, very possibly including the United States. French civil servants and diplomats were of the first water, well educated, sophisticated, with a great sense of the state, which I think is something that often is lacking in American diplomats, and lamentably, in American presidents, but not so in the case of French civil servants.

Q: Excuse me, when you say "a sense of state"?

FINA: I mean a sense of the responsibility of the individual for the collectivity of the state, not as seen from the point of view of one political party or another, but the state as the collectivity of Frenchmen, or Americans, which has a stature that overarches the individual political parties, and the political institutions. A sense that one has a loyalty to the community that one represents, and that requires comportment of a certain dignity. The state is important. It has not only a juridical existence, but it has a philosophical and ideological existence as well which you, as a statesman, or as a politician, to some degree represent. And in doing that, you carry some of the historical burden of the state, and your actions are informed by a recognition of the past of that community. It means the sense that you represent something more than this morning's cable that you've gotten from Paris about what you're supposed to do. And that you're invested with a certain dignity because you represent a historical community tradition. That's what I'm talking about.

Anyway, the French have that, or at least the ones with whom I dealt, had that to a degree that practically no one else did, except, perhaps, the British. So they were very difficult, very effective people if you were in conflict, as was the case when they were opposing the admission of the British. They were very effective. On the other hand their people in the Commission were very effective in carrying out the goals of the Commission. So the French, and France, are two different things, and sometimes they were our best friends, and sometimes they were the people we most regretted.

The Germans, I think, were almost uniformly the good guys. They were very much in favor of European unification without protectionism. They supported the enlargement of the community. They wanted it to work. They made sacrifices for it to work. A lot of their people were absolutely first rate, not quite of the glittering skill, I would say, of the French but very impressive.

The Italians were totally committed to the success of the European community. They were committed on ideological and political grounds. They believed in a united Europe. There's a long tradition of Europeanism in Italy that goes back to the 1800s. Carlo Sforza, the first post-war Italian Foreign Minister, had been a great advocate of European unification. So they had the political will, and this includes the Catholics of course, who have a vision of a Catholic Europe. They also saw it as economically advantageous to Italy, and the Community has given the Italian economy a shot in the arm, and has helped to bring it to the very high level of efficiency and prosperity that it knows today.

But in terms of the personnel with whom I dealt with at the time, I'm sorry to say, they were poorly represented. Italians don't really want to leave Italy, and Italian politicians especially don't want to leave the home playing field where all the plums and all the careers are made. No one would dream of leaving Rome, which is where political intrigue boils from morning till morning. You know if you turn your back, you've had it. So you could never get a political figure of any significance to go to the European Community institutions. Not even as a reward for after you've been thrown out of something, could you get any Italian politician...a guy with political savvy, and skills, to come up there. Their best representatives were their top career diplomats like Prince Colonna. Otherwise, there were a lot of second string people. When it came to the recruitment of civil servants, the Italians really don't want to leave home. It's a much too nice place to be, so it was difficult to employ people even at the secretarial, or the middle levels, as well. That isn't to say there weren't some good ones, there were. But it was a genuine problem.

So when you attended a meeting of the Council of Ministers, which I did all the time as an observer, you'd see the French delegation come in and there would be Couve de Murville, the French Foreign Minister, big, handsome, striding into the room followed by a series of experts with briefcases, each one more brilliant than the predecessor. And eventually the Italian ambassador would arrive because the Minister couldn't make it, the plane broke down, or he couldn't come. So the Italian ambassador would arrive, and he'd come with somebody from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

And that was sort of the way it ran. The French fielded a brilliant team on every occasion, at every level. And I'm afraid that the people who brought up the rear were the Italians who always came...they were charming, and they knew what they wanted lots of times, but they didn't pack the clout that their vote would have given them.

The Germans were in between. They were the real heavyweights. They got a lot of the things they wanted, but they weren't quite at the level of the French.

The Belgians, I think, were pretty good although they knew that they were a small power. The Dutch were very strongly committed to European integration, they did a good job. They would, I suppose, rank close to the French in terms of their competence, and their commitment, but they weren't a great power. That makes a difference in the kind of clout you have.

Q: Was Greece in it at the time, or not?

FINA: No, my period was when there were only the six. The three Benelux countries, France, Germany, and Italy.

Q: The instructions that were coming from Washington, George Ball was pretty well calling the shots, wasn't he for most of that time?

FINA: Yes, he was in general terms. But no single individual really dictated all of our activities because so many government agencies and interests were involved.

Q: Were there some feelings at all among the delegation that George Ball being a colleague and a disciple of Jean Monnet, was almost too pro-European? I mean, did you feel sometimes that maybe the United States was selling out the store, or something like that?

FINA: Not in our team. We were all Ball supporters.

Q: Ball-ites.

FINA: Ball-ites. We thought he was great. We thought that what he was doing, and what we were trying to do, was profoundly in the interest of the United States. That it was the enlightened thing to do for the interests of our country, bearing in mind the events of the First World War, the Great Depression of which we were all very conscious. We were of an age where most of us had grown up during the Depression and the Second World War which most of us had seen at closer hand than the First World War. So that we thought that what we were doing was really the right thing, and we were absolutely delighted. I don't remember ever hearing any criticism from our group about George Ball although there was plenty of criticism in the US about our support for European integration on the grounds that it would be contrary to our economic and political interests.

Now, there were other people, other parts of the government, that felt differently. But we fought them with serried ranks, and it was a time when Mr. Ball's writ ran far. And when we ran into problems, it was Mr. Ball who had the clout to cut through.

Q: There is one question that I didn't cover in our last time when you were in Brussels working with the European community. How did you and the others view Japan at that time, '63 to '65?

FINA: I don't think that Japan figured very largely in our thinking. Japan was a member of COCOM, and played a pretty minor role in that, and, of course, wasn't a member of NATO. The Japanese were present in Brussels, but they weren't really significant players. It wasn't until I got into the White House in 1971 that I suddenly became aware of Japan in a big way.

Q: Then in '65 to '68 you went to the Department. What were you doing there?

FINA: I went back to be the Officer-in-Charge of European Integration Affairs. That was an office that covered European communities, the Western European union, and EFTA, as well as the...

Q: EFTA being?

FINA: EFTA was the European Free Trade Area which had been the British-backed counterweight to the continental European unification of the European Communities, the Common Market. But EFTA by that time had pretty much faded out and had lost any real future so that my job boiled down to support for the Mission in Brussels, our Mission to the European Communities - that meant the Coal and Steel Community, the European Common Market and EURATOM, which during my period then became the European Communities.

Another aspect of that job was support of the economic aspect of the NATO Assembly. That was something every now and then, but the heart of the job, and the thing that was the most interesting for me was our support for the movement toward European political unification. And that was what really drove our activity. We saw economic integration in Europe as a stimulus to the world economy, and therefore to our own economy, and strengthening the long-term vitality of the world economy, and of our own economy. But we also saw it as the way of bringing about European political unity which we thought would create a major pole of stability with which the United States could collaborate on more or less equal terms, particularly in view of the continued power of the Soviet Union and its allies. So we saw the creation of this other pole as a very important objective. And I think that was really the consideration that drove everything we did.

Q: Were there ever any questioning about in the future the role of Germany? I mean, the whole idea of this European integration was really to embrace Germany, in a way.

Having been dragged into two world wars over the German problem, was there ever any question about say, "Well, 20-30 years from now ___ Germany?"

FINA: Concern about Germany was always in the back of one's mind. Those of us who had been involved, or fought in the Second World War, obviously had a lot of sensitivity to what was happening in Germany. Our view, however, was that by involving Germany deeply, and creating a single state in Europe, or as near to a single state as you could, you diminished the chances of a rogue Germany being able to create new problems. The French had understood that during the war. Immediately after the war they had taken the initiative in trying to deal with this issue in a very creative way by putting behind them the animosities, the hostilities of the war of 1870, the war of 1914, and that really set the tone for what we were doing. Our whole idea was to work with the Germans who wanted to create a united Europe in which Germany would be so firmly imbedded that the kind of aberration of a Nazi movement, or a recrudescence of that sort of thing, would be minimal. That was something very much in our minds.

Q: What about the role of France? This was high de Gaulle, wasn't it? I was interviewing somebody recently who served in France and what Mac___ was saying it sounds like being in a hostile country. It was the early ''60s, you know, from Couve de Murville on down. I mean really de Gaulle turned more and more anti- American. How did you find this?

FINA: We had, I suppose, what you'd call a love-hate relationship with the French. Interestingly, it was the French who were the strongest people working for European integration, and they were also the strongest people who were obstructing it. That was part of the wonderful anomaly of that situation. The civil servants in Brussels, and in Luxembourg, who were driving the whole internal movement of the European communities, were the French. They were the most confident, the most imaginative, the most determined, and in many ways the most eloquent advocates of European integration. At the same time just a little to the south in Paris, you had General de Gaulle, one of the most eloquent, persuasive people in the post-war world, who had absolutely no intention of allowing France to be submerged in this melange, this mixed breed that he saw coming out. And it was always a matter of puzzlement to me, and I guess to others who followed this situation closely, that General de Gaulle didn't take the lead in European unification. Had he done so, France would have dominated the new Europe in a way that no other state could. Frenchmen, and people who were loyal to French thinking, occupied the key positions of the entire community structure. They were the de facto leaders of what was going on. If General de Gaulle had picked up the banner and led, he could have become the Father of Europe. Jean Monnet, who was the real father of Europe, wasn't able to do because he didn't have the political profile, he wasn't that up front.

But de Gaulle refused to do that. He had his own vision of the world, and of France's role, and consequently he held things back for many years. He balked British membership in the Communities, and that was a very exciting tense time when the United States was still pitted against de Gaulle, at least in the early period.

After Henry Kissinger became Secretary of State, or even when he became National Security Adviser for President Nixon, our position began to change very significantly. Kissinger was no supporter of European integration. He was in fact an admirer of General de Gaulle. And that began to create a lot of problems for those of us who were committed to European unification. It created personal career problems for me in particular. Because when Kissinger began to give the signal that we were no longer to support European unification, we were to become passive. Whereas before during the Ball period, during the Johnson Administration, during the Kennedy Administration, we had been active. We had been behind the scenes. We'd been fixing things, pushing things, driving things, with a vision of achieving a united Europe because that was in the interest of the United States. Henry Kissinger basically first put us in neutral, saying, "No, we're not going to do this anymore."

Q: This had been probably...Nixon came in '69.

FINA: Well, it was even earlier than that. Didn't Nixon come in '68, something like that?

Q: Well, Johnson didn't run in the election of '68, and Nixon beat Humphrey, so he would have come in '69.

FINA: It was the very beginning of the Nixon period when among the earliest things that he did was to begin to give the signal that we were to stop support.

Q: What was the feeling, the rationale for that?

FINA: I'm not sure that I understand, or remember, Kissinger's rationale. What I remember are the results of his policy which was, to stop support for European integration. And that rippled out through everything we did, whether it was in the trade negotiations, whether it was NATO, or political negotiations. He was an admirer of General de Gaulle's. He said he was an admirer of General de Gaulle's, and that meant that down at the peasant level where I was, it became increasingly difficult to continue the policies of support for European integration which I thought, and continue to think, were profoundly in the interest of the United States. That created conflict for me, and for others. My boss, Bob Schaetzel was replaced. He had been Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Atlantic Affairs, and then he went to Brussels as Ambassador. Now, the new team simply was not willing to continue the policies that the Ball group had fostered in the past.

Q: Going back to more of the Johnson period with Ball, was the feeling that with de Gaulle you sort of said, "Okay, he's there, but he is a temporary phenomenon." Obviously the French bureaucracy was already more or less in line to this integration thing. Was it the feeling, "We can outlast de Gaulle."

FINA: I don't remember a feeling like that. We were all, I think, aware of the mortality issue but the question was whether Jean Monnet would outlive Charles de Gaulle. We had the recollection of the long-lived German chancellor. We had Adenauer, who had lasted until he was a very elderly man. Chiang Kai-shek was still on the scene and so was Franco. So I don't think that anyone was counting on General de Gaulle departing for the Elysian Fields, no. We figured it was a day-to-day issue. I wouldn't say that the French bureaucracy in France was sold on the positions of the French who had gone to Brussels. I don't know enough about them. I imagine they were pretty loyal to the boss.

Q: My feeling talking to other people, for example, Mike Ealy, and his feeling was the same. It was a pretty cold place for Americans during that time, bureaucratically speaking.

FINA: It could very well be. My period in France, I found the French to be charming, delightful, amusing, but I wasn't in conflict with their government.

Q: There's always the official, and the personal. As you were working in EUR, John Leddy was the head of that, was he?

FINA: He was the Assistant Secretary for European Affairs, yes.

Q: How did he operate?

FINA: Leddy was primarily an economist, an international economist. He was also very much interested in the political side, and he was a supporter of European unification. But I never felt that he was particularly assertive in his position. His deputy for Atlantic Affairs at that time was Bob Schaetzel who was very much of an operator, very creative, imaginative, and was the person to whom I was most attached, and felt most loyal. George Springsteen came down from Ball's office where he had been Ball's special assistant and succeeded Schaetzel when he went to Brussels.

I disliked him and he reciprocated. He had always been a hatchet man for Ball, and he did what he was told to do. But when he became Deputy Assistant Secretary for Atlantic Affairs, he was rather more enthusiastic about abandoning our support for European unification than it seemed to me that he should have been. And we found ourselves in conflict almost from day one. And that made me very interested in getting out of EUR, which I did.

Q: You went where?

FINA: I went to the National War College for a year. That was a good experience, I was very glad of that opportunity. I think EUR assigned me to that job both to please the Deputy Assistant Secretary who wanted to get someone who was more malleable in my job, and possibly out of sympathy for me, to let me escape from a situation that I found increasingly disagreeable. I thought the War College was very good. It was a period when

we were in the midst of the Vietnam War, and War College people were overwhelmingly favorable to what we were doing in Vietnam. I really was very ignorant about it, and I didn't really want to get to know more. I didn't know much about Southeast Asia, and I had no interest in learning any more. But at the time I was pretty much convinced that what we were doing was inescapable. I didn't think that we should have gotten into that war, but I thought once we got into it, I didn't see how we could possibly get out unless we carried it through. In retrospect I think that was probably a lousy analysis of the situation. But at the time it seemed to me the right thing to do. The War College gave me an opportunity to travel to the Far East, and to think about some other things, and to meet a lot of military people who were going to have senior responsibilities in the military service. That was a very good experience.

Q: When did you leave the War College?

FINA: I was in the class of '69, I forget when graduation was, I suppose it was in the spring or summer of '69, and therefore I was looking for a job. I guess it was Art Hartman, who was then the Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of State, put me on to a possibility in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, ACDA. They were looking for a new Staff Director, whatever you want to call him, to the General Advisory Committee which was a committee of distinguished citizens who were supposed to advise the President and the Director of the Arms Control Agency on arms control negotiations.

John McCloy had just been named chairman of the committee. Nixon had appointed a new committee. It included Bill Casey, and Bill Scranton, Peter Peterson, Jack Ruina of MIT, about a dozen absolutely first rate men in this country. And at the time I didn't know who they were, but I knew that McCloy was looking for a staff director. I thought that would be a great opportunity because
working for McCloy would be terrific since he was a very influential man, who had had a major role in our foreign policy toward Europe. When he interviewed me, I didn't know what he was looking for, but I told him what I believed in. I didn't really know much about McCloy at the time. I didn't know where he stood on Monnet, or on European unification. I knew that he had been very important in German affairs. I told him pretty much what I've told you about my views about the importance of European unification to the United States, and how I thought that arms control and our relationship with the Soviet Union related to all that. And that seemed to satisfy him, and I got the job.

The job I got was a non-job. We had no offices. We had nothing. So I created the position, set up the system. I thought the way to do this was to have an agenda of issues that Committee should advise the President about. We were then in the SALT 1 negotiations. The central question was whether we should agree with the Soviet Union to outlaw anti-ballistic missiles. We had long been playing with that idea and now we were negotiating to see whether we could reach a satisfactory agreement.

So I set up a series of hearings to which we brought the most eminent people in the United States Government, and outside the government. I had Andre Fontaine, who was then the foreign editor of Le Monde, and I had various Europeans, Pierre ___ perhaps, and other people whom I had known who I thought would bring a world picture, and creative ideas to the question. We set up meetings in the Operations Center, or some conference rooms on the 7th floor of State, I got a Department stenographer to make a verbatim record. I set up a big hollow square table which I thought very important to the process. I provided the witnesses with detailed questions in advance--what we wanted them to discuss. So when we got a witness, usually there were maybe three or four it seems to me for a session, the witness would focus on the tough questions without our committee members having had to study up in advance to know what to ask. They were exposed to the questions and the answers. These were just one day sessions because it was very hard to get these men together. And the only way you could get them to come, was if it were interesting. I realized it had to be something that they thought was worthwhile, that was stimulating to them, and in the right kind of an environment. And that was one reason I wanted to go for witnesses who would really be provocative, and that we tried to ask really provocative and searching questions. They fell into two general categories: (1) the professional experts and officials with access to the highly classified information about Soviet and our weapons and policies and (2) non-government connected people who were authoritative about world opinion, Soviet policies, or general arms control policy.

Q: Were you able to get a Soviet?

FINA: You mean from the Soviet Union?

Q: Yes.

FINA: No. That might very well have run into various political problems within the Administration. I was happy enough getting people with independent opinions about what we were doing from around the non-communist world. And then, of course, this was all done at an exceedingly high security classification which created a special problem.

To help create the right environment, we had a buffet in the meeting room so there was never a break for a meal. People got up and got something and went back to the table. We went right on to get as much done as possible during our one day meeting (there were held about monthly).

I based a lot of my information on continuing conversations with people in ACDA and other parts of the government to keep myself informed about what the issues were, and what we ought to be exploring. Suffice it to say that periodically we would come up with a hunk of advice to the President. The most important one of the pieces of advice was a recommendation that the SALT treaty be approved. The Committee was all in favor, and unanimously, I might say, and this included Bill Casey.

Q: He was head of the Central Intelligence Agency.

FINA: He later became head of Central Intelligence. At this time he was still just a rich right wing lawyer in New York, who had signed at least one full page ad in the New York Times, condemning the SALT negotiations. But once he got into the Committee, he finally joined a unanimous recommendation that the SALT treaty be approved, and that we abandon our independent initiative in the anti- ballistic missile field. I was, and remain, pretty pleased that I was able to help this group of very wise men to come to this conclusion.

This was something to which the Department of Defense at the lower level was completely opposed. Under Secretary of Defense Packard, I must say, who was always the spokesman for Defense during this period, was very good. So were the Joint Chiefs. But at lower levels there was an awful lot of opposition, and people in DEA were constantly seeing, in my view, mirages about what the Russians could, and would, be doing.

The most important recommendation that we ever made was against MIRVing, the multiple independently targeted missile--a warhead. It was a period before we had made the final decision to deploy MIRVed weapons to our nuclear submarines. We had invented this system of multiple warheads. It was a quantum leap forward in the destructive capability of the attacker. And it increased your defensive possibilities because any attacker would have to eliminate many more of your silos before he could eliminate your counter-strike capability. At that time we had the monopoly on this technology and it was pretty clear that when we MIRVed, we would have a significant advantage compared to the Soviet Union.

Well, we held hearings on the strategic implications of MIRV, and I got all sorts of people in there to debate the issue. I think we gave it a very fair shake. The conclusion was that we recommended against proceeding with MIRVing on the grounds that it would only be a temporary advantage. The Soviet Union would almost immediately catch up with us. We would simply be back to a stalemate situation. It would be better to get an agreement with the Soviet Union not to MIRV. The question was, could that be done? Well, from the conversations I had with various people in the SALT delegation who were talking to the Russians, I became convinced that it was do-able. At any rate that we ought to make a serious effort to get that kind of an agreement because it would be so advantageous to us.

The Committee accepted my draft paper (I prepared all of the draft recommendations) which made this recommendation, approved it unanimously, and McCloy was to deliver it. We sent it to Kissinger, and McCloy was to ask for a meeting with the President to state the Committee's position. Well, Kissinger could never find time for the President to meet with the Committee on this issue, although it had met with him on a previous occasion. And Kissinger killed the recommendation.

One of the things that I concluded about McCloy during this period was that he was really not prepared to take on the establishment. He was a wise man, he had all the connections, he had had fantastic experiences from the First World War until then, but basically he was not the kind of guy who was going to fight city hall. And I think that is one of the things that led Douglas Dillon to be the only member to resign from the committee during my assignment to it. I think he dropped out because he concluded that we were not really going to take on Kissinger and the Administration on a couple of the fundamental issues. And this may very well have been one of them.

McCloy's heart was in the right place, but he shared the deep skepticism that everyone else had at the time of the Soviet Union, and I don't think he thought there were chances of the kind of negotiating compromise that people in ACDA who were negotiating with the Russians at the time thought they saw. He played a rather passive role in all of this that disappointed me since he didn't go to bat for what was really a very fundamental issue.

And you may have noticed a few years later, maybe it was about six years ago, Kissinger said publicly that he had made an error in having supported our MIRVing. It was a great personal satisfaction to hear that come from him, although it is the sort of satisfaction you have in private because very few people knew that any one had opposed proceeding with MIRV deployment.

Q: What was the impression while you were charged with organizing this thing, of Kissinger, and the National Security Advisor's office? Kissinger was the National Security Advisor. What was his view towards arms control disarmament?

FINA: Well, I would say, my impression of Mr. Kissinger at the time was that he was interested only in relatively limited arms control agreements with the Soviet Union. That he wanted to keep all this in his own hands. There was no real power shared, as far as I could see, on our negotiating position, or on these questions, with anyone else. He certainly repeatedly humiliated the Director of the Arms Control Agency, Gerry Smith, who was conducting the negotiations in Helsinki, and wherever else they were at the time. I remember particularly when we were sending things up to the National Security Council, Kissinger was always very plain that no National Security Council deliberation was ever to conclude with a recommendation. National Security Council papers all ended with the transmittal of the discussion, and the arguments to the President, but that really meant to Mr. Kissinger and the decisions were then all made in a much more restricted group. He was never going to let the National Security Council be in a position, I won't say dictating, but deciding things which the President would then have to overrule, or abide by.

And on this issue of MIRV, which was a very fundamental one, I thought it was just very clear that he had absolutely no interest in trying to reach an agreement. I thought that was pretty ignorant. And in as much as he had abandoned our support for European integration which was, to my way of thinking, a very major way of dealing with the

Soviet bloc, and was not willing to negotiate with them in a meaningful way here, I didn't have a very high opinion of this National Security Advisor. On the other hand, I was by no means privy to Kissinger's private discussions or thinking so I can speak authoritatively only about the Committee and my work with it.

Q: What was the role of the Defense Department? You mentioned unhappiness at the technical level, and these are the guys who wanted to get their stuff out there and use it. I mean it was fair enough at the top, but what was your impression of the role that Defense was playing in the game of disarmament, or at least down-sizing the military side?

FINA: I thought that Packard was always...

Q: He was Assistant Secretary...

FINA: He may have been Deputy Secretary of Defense. I thought he was always very much interested in reaching arms control agreements with the Soviet Union, even though we were in a period of continual competition with them. I think he saw the advantage as a closing off areas where there was very little to gain from our point of view in competing. And one of them, of course, was the area anti-ballistic missiles.

The politics inside the Department of Defense, of course, are all weighted in the direction of bigger, and better, and more. It's very hard to find anyone, from my experience with the armed services, who isn't convinced that you need the latest, the biggest, and the best, and after all, that's their profession. They are not professional arms controllers. They believe in the Roman dictum of, if you want peace, prepare for war.

Q: You were involved in this arms control thing, particularly you had to be looking at nuclear strategy. The question that always comes up, and one looks at exchanges, one can play this game and say, "If we knock out all but five percent of their population, we have 20 percent of our population left, we win." There must have the question about, it is not a theoretical thing, it's almost impossible to win one of these things. Or did you find yourself getting involved in these mathematical models which the experts seem to enjoy so much? They're not really talking about what would happen to society.

FINA: As far as my work with the Arms Control Agency, and the General Advisory Committee was concerned, I would say that was never really a serious issue. The people at a senior level in Defense, and in State, and of course in CIA which was, I might say among the more--if I may use the term--liberal forces involved in all this, never believed that anyone could win after a nuclear exchange. I don't think there was anybody of a sophisticated nature who thought that there was going to be anyone who could walk away from a nuclear exchange. The best you could say was, that we could demonstrate to the Soviet Union, and to other people, that if they started something, we would be able to retaliate in such a hideous way, that it really wasn't worth starting.

Now, when you get to a lower level, when you got to the colonel level, or the general level, that I found was a different kettle of fish. I've had a number of very heated arguments with people at that level about whether you could win a nuclear war. There were a lot of guys down there then, and for all I know now, who are absolutely convinced that after the last exchange, we would have more people staggering to their feet than they would and therefore we'd win. I found that incredible but I must say it was a very widely shared view among people in the military services, and a lot of the less sophisticated political people too. I don't think that was the case, however, with the policy people who were really close to the matter. There they saw it as a question of deterrence. And the question was, how much do you need to deter? One school was, you've got to match them missile for missile, or they won't be deterred. And the other school was, a few hundred or a thousand missiles were enough to deter any rational person, and the irrational one you weren't going to be able to deter even if you matched gun barrel for gun barrel.

Q: Did you get any feel for what was happening on the other side of the Hill, and in the Soviet Union? I mean, was there any input about how they were thinking about things?

FINA: To some degree, yes. One got some views from the negotiators who were convinced that the people they were dealing with in many cases were interested in finding a way to stop the escalation. At the time there were sort of two schools in the United States. One was, let's find a way to stop the escalation because it's hurting us, and it's hurting them. And the other school, and that was the conservative, the right wing school, was, "We'll spend them into the grave, let's compete with them, in the end they're going to go bankrupt." "And sure, it's going to cost us a lot of money, but we've got more to spend than they do, and we're going to destroy the Soviet system because we're going to bankrupt them."

In some respects those guys have been proven right, that that competition did help to destroy the Soviet Union, although I think there are other things that did it too. The question is whether it didn't destroy us at the same time. I always thought that was one of the risks, that we would commit such a large part of our resources, or capacity, to war making that we were increasingly neglecting our internal economy--the problems of the cities, our racial problems in this country. And that we were indebting ourselves to an extent that was going to undercut our real strength. I thought that then, and it seems to me that that has certainly turned out to be the case. I think it still remains to be seen whether we have reached the bottom of the price that we're paying for this attempt to outspend the Soviets. Certainly the tremendous national debt that we've accumulated, the incredible interest charges we're paying, the neglect of the cities, all the things that are the condemnation of the Reagan and the Bush period, in my view, in their domestic policy, are outgrowths of this policy of our competition with the Soviet Union at any price.

Well, those were issues at the time of the General Advisory Committee, and that was one reason that it seemed to me, and to others, that it was important to try and find ways to slow things down. There was reason to believe that the Soviets knew that this was a disastrous course for themselves.

Q: To sum up with this Advisory Committee, what happened? Did it continue? I notice that you...

FINA: Well, what happened was that after the recommendation on MIRVing, we then went on to some other issues which I don't recall at the moment. But about that time Peter Peterson, who was a successful businessman, a friend of Senator Percy's, and a member of McCloy's General Advisory Committee, wanted a senior government appointment. He knew George Shultz who had real power in the Nixon Administration.

Q: He was Secretary of Treasury at the time.

FINA: ...who at that time may have been special advisor to the President for economic affairs, or something like that. Anyway, Shultz recommended Peterson to be Under Secretary of State. There was a change of Under Secretaries at State at that time, so Peterson wanted that job. I don't know how I got involved in it, but I became his ally in trying to get the job. I was busy trying to find out where things stood and we worked closely together. He failed to get that appointment but then he had a chance of becoming Special Assistant to the President for International Economic Affairs. Nixon decided, or maybe Kissinger decided, who knows who decided, to create someone comparable to Kissinger to deal with international economic affairs. And since Peterson had been very active in international economics and in business and had the backing of Shultz, he eventually got the job.

He then asked me to help interview people for his staff and to outline how his office would function. I got very much involved interviewing all sorts of people to work in the White House before he came down. I saw this as an opportunity to leave the General Advisory Committee, in which after all I'd had a stimulating experience, but going to the White House looked even more interesting. And Peterson was a very attractive guy.

Q: Also, I assume the Advisory Committee, something like that, on that it really is sort of the beginning of the Nixon administration, had shot its bolt pretty much, hadn't it?

FINA: Yes. There wasn't any major issue left at that time, it's true. We'd been through these two very big things, the SALT agreement and MIRVing, and while there were a lot of interesting things out there, they weren't of that level. So I was ready to go on to something else, and the idea of ending up in the White House, in career terms, looked great to me. And Peterson was a very imaginative guy, and so he took me on as his assistant, or something--I forget what the title was over in the White House. And I left McCloy, and moved into the White House for an exceedingly brief period.

That was one of the most turbulent periods of my life, for a variety of reasons. One, the White House was very hostile to Foreign Service Officers, and to the Department of State. It was the Nixon White House. It was filled with political types who were very distrustful of career officers under the Department of State as a hotbed of something bad.

Consequently, sort of everywhere you turned you found people who were making nasty remarks about the Department of State. And while I'm pretty critical of the Department of State for being too conservative, it's kind of funny being criticized for being too radical. Anyway, that was one aspect.

Another aspect was that Peter Peterson turned out to be, from my point of view, an absolutely impossible guy to work for. He was totally disorganized. He'd bring his briefcase into the office in the morning, or it was usually a small suitcase, and he'd simply turn it upside down on his desk, and everything would fall out. There would be a pile of papers, and books, all over hell, and he never knew where anything was. Somehow or other, I was his only assistant at the time, and I had to find out what had happened to that memo he had written to the President, or where things were. I'm not very good at that myself, and I'm not really very interested in being a glorified clerk. So I was busy trying to get him a staff of secretaries, assistants, paper pushers, all the things that you need in order to keep a high powered guy going.

And at the same time we were deluged with letters from people who wanted jobs. It was an experience for the uninitiated like myself to get these letters. "Dear Pete, Congratulations on your appointment. The President certainly made a wise decision. I remember well when you and I appeared on the panel at DuPluck University to discuss so and so, and I thought your remarks then were as incisive and brilliant as I found them to be since. I'm available at the present time if in the event that you think that my collaboration would be of value. And I include my 40 page resume." Well, I had a file cabinet full of these things. There were so many of them that I couldn't even answer them or acknowledge them. And telephone calls from the usual assortment of climbers, of whom there are many in every capital, and in every court. I'm sure Louis Quatorze was besieged by these guys. But in Washington we have our own special brand. And all these guys, whom I had known at one time or another in the past, suddenly appeared on the phone and we were warm friends, and good old Tom, and he'd like to see Peter, whom he had never met, of course. But tell Pete that I would...

That was an interesting if somewhat depressing experience to see how that worked. But I decided that what Peter needed were some really absolutely first rate people around him, and I recommended that he take on as his staff director Dean Hinton, who had been my boss at one time. Hinton was an absolutely superb mind, a very competent professional, whom I thought would be wonderful. And at that time he was maybe in Chile. I'm not sure. He was off in some post. Well, I sold him to Pete, and he got him back up here, and they fortunately hit it off, and Dean moved in. And I got various other people whom I thought were absolutely first rate, and I think they were. But I rapidly discovered that I had recruited myself out of a job. And I had recruited myself out of a job partly because I don't think I was really up to the intellectual, and professional, requirements of that job. You needed someone who was really more competent than I was in dealing with these issues, and a guy like Dean Hinton could do it. He had the skill, the experience, and the brains to do it, and I knew that I didn't.

So, I was very uncomfortable in that position because I really had nothing to do. Once I'd gotten these people in there, and gotten them on-line, I concluded the best thing for me to do was to get out of here. I couldn't really--I had no intention of trying to compete with Dean Hinton--and I couldn't stand Peter after I got to know him a little better. So I asked for out. He was very nice and said, "Name any job you want." He was very gracious. But I realized there was really no job in that situation that I would be able to fulfill with any sense of satisfaction.

And so, after a very short time, I can't have been there more than--February to April. I went back to State to walk the halls.

Q: Walking halls, I might add, is our term for being essentially being without a job. I speak of someone who has "walked halls."

FINA: It is so devastating, and so...

Q: Without a job, you're a non-person.

FINA: That's right. All of us, it seems to me, who have made a career in the Department of State, are there not because of the money, but because we've been interested in the substance of wanting to do something. And when you discover that there's nothing that anyone wants you to do, it's pretty hard on the ego.

Well, fortunately I got picked up, and again it was by Art Hartman, who put me in touch with David Abshire, who at that time was the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, that was H. David was a stout Republican out of the Georgetown Center for Strategic Studies which he had been running, and which he had turned into quite a reputable, if conservative, foreign affairs think-tank.

Q: Yes, that's the center out of Georgetown.

FINA: Yes, which he had pretty much created. He was a remarkable operator. I must say David Abshire was among the most skillful lobbyists I have ever seen. Certainly he was a model of how you should run the Bureau of Congressional Relations. He was very good. I don't agree with his politics, and I don't think he really understood much, if anything, about the substance. It seems to me he was a graduate of either B.M.I., or West Point, he had a military education. He didn't really know much about the things that interested me, or that I worked on, namely, NATO, the European Communities, international trade policy, GATT and so on. He didn't know much about them and he didn't really appear much to care.

But at any rate, he took me on, and my responsibility was the Ways and Means Committee because it had the responsibility for the GATT negotiations for trade policy. At that time Wilbur Mills was the legendary chairman, and he ran that committee with a very tight hand. It was a very powerful committee. I also had the responsibility for NATO

questions, and for the European Communities. And then we dreamed up various other things, about how to communicate for the Congress. I was convinced that one of the things that was very useful to us, or could be very useful, was communicating with the staff. You couldn't cover all of the staff. There were too many hundreds of people up there. And you couldn't get to the members all the time. Abshire, or a Deputy Assistant Secretary, or an Ambassador could get to a member almost anytime, to a Senator, or a Congressman. But the rest of us couldn't do that as easily, and you had to deal pretty much with the professional staff.

Q: Okay, you were talking about developing relations with the Congressional staffs.

FINA: Yes. One of the main problems is, how do you influence members of Congress? And one of the things that we did was to create a series of briefings for staff members. We figured staff members have more time; in many ways they're more professional than the members themselves, they know more about the subject, and so I set up a series of Dutch-treat luncheons down on the Hill. We got a dining room, and everybody paid his own way to come, since State has no money, and never had any money, to pay to invite staffers. And we would get a couple hundred people in those things, and then we'd have a significant person from the Department of State speak about this problem, or that. It was a way of getting our point of view across to a lot of people who were influential with their bosses. That was one thing we did.

Another thing we did was to organize a series of morning breakfasts. I sort of thought of myself, and still think of myself, as sort of a social arranger. But I'd fix up breakfasts down there and get senior people from the Department, and invite Senators or members of Congress, the key people we wanted to reach. We might get 10 or 12 members for a breakfast, which is pretty good. Getting members of Congress to sit still very long is very difficult because they're under such tremendous pressure and they've got such an enormous amount of work to do. But those breakfasts, which we generally did around 8:00 in the morning in the Capitol, were, I thought, very successful. David Abshire hosted them with, I think, consummate skill.

I must say I came away from my--what was it a year, maybe two years up there, '71 to '73--with a very good impression of the Congress. I don't think that there were many members whom I knew, or even knew of, whom you could not approach, and from whom you could not get a fair hearing on an issue. If they weren't committed for some special reason, whether they were Republicans or Democrats, I always felt you could expect them to make a sensible decision. I know that's contrary to the present perspective on Congress, but my own experience was, that nearly all these guys were very hard working, very conscientious. All of them were dependent upon someone, every member has some issues on which he has absolutely no flexibility, because he's got a big donor, someone upon whom he's heavily dependent, who has a strong position on something. No matter how rational a change in the member's position might be, and no matter how much he might realize and agree with you, that he ought to vote differently, he won't budge. He can't

budge. And I think that nearly every member has one or two spots like that, or did at that time.

But otherwise they were pretty much open to hearing different points of view, and being convinced. I came away really very excited about the Congress, and very upbeat about our democracy because it seemed to me that you really could deal with nearly every issue, and that there was a way of getting the Congress, the legislative branch, to review reasonable grievances, and to make the system work.

Q: Well, the one that comes to mind, sort of the pressure group, is the Israeli lobby, and there are other ones, but this is the mightiest of them. How did you find dealing with that? Did you get involved in it?

FINA: Very little. The issues that I was responsible for, namely NATO economic policy, European communities, were not things which greatly interested the Israelis. They had no direct concern about that. The one thing that I was very much involved in, and which they cared a great deal about...now that you make me think of it...was the question of Soviet immigration to Israel. The Israelis always wanted more Jews to be able to leave the Soviet Union. And that led to something called the Jackson-Vanick__ amendment. Mr. Jackson, a Senator from the State of Washington--Scoop Jackson--a liberal in domestic affairs, and a conservative in foreign affairs; and a guy named Vanick__ from Chicago, who was a Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee, came up with an amendment to some law...I can't remember which one, which denied MFN benefits to the Soviet Union.

Q: I think it probably was Most Favored Nation, or even more than that.

FINA: Yes, it was very restrictive of the Soviet Union, and they saw this as a device for forcing the Soviet Union to release more Jews. There was a constant flow of Jews out of the Soviet Union during this period. I don't remember how many, but there was a flow. But they wanted more, and my recollection is that the Israeli lobby was pushing this very hard. As soon as I realized what was happening, and the Ways and Means Committee was my baby and therefore, I guess, I got wind of it early on. I warned David Abshire of what I thought were the negative implications of this. I thought it was a lousy idea, and he went to Kissinger with whom he had, I think, quite good relations, and Kissinger was opposed to the Jackson-Vanick__ amendment, at least in the beginning. We did what we could to try to prevent that coming into being. But we lost rather badly on that, whereas we had won on some other issues, but the Israeli lobby is very powerful. And on this there was a lot of demagoguery, and poor calculation about what would happen. The result was the Soviet Union cut off virtually all immigration to Israel in retaliation. So you went from a situation where there had been some more or less reasonable flow to almost nothing. And that didn't change until Gorbachev and company came on line. So it was another poor calculation in the cold war thinking that more toughness would force the Soviet Union to back down. But toughness didn't have that effect upon them.

Q: It doesn't work with us, it doesn't work with them.

FINA: That's right. But that was something that is very hard to convince a lot of people about, especially conservatives in this country who are basically force oriented, rather than resolution oriented, compromise.

Well, there were a lot of things that went on. One of the things that I was very pleased with was the effort to prevent the reduction in our force levels in Europe. Senator Mansfield, who at that time was the Majority Leader in the Senate, wanted to make drastic cuts in the number of our troops assigned to NATO and presence in Western Europe. And I was the guy who headed the task force to try to convince the Congress not to do that. We did a lot of interesting things, and we succeeded in convincing the Congress not to support Senator Mansfield. I was pretty happy about that.

Q: How did you go about that?

FINA: It was a question of getting people to come down and testify, and to bring them into private meetings with members. I don't remember whether I had McCloy, but a whole bunch of eminent people of both parties who came down and met. I got together a little booklet on NATO, and the costs of NATO, to demonstrate that we were not paying a disproportionate share, we were not bearing a disproportionate share of the burden. Once you get the facts out on paper where people can actually see them, a lot of the myths disappear about what our role was. And I devoted a lot of time to simply creating this little booklet that fitted in your pocket that had all these little details in it. I was rather pleased with that. It seemed to have some benign effect. I'm sure that what really counted was Mr. Kissinger, and Mr. Nixon going to work on members, but I thought that I had also had a part in defeating the Mansfield resolution.

Although interestingly enough, President Nixon was not very good when it came to lobbying the Congress. I remember that one of the things that repeatedly disappointed David Abshire, and even the White House Congressional Relations people, some of whom were pretty good, and some of whom were terrible, was that it was very difficult to get the President to pick up the phone. Members of both parties are very much influenced by the President contacting them personally. If the President calls you and asks you to change your vote on something, and if he has a fairly decent reason for doing it, it's very hard for a member to resist that. It isn't a question of being promised judgeships, or favors, but if the President says, "We need this for the United States," members have a lot of trouble resisting. But that, Nixon just wouldn't do it.

Q: And Nixon was following the preeminent man who was practically born with a telephone in one ear, and that's President Johnson.

FINA: Yes, that's right. Johnson was a tremendous arm- twister, a jawboner, and I never could understand why President Nixon, who lost a number of issues on the Hill, was not willing to jawbone some people by phone. His people up on the Hill, and those of us who

were working with them, knew that this vote or that vote could be swung if the President would do it. According to the scuttlebutt, he just wouldn't do it.

Q: Nixon is one of these, if one looks at it, I mean he's a very complex character, and these are the things that came out to haunt him.

FINA: Yes. Whether it was because he didn't want to put himself in the position of being beholden to some mere member of Congress...I don't know. But in terms of accomplishing your legislative, or your executive agenda, the President really has to play a leadership role in playing with the Congress.

One of the things to David Abshire's great credit was, that he knew how to count. And there's certainly no greater skill in working with the Congress than knowing how to count. He was meticulous in keeping lists of members in committee, and in the Congress as a whole, on issues and wanting to know how they were going to vote. And we, foot soldiers up there, spent a lot of our time trying to determine how members were going to vote, so you knew whom you had to influence. In that respect David was very good. He just understood how that ought to be done. There are other ways that I was dissatisfied with him...his politics were somewhat to the right of mine! But in this he really was exemplary. I know it was a disappointment to him that on issues that the White House thought were crucial, you couldn't get the boss to pick up the phone.

Q: Is there anything else we should cover on that, or should we move to your next assignment?

FINA: The one other major project that I handled that pleased me was defeat of efforts to transfer foreign commercial responsibility from State to Commerce. For some time there had been an effort by the Department of Commerce and its friends on the Hill to transfer the commercial reporting and trade promotion functions of State from it to the Department of Commerce. During my watch in H, this effort was renewed and there was an excellent chance that Congress would legislate the change.

State was opposed and I was given the project of stopping it. I chaired a little task force representing various parts of the Department to marshal the arguments and to get people to help my lobby. My recollection is that this battle was won almost entirely by lobbying committee staff members - in the Senate principally. After a rather long period, we won and the initiative to take this function from State was dropped. Later, after I was at my next post, I learned that Kissinger had acquiesced in shifting the entire function to Commerce. That led to the creation of the Commerce Foreign Commercial Service, another lamentable splintering of responsibility in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

There were other events like the staff lunch series, but suffice it to say that I had a wonderful time working with the Congress.

Q: One question, let me ask. One of the complaints that I've heard surface again and again was that the Department of State, and particularly the Foreign Service, didn't have a proper appreciation of keeping in touch with Congress. I mean to get them on their side. Obviously this is your job, but did you find that within the rest of the Foreign Service, the Department of State, there was a problem in getting them to devote the time that they should to Congress?

FINA: Yes, I think that's very perceptive, and you remind me of what was a continuing issue. I think that criticism is justified, that the Department of State, and the Foreign Service, pretty much wanted to stay away from the Congress when it could. There were some exceptions. There were some guys who were very good up there, and had good connections, and knew that they were good, and that this served their careers, and also served the substance of what they were trying to do. But for the most part I think it's true that Foreign Service officers, and Department people, really wanted to stay away from the political brawl. And oddly enough, frequently I don't think they were sufficiently...I don't think they could explain themselves in the kind of language that members and staff could readily understand. Sometimes you get too involved in the details of what you're doing professionally, to be able then to communicate with laymen. Many of the members of Congress have to be laymen on an awful lot of issues. They're specialized in some, but they're not in others. You're quite right, that was always a problem. The wise Bureau, it seems to me, would have tried to keep a line open to Congress and keep up a constant exchange of views. I think it can't just be one directional, its got to be an exchange. So you understand the concerns of the Congress, and you factor those into what you're trying to do, and at the same time that you try to keep the members aware of the significant aspects of what you're trying to do about which they have a legitimate concern.

That didn't happen very often from my recollection. In fact all the bureaus had an officer who was supposed to be their Congressional relations person. Some of them were all right. I don't know that I can remember any who was really very good. It was always sort of a second rank job. I'm not sure exactly why that was except that Foreign Service people tended to think that they really wanted to deal with foreigners, who are more fun to deal with than members of Congress, who come from an even more foreign land.

Q: Okay, let's move to your next post. Your next assignment was a really solid one for six years, wasn't it?

FINA: Yes, that's right. It was solid in terms of durability.

Q: You might explain what it was.

FINA: I was assigned to Milan as Consul General, and that was the first sort of normal Foreign Service assignment that I had ever had. I'd begun in intelligence research which was an odd-ball thing. I'd been assigned to Europe to the OECD which was an odd-ball thing, the European communities were odd-ball, back in the Department backing them up was out of the usual track, the same could be said for Congressional Relations, and the

Arms Control. They were all tangential to what is thought of as sort of the core activity of the Department of State which usually centers around starting as a vice consul, and becoming an ambassador.

So this job as Consul General was pretty interesting, and going back to Italy was especially attractive to me because since I had gotten out of Italian affairs, after my disagreement with the Department's position on the separation of the communists and the socialists back in the 1950s. It had taken, what, 20 some years to overcome that particular little problem? And in the end I only got this job because of the friendship of Republicans!

Q: I was going to say, having myself been forced down the caw of the EUR establishment somewhat later as Consul General to Naples, I know these Consul General jobs, particularly in Italy are held like little jewels in the EUR establishment hands, and you didn't belong to anybody's establishment.

FINA: No, I was not a member of the EUR inner circle, to say the least. What happened was that, in Congressional Relations the White House assigned one of its people from Kissinger's staff to the Department to be the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations. David Abshire had wanted to put me in that job, and he told me that he was nominating me for Deputy Assistant Secretary, which I thought would be great. I was enjoying the job enormously, I liked the Congress, I liked what I was doing. Even if I was out of sympathy with the Nixon administration the things that I was doing were things that I believed in. I wasn't obliged to do things on Vietnam where I was increasingly uncertain, and the Nixon administration position on keeping troops in NATO, and on multilateral trade negotiations, GATT, and so on, those were all things of which I was very supportive as I was of some of their other activities.

So I was glad for the opportunity to get on, and David proposed me as Deputy Assistant Secretary. Unfortunately, the White House must have gotten wind of the fact that I had views that were not exactly safe Republican views, and I was black-balled. I'd moved into the office, I was settling my papers in the desk, I was feeling hot-dog, I'd made it. And then the announcement came that, in fact, I had not made it, and the White House wouldn't approve.

So that increased my interest in leaving H, and going somewhere else. Then Personnel told me that this job was up in Milan, there were a lot of competitors for it. But interestingly enough, the guy who had been brought over from the White House to fill the job that I had thought that I was going to get, was a 32-year old Republican whiz kid, who had restaffed the Arms Control Agency after Nixon's second term, and cleaned out all the guys who had been responsible for the SALT negotiations because that had been part of the political deal that Senator Jackson had made with the White House. The conservatives were being paid off by purging all these people of dubious wisdom who were in the Arms Control, and in the Department of State, for their role in the SALT treaties. Anyway, this guy appeared on the scene and he knew nothing about nothing when it came to the

Department of State or foreign affairs. However, I rapidly discovered he was a very attractive person, and he was open to learning, was interested, and very candid about what he was doing, and what he had been doing in the White House. He escaped the Watergate thing by a hair although his buddies were implicated and dragged through the courts and the hearings, etc., but he, Stanton D. Anderson by name, escaped all that. Anyway, I became very fond of him. I thought he was really a very able, well-intentioned, and intelligent person, who wanted to do the right thing. And he rapidly caught on to what he was supposed to do. I thought he was very impressive.

Anyway, about that time, I found out about the Milan job, and it kept escaping from my grasp. There were always further meetings, there were always further problems, there were other candidates. In the end there were supposed to be objections by other agencies to my getting this job. I'd been keeping Stan Anderson informed of this, and he said, "Why don't I see what I can find out about this." After all, he had been in the personnel business in the White House, and had been fixing these things. So he called the Secretary of Agriculture, whose name I mercifully forget, and found out that he really didn't give a damn about who was assigned there although I had been told by Personnel that the obstacle to my getting Milan was that Agriculture had put a hold on it. The Byzantine life of the personnel business.

Anyway, Stan made a couple more telephone calls, and I was presently informed that in fact I had been paneled and I had gone through, and I was going to be Consul General in Milan. So I owe that, not to my buddies in the Foreign Service, but to a Republican, and a Nixon Republican at that!

Q: I might add that right now that you're...what's your title, what you're doing right now? We're talking about this is the election year of 1992. You're doing what?

FINA: I'm Executive Director of Democrats Abroad, which is the overseas arm of the Democratic Party.

Q: Okay, now let's go back.

FINA: Well, Stan Anderson, after leaving the Department I might say, has had a very successful career. I forget whether he made his first hundred million, or whatever it was very shortly thereafter. He's now running a lobbying firm here in town, and he's been a lobbyist for the Japanese and one of the principal organizers of the Republican conventions. Anyway, suffice it to say that I would never have gotten a decent job after Congressional Relations, if it hadn't been for the friendship of this Nixonian Republican.

So I went to Milan, and found it a rather dismal post, run down, sort of neglected, and with a long tradition of trying to do as little as possible because the embassy didn't really want other people second guessing it on political, or economic, things. You were supposed to stick to airgrams about local agricultural affairs, or something like that, but certainly not be involved in anything that the political section in Rome cared about. Well,

inasmuch as I was interested in everything, I was into everything. and I wanted to make the Consulate function the way I thought a government office should. It should serve the public.

So my period there was one of, I would guess, relatively high profile. I got rid of people whom I thought were not doing anything, and I insisted that we do various things. We remodeled the Consulate, got in new contemporary furniture (Knoll) since I wanted Milan to see that we were living in the present, creative world. We took down partitions which allowed local employees to close their doors and be insulated from that nasty public out there that wanted visas or other services. I opened it all up so that there was no place you could hide from the public. That was a revolutionary concept when I got there, but I wanted both the consuls, and the local employees, to be serving the public whether it was the American public, or the Italian public. I figured we were there to serve them. And I wanted them out, visible and available, and being nice to people. Well, there was a lot of time spent on doing things like that, some deadwood in the locals who were hard to get rid of but eventually they retired, or we moved them, or something. And I thought that the Consulate became a pretty effective and active place, because I asked a lot.

I gave people a lot of responsibility and I urged them to do things. My theory was that we should know everybody in our Consular district, which incidentally ran from the Turin consular district, which was Piedmont, all the way to Trieste. We had the whole of northern Italy down almost as far as Bologna, a big consular district. And I wanted to know everybody who counted, and I wanted them to know us. I wanted our people to go out and visit them, to find out what they were doing, and to know them before the problems arose so that when something happened, we could call up and go see someone who already knew us. We shouldn't have to make the acquaintance of some guy for the first time when we needed him. So we drew up lists of the people who counted, and assigned them to people as their contacts, and we went out and did it. I traveled a lot through the consular district, constantly calling on all the right people, the prefect, the bishop, the cardinals, the leaders of industry, trade union leaders, all the political parties and the press.

Another aspect of my tenure in Milan was having a very active social schedule. I tried to know everyone who counted politically or economically. That meant a lot of entertaining. To do that within the rather tight budget that I had, nearly all was done at our residence. My wife supervised it all and did all of the shopping. In one year we had some 1,500 guests!

My access was increased when I became Dean of the Consular Corps in Milan. There was a large consular community and some friction between it and the government for very silly reasons. The Mexican Consul General made a big fuss about the Prefect not giving an annual dinner for the Consular Corps! I tried to clear that up and turned it into a quite active group which gave me further entry to both the consular community and to the Italian community. It was a lot of work, but it advanced the interests of the United States.

Our residence was a new apartment that we had leased and furnished with contemporary furnishings and art. I had small lunches there with every sort of local leader and we also had larger receptions on July 4 which reached out to the broadest range of Italians. I did not want to spend our limited funds on the American community, so I organized a community picnic funded with private donations. That worked pretty well except that our Foreign Service people got stuck with all the dirty work. So that had some drawbacks.

I was in a very happy position at this time of having John Volpe, a Massachusetts Republican, as ambassador. He arrived in Rome a day or two before I arrived in Milan. John Volpe was an unusual man. He was a Republican, and I was a (closet) Democrat, although I didn't advertise the fact. He was a very energetic and committed Catholic. I was an atheist. He was a sort professional Italo-American which I certainly wasn't. But he had a lot of qualities which I very much respected. And one of the first things he did, which has endeared him to me ever since, was that he changed our policy with respect to dealing with the Communists. From the time that I had entered the Department of State in the 1950s, until I got to Milan in 1973, it had been forbidden for Foreign Service Officers to deal with Communists. Until the 1960s you had not been permitted to speak with many socialists. Well, I thought that was absolutely idiotic. And I was so delighted when...I forget how it came about, but I asked for authority to deal with everybody, to talk to everybody, to report on everybody. And Bob Beaudry, who was the Deputy Chief of Mission in Rome to Volpe, a very fine career Foreign Service Officer, a very professional guy...I don't know how he brought it about, but at any rate Volpe agreed. And Volpe believed in it. His view was, that if you didn't talk to the enemy and understand them, how could you possibly know how to cope with the problems they were creating for you. So eminently sensible, but that was a politician, that wasn't a professional diplomat. That was a man who had lived his political life competing with, and rubbing shoulders with his Democratic opposition in Massachusetts. He had a much more sophisticated view of dealing with your political enemies than this very ideological approach that I think the Foreign Service had taken, and which was undoubtedly caused in large part by the McCarthy period.

Well, suffice it to say, that I began my contacts by dealing with all the political parties, and wherever I went whether it was Milan, or Venice, or anywhere else, I methodically saw them all. I saw the Christian Democrats, the socialists, the communists, the neo-fascists, whoever it was that was a political party, who counted. I wanted to go around and meet them, and interview them, and hear what they had to say. I did that in every provincial capital of my territory...it seems to me there were ten, or something like that, or twelve.

Q: It's amazing how divided as Italy is to areas (overlap conversation)

FINA: There's a great deal of decentralization, and long cultural history for all these places like Mantua, or Varese, or Verona, and Como. Each one of those places is a little society, and a little world. My objective was to go and see them all, talk to them all, find

out what they had to say. So I began a series of telegrams, not airgrams, called "Cable from Mantua". Each place I went to I wrote a reporting cable.

Well, those cables gave me great grief, and great pleasure. I love to write, and I love to report, and I dealt with all the major political, and economic issues, that faced these areas. I reported with as much candor as possible without regard to whether that jibed or didn't jibe with the political views of either the ambassador or the political section, or much less, the desk in Washington. I believed strongly that somebody ought to be telling it the way it is. You may draw different conclusions, but my job was to tell you what they're saying in Mantua, and what they doing in Bergamo, or what they're saying and what they're doing in Trento, or what they're saying and doing elsewhere. You owe it to your government to tell it exactly the way you see it. Washington can disregard your truth. It can conclude you're wrong, but you should never fix your reporting to suit your listeners. And that's what I did.

Well, the ambassador was very good about that. He was very supportive. The political section in Rome, I think, had a constant case of indigestion from these cables. One reason for that was that I sent them as cables, and therefore they got back to the Department of State, and somebody read them. Airgrams traditionally have gone to the researchers, and no one has paid any attention to them because you're submerged in material. And I wasn't interested in writing for the archives. My cables were sufficiently lively to be read. They not infrequently got passed up to the Secretary of State, and I heard about it. I heard about it in complaints from the embassy saying that I was getting too much attention for a point of view which was obviously wrong! All this business about how the communists were no longer communists, and how the Christian Democrats were stealing out of the public treasury. This thing only misled people back in the Department. You shouldn't do it.

On the other hand, Beaudry and the ambassador didn't try to stop me. I certainly didn't make any friends among the traditional right wing Foreign Service community. They didn't like being upstaged by a guy in Milan who was dealing with all the hot issues of the day, and with national level political leaders to whom I had access, and who were very, very willing to see me, and to talk with me. That included Cardinal Giovanni Colombo, who was the Archbishop of Milan, who at one time was in the running for the Papacy. I think he would have been very good, a very impressive man. On the other hand, it was his colleague the Patriarch of Venice who got the job, who in my view, was really a second rater. I had seen him regularly when I went to Venice. I always call on the Patriarch. An incredible experience to go Venice and call on the Patriarch of Venice, and you think of the history that lies behind him. But he really was not...

Q: Who was this:

FINA: This may have been Pope John Paul, anyway he's the Pope who had a very short reign.

Well, suffice it to say that I was busy reporting from all over the area, and obviously making the political section very unhappy. And, I guess, to make things worse, the ambassador started picking up my stuff as an example of what he wanted all consular posts to do. Some of them could and some of them couldn't. Some of them were interested and some of them weren't. If I had had only career aspirations, I would have done things differently. I had career aspirations, but I also had substantive interests in what I thought ought to be done.

Volpe was a fascinating man, but he certainly caused us all unlimited anguish because of his Italian-Americanism. I don't know whether you were there when...

Q: I wasn't there when he was there, but I heard about it.

FINA: He was such a nice, decent person in many ways, although he was pretty tight, I guess. The people who worked with him in Rome thought he was tight-fisted. I think what agonized us all was that when he'd come to visit, and we wanted ambassadorial visits...these pastoral progressions, around the country were important in public relations terms. He insisted upon speaking Italian, and while he speaks and spoke impeccable English, excellent grammatical English with a fine accent, no one could ever fault him on his English; when he shifted to Italian, it was just awful. He spoke, and speaks the Italian of an uneducated mountain peasant from central Italy. He's very articulate, and undoubtedly in Massachusetts, and the Massachusetts political milieu with lots of Italian immigrants, lots of people with that kind of a background who still speak kitchen Italian, it must have been a tremendous asset. But in Italy there is a racism something like that of the United States with regard to blacks, and it's based on your cultural level, or your social standing. The minute you open your mouth, you're typed by any Italian. He knows immediately where you stand in the social scale, whether you're educated or uneducated, whether you're from the north or the south. And unfortunately the movers and shakers in Italy are, for the most part, the educated, traditional, upper- class. Ambassador Volpe sounded to them as lower class, which he certainly wasn't. And when they weren't laughing at him behind his back, they were disdaining him. It was very humiliating for those of us who wanted the United States to look good to see our ambassador tarred like that.

Q: Did anybody tell him this?

FINA: Oh, it's a very hard thing to tell an ambassador something like that! He was such a nice man. We'd beg him to read an Italian text. And USIA, which was as conscious of this problem as any of us, always prepared him fine speeches. They were good literate Italian, and he could read it properly if he wanted to. But he'd always arrive at the rostrum and say, "Well, the staff has written this for me, but I want to speak to you as paisani", or something like that. And he would then launch into his idiomatic Italian. He had them rolling in the aisles in some ways. He had this wonderful electric communication with people, but in the end there was disdain for the man among the movers and shakers, at least those who did not really know him. What the common man thought, I don't know.

But among trade unionists, among business leaders, among government officials, in my area, they were not very generous about him. The problem has been that so often we've sent ambassadors to Italy who were beneath the dignity of the United States to send. There have been some good ones, but often they have been second raters. Ambassador Volpe was not a second rater, but he appeared to be in the eyes of many of these people because of his vanity, and because of this insensitivity to the cultural world in which an ambassador has to live.

His successor was an entirely different kettle of fish, and that was Richard Gardner. Did you work for Gardner?

Q: I worked for him, yes.

FINA: Richard Gardner had the intellect, the education, the background to be a great ambassador.

Q: He spoke fluent Italian, and was a professor of political economy...

FINA: ...and of law.

Q: And of law, which put him right up in the upper reaches of intellectual heights of the Italian scene.

FINA: Absolutely. He understood all the issues. There was never any question about Richard Gardner understanding the issues, being sensitive to the politics. He had a great command of what was going on, and he was a great credit to the United States in many respects. He made an excellent impression upon Italians. From my point of view, he was very supportive, very complimentary, he was very good to me.
Among the things that I very much respected in him, was that even though he disagreed with my views on the central issue of the Communists, he never tried to close off open discussion.

I reached the conclusion toward the end of my tour in Milan that we really ought to favor the reconciliation of the communists, and bring them into the government. It was a time when the Christian Democrats were struggling for majority, it was the period of the Brigate Rosse, the Red Brigades, the kidnapping, the knee cappings, a very fascinating, and very tense period in political and national security terms. I concluded, after several years of getting to know these people, and really spending a lot of time working at the grass roots...or at any rate, at the provincial level, getting to know the political leaders, that it would have been in our interest to have favored bringing the communists into the government. They were no longer loyal to the Soviet Union. They were no longer a subversive threat to anybody. They had become a bourgeois party, sort of a liberal democratic, or a liberal socialist party. All of the Stalinist, Leninist, revolutionary, totalitarian stuff, had gone down the drain sometime after Czechoslovakia, from my experience.

Q: That was in '68.

FINA: The leadership, and I don't know that much about the followership, but the guys at the trade union level, or the provincial, and city level communist party were about as committed to the democratic system as anyone could be, and a great deal more honest than their Christian Democratic counterparts. Anyway, I came to the conclusion, I suppose around '77, that we really ought to be moving in that direction. So I said so. Well, Gardner had come to Italy announcing as he left the United States that there was going to be a new policy with respect to dealing with the communists. We were now going to talk to them. Of course, that had been the policy that Volpe had established in 1973, but somehow or other that had never gotten back to Gardner, and maybe never gotten back to Washington! I don't know. Volpe certainly was not the kind to advertise it. But Gardner was, and he no sooner arrived in Rome, than Evans and Novak, as I recall, zapped him.

Q: These were conservative columnist of the nasty ilk.

FINA: That's right. I think they did a column in which they really zapped him for being soft on communism, and a woolly-minded liberal. He really got raked over the coals by them. Well, that slowed him down to an impressive degree, and from then on he was very, very guarded on this question. He didn't stop me from continuing my contacts with the communists. But he certainly discouraged everybody else. As I say, I always appreciated the fact that he was willing to let me continue writing things which were contrary to the advice he was getting from his very conservative political section, and from his staff, including his new DCM (Allan Holmes) who was career minded at all costs, who later became an ambassador without any particular contribution to the interests of the United States, in my view.

Q: This was Bob Paganelli?

FINA: No, this was another guy...what was his name. I've a Freudian inability to remember some people whom I want to forget! Suffice it to say, that despite the pressure he had from his staff, he never tried to censor what I was writing, which was diametrically opposed to what the embassy was then saying, and what he was saying. And when we had national meetings of the staff in Rome, and so on, he was very willing to listen to my different point of view. I found myself alone, I think, among all the consuls and consuls general, and the staff, in advocating this point of view. He was willing to hear it, he never tried to squelch me, and for that I was very grateful.

On the other hand, my regret about Richard Gardner was, and is, that it seemed that his ambition was so great that there was no substantive issue which couldn't be modified, if that were necessary, for what he conceived to be his career interests.

Q: One has the feeling, when I served under him, that his career interest was Secretary of State.

FINA: It may have been. I don't know. I never attempted to divine what he wanted to do, but he was ambitious and wanted to rise in political influence, and stature, etc. He had all the abilities to do that, but there was this overriding ambition which unfortunately colored, as far as I could see, everything that he did. And I thought that was too bad because here was a man with great natural endowment, a wonderful education, a charming person with whom to work, but with what I considered to be a flaw for a public servant. Not an uncommon flaw, but in an ambassador, or a person of his abilities it turns out to look bigger and be bigger just because he's got more authority, and he's got more ability than the average...

Q: Can you think of any examples of how this played out?

FINA: Well, I think it was principally in this question of dealing with the communists, or what the relation of the communist could be. I think that he was so spooked by the public criticism of his initial declaration of a willingness to dialogue with everybody. There were, I think, other things, too, that escape me. He was very friendly with, or attempted to be very friendly with Brzezinski, who was at that time the National Security Adviser. I must say that I didn't think much of Mr. Brzezinski. I had known him when he was on the Policy Planning Staff in the Department of State. I think he was a very intellectually alert, and stimulating person, but unfortunately his Polish background gave him a special perspective on anything that had to do with the Soviet Union. That, in my view, distorted his picture of what was in the interests of the United States. And Richard Gardner needed to remain on good terms with Brzezinski whatever his own personal views may have been. I think that influenced his position in a conservative way on a lot of the issues that we faced.

Q: Talking about the political section in Rome, I served in Naples as Consul General from '79 to '81. I came not from a political reporting background, basically a consular background, and maybe it showed my consular upbringing or something, but I have the feeling that the political section there, in Rome, spent an awful lot of time trying to figure out who was in what position in that minuet called the national political scene. I mean, you'd have an election and there would be in those days a difference of two or three percentage points. Nothing had changed since 1948, and we used to get cables saying, "What do you think of the latest alignment?" You'd get sort of a blank look when you talked to the local officials there because they didn't pay any attention to this. Did you feel that the political section in our embassy in Rome was more or less caught up in the exquisite detail of...Italian politics was very interesting, but as far as American interests are concerned, nothing had really changed. This was sort of my impression.

FINA: I think I would share that view. I wouldn't have thought of putting it quite that way, but I do think that the political section in Rome, as long as I can remember it, and I remember it from the 1950s, was always involved in this minutiae without ever looking at the big picture. They started with certain fixed views that all communists were subversive, bad, and enemies. Until the Kennedy administration, all socialists were really

communists. The only really reliable people were the Christian Democrats, and then there were these other little parties that were frivolous, and needed to be kept in line to maintain a parliamentary majority. It all revolved around how you achieved these majorities to continue to rule with a minimum of attention being given to the macro picture of what's really happening in Italy, what's happening to the global economy, what's happening to society as a whole. And without giving any consideration to whether our interests might not lie in some fundamental changes in how Italy was governed. So I agree with you. That certainly was my impression over all the years.

It was a rare period when you got anybody in that political section who was able to get any perspective on the overall picture. I always thought the air in that embassy in Rome must have been recirculated from the 1940s to the present, and there was something miasmic about it. You began to breathe it and before you knew it you were involved in these Byzantine maneuvers about an unreal world in which communism and anti-communism were the two great symbols, and long after that had any real meaning for the interests of the United States, in my opinion. At any rate, it was still that way when I was Consul General, but I sure as hell didn't accept that, and that, I'm sure, prevented my ever getting an onward assignment because when I got through in Milan, Gardner was very nice, and he actually asked me, and urged me to stay longer. But my view was that I'd put in six or seven years, it was a wonderful time. I enjoyed it enormously, I liked my job, but if I was going to get anywhere in career terms, I had to stop being a Consul General, I had to go somewhere to be a DCM, or an ambassador. And I thought, if I can't get a better job then I've got now, then I ought to get out, because the Department of State, the Foreign Service, even at that time was shrinking, and everyone knew there were fewer and fewer interesting jobs around. Then, too, I was getting older, and the question was, do I stay on here in this really nice job where I know everyone, where I've got a lot of prestige, and I'm living a very fine life. Or do I face reality and say, either I get a better job, or I get out. So I declined to continue. I suppose I could have continued a couple more years, I declined to continue.

I went back to Washington, and started walking the halls. In the end after endless hall walking, I decided I had to get out. I was not going to get a job. I had difficulty enough getting an interesting job in the Carter administration where Brzezinski had a very conservative influence. And when it became clear to my disbelief that Ronald Reagan was going to be elected President...

Q: I still find it difficult.

FINA: I never met anyone who said he was going to vote for Ronald Reagan when we got back to the United States. When it happened I said, "Man, they won't even give me a job sweeping halls in this place, and I don't want to be around." Moreover, there was a question of money. I had become an FSO-1 and so was at the top of the scale. But the income was capped by the rule that it could not exceed that of a Member of the House

and the penny pinching required to support my family under those circumstances was very painful. I was tired of having to be so tight fisted with my children.

So I began job hunting, and I found a job in the private sector which I'm very glad I took because it was very stimulating. That was the end of my career with the Department of State. I am grateful for the opportunity that it provided to my and my wife to make a contribution to the interests of the United States. But it neither made me rich or famous.

Q: Well, I'll tell you it made you famous in one way--I can only speak for one person--I read all your cables. Before I went out I had a little time before I came from Seoul to be the Consul General, and I read with great pleasure your cables, and they were the only reporting ones reporting from Italy that seemed to make sense.

FINA: Thank you, sono commosso!.

Q: But the point being that they were there, and I think they have become part of the business which isn't true in most cases of those posts. So there is a legacy. I'm not saying this as a compliment, I'm saying this as a fact.

FINA: Thank you, I'd never known what happened to my cables. I had various people mention them to me on one occasion or another. However, they did not enhance my career prospects. Still, I look back on them without any regret because I tried to be as honest as I could, and sometimes honesty is rewarded, and sometimes it is penalized. But when you're honest at the wrong time, you get no benefits.

Q: Well, I think probably more than that was the fact that although you had served for some time as Consul General, you were not really part of the European establishment back in the Department. I know this, once you're out, when you come back you just don't belong to anybody, and that was a particularly trying time. A couple years later I joined you in the hall ranks, and unless you had a home office, and some people who cared for you in Washington, you weren't going to go anywhere.

FINA: I think that's absolutely right. If you didn't have a patron, a sponsor, who was taking care of you. Just as in any European court, or in the Soviet Union, or anywhere else, you didn't have much of a chance unless you have extraordinary talents which I cannot pretend. And in my particular case, all of my patrons, the Bob Schaetzels and Jack Tuthills, were out because there had been a change in policy and they were out of favor. So I was really navigating purely on my own, and you just don't get very far when you are as independent in thinking as I was. After my last patron, Stan Anderson, intervened to get me the job in Milan, there was no one left. While Dick Gardner offered to help, his influence was limited. And the interesting jobs available were precious few.

Q: He was cut off.

FINA: He didn't have the kind of clout in the Department. As I say, in retrospect, I've no regrets. It was a wonderful experience. I learned a lot. I hope I did some service for my country. One never knows. Our policy towards Italy hasn't greatly changed.

Q: Well, what's there to change?

FINA: That's right. The Italians are doing it for themselves, and they're being very successful.

Q: I want to thank you very much, Tom.

FINA: It's I who thank you for having taken the time to listen to the recollections of an old soldier.

End of interview