Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training
Foreign Affairs Oral History Project

WILLIAM McAFEE

Interviewed by: Charles Stuart Kennedy
Initial interview date: September 9, 1997

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Carter priorities
Current intelligence

National Indications Center [NIC] 1954-1956
NORAD
Suez Crisis - 1956
Soviet missiles

State Department - INR - Special Assistant to Director 1956-1960
Sputnik
China-Soviet relations
Soviet Union
Middle East
Policies

State Department - INR - Publication Procurement 1960-1966
Hilsman
Advanced Planning
National Intelligence Assessment
Overhead Reconnaissance
CIA
U2s
Cuba Crisis
SR-71 Blackbird
UFOs
French problems
Interdepartmental coordination
Aerial photography
Intelligence gathering sources
National Security Intelligence Directive
CIA-embassy relationship
Forty committee
Kissinger
Allende
Nicaragua
Clandestine intelligence
Defector committee cases
Asylum
Soviet deception program
Libya
Pueblo incident
Park Chung Hee
The Liberty
DOD & INR coordinators
Greece
Vietnam

INTERVIEW

Q: Today is September 9, 1997, and this is an interview with William McAfee, which is being done on behalf of the Association for Diplomatic Studies and I am Charles Stuart Kennedy. Can we start when and where you were born and a little about your family?

McAFEE: A friend of mine once said I looked like a person who had descended from a long line of Calvinist maiden aunts, easy to understand since I was born January 25, 1910, which makes me 87, at Port Royal, Pennsylvania, 45 miles west of Harrisburg, where my dad was a Presbyterian minister. My mother was born in Saint George, New Brunswick. Her father, a sea captain sailing out of Saint John, moved his family to Portland [Maine] when he was 70, probably selecting Portland because it was most like Saint John, which was near Saint George. Though she always spoke fondly of Saint George, it must have been an exciting change for a young girl of fifteen. I remember her in her late eighties saying, "To be young looking up Exchange Street." I grew up in Pennsylvania. Dad was a minister there, then later at Taylor Street Presbyterian Church in Fort Worth and at Patton, Pennsylvania. Dad was a student and scholar all his life and I grew up thinking that was

the only way; somewhere along the line I fell by the wayside.

I went to college at Wooster, in Wooster, Ohio, and took an MA [master's degree] in U.S. history at Penn [Pennsylvania] State and did some summer work at both Harvard and Oxford where my mother, brother John, and I took an unbelievable lecture course in the summer of 1937 on England in the post-war world. It could have been called "England Between the Wars," but they didn't know that then. They had a historian, I think he later became one of the well-known ones, as chairman. Sir John Marriot spoke, Morrison, the labor leader, and Harold Nicholson participated, as did Auden and one of the Loyalist Spanish leaders; and one of the last lecturers was a then little known economist by the name of Barbara Ward. [Such] was the quality of the course.

Q: I would like to come back to that later. Was Wooster a college or university in those days?

McAFEE: Wooster College.

Q: Did you get involved at all in foreign affairs there? What was your major?

McAFEE: I had started off thinking I would be an English major. Howard Lowry, who was my main professor, was a scholar who had been given the initial access to some of Matthew Arnold's background papers. But, Eileen Dunham was a history professor whose course on World War I and events leading up to it, made history come alive, so I did gradually change and became more interested in foreign affairs. Then happenstance - it is curious how it plays a role - the editor of the Wooster Voice was Willard Hanna, a friend of mine, and a brilliant guy. He said to me, "Bill, go down and see Dean Compton [who was the father of Arthur Compton, the Nobel Prize winner, and his brother who was president of MIT, Massachusetts Institute of Technology]. The college has always given money to a college in India. Maybe we should be thinking of doing something new and different." I went down and interviewed Dean Compton and he suggested instead of giving money here and there for students [in India] to support a teacher [to be sent to] India. It sounds like collusion, but when they asked for people who wanted to go, I was selected and I went to India. I was the first of almost twenty representatives from Wooster to go to India.

Q: You were in India from when to when?

McAFEE: From 1932-35.

[There is] one episode on the way to India I have recalled many times during my work in intelligence. I was traveling second economy class on the Lloyd-Triestino - with a cabin just above the water line. It was monsoon time in the Arabian Sea and I left the deck for my cabin, shared with a British Army officer whose wife was in a medical institution. When I got to the cabin he was lifting all the bags up on the berths - there were four or five inches of water slushing around. The ship's captain had slightly changed course and the sea was coming in through port holes. After closing those [in the cabin] he sat down

and said he had not had anything like this since the Western Front. He was a forward artillery observer at a farm house well ahead of the British main line on the morning of March 21, 1918, when the whole sky lit up. It was the start of the Big Drive that almost won the war for the Germans. He moved to the front and soon met a German who turned and disappeared in the fog, losing his coat as he did so. Lieutenant Tomlinson picked it up and found it had a unit identification - it proved to be a German crack division and this information was part of the information that led the British to conclude a major offensive had started. Up until that time such offenses were preceded by a long bombardment but Ludendorff had decided on new infiltration tactics with a short barrage and an immediate troop assault. John Kegan, military historian, describes infiltration as anticipating blitzkrieg tactics of World War II - attack in strength and go deep; Ludendorff himself characterized it as punch a hole and see what happens. It was a change of direction and it almost caught the Allies off guard - catching a change of direction - one of the hardest tasks in intelligence.

Q: Can you describe India from the perspective of a brand new American college graduate?

McAFEE: Your first impression is of the overwhelming poverty, just everywhere. It was depressing, but you soon got used to it, sorry to say. I served both in India and China and I am one of the few Americans who can say they prefer India. I have always kept up my contacts there.

First the setting - there is nothing in the world like the Himalayas. From the foothills you look back to the main ridge always snow covered, and down to the plains where you can see the rivers, moving across the dry and hot land and understand why the Indians revere them. India had an ancient civilization, magnificent monuments, and an active engaging people. At Ewing Christian College where I taught, you came out of the clamor of the bazaar into the quiet of the campus with its great banyan tree and [location on] the Jumna River. I liked the country and my place in it. I greatly respected the missionaries - and they did not fit in the picture many Americans have of them. Dr. Rice, Principal, was a Princeton Ph.D.; Jim Manry, a three year magna cum laude graduate of Harvard; Cal Hazlett after retirement and in his mid-seventies learned Spanish so he could talk with the maintenance workers in his retirement community in California; Dr. Forman ran a dispensary that the surgeon general of the United Provinces called the best adaptation of modern medicine to India's situation and needs; Art Mosher, who had to leave because of family health problems, became head of a Rockefeller foundation - to name a few. The Indian staff included Dr. Malvea, a Ph.D. in chemistry from Ohio State, and a Ph.D. in economics from Cornell, C. M. Chattengee - many others had either U.S. or British university training and degrees from India's major universities, and I liked and respected them - mostly Hindu but with a mix of religious backgrounds.

I enjoyed very much traveling around India, being part of its sights, sounds and smells, trekking in the Himalayas, rubbing elbows with pilgrims at Benares, seeing the Taj Mahal, which is beautiful at all times. I traveled third class, carrying my own bedding and sleeping on station platforms between coolies and cows, eating from the bazaar, but hot

food and tea only. It gave you a wonderful sense of being part of a very ancient civilization.

Q: What was your impression of the British role in India during the period you were there, 1932-35?

McAFEE: They were still very much entrenched. I remember on a railway station platform talking by chance to some minor British official. He said that this country was not going to be ready for home rule for another 200 years. On the other hand, the British had laid all the infrastructure for independence. They had a pretty good educational system in place. They had the railroads, the post, the telegraph, stability to permit certain economic development, and a bureaucracy that the Indians were in a position to take over. So compared to other colonial empires, I think India was far and away more advanced.

The Indian Civil Service was a desired assignment for highly qualified Britishers; it paid well; you retired early. Whatever its effectiveness it made the Indians second class citizens in their own country. I always felt that if I were an Indian I would be a rebel if I had the fortitude.

Q: Where were you teaching and could you talk a bit about the teaching experience?

McAFEE: Ewing Christian College [founded in 1901] was at Allahabad which is at the junction of the Ganges and the Jumna [rivers] and is one of the three holy cities of India. It was a good intermediate college. The head of it was Herbert Rice, a Ph.D. from Princeton who had done work in psychological testing. He did a lot of testing in India between castes which upset some Indians a little bit, because he didn't necessarily find that much difference test-wise between Brahmans and some lower castes.

Q: What was the attitude towards a Christian college in a holy Hindu city of India?

McAFEE: Actually, there were no problems at all between the Americans and the Indians. The problem was between American missionaries out in the countryside and what they considered the too liberal missionaries at Ewing College. There was no emphasis on conversions while I was there. They had one required course in either Bible or ethics, with no evangelical pressure. It was just a good college that offered a much broader range of activities than the average college in India. It had a lot of student-teacher contacts. Roy McCorkel, a short termer, had students waiting in line outside his quarters in the afternoon after classes to talk about various student concerns. As warden of Princeton hostel with its nine Hindus, nine Muslims and nine Christians, I would occasionally in the evening move around the hostel to visit with students. Years later in a comment I still cherish, a former student noted how much they looked forward to the visits from the chota (young, junior) sahib. They welcomed the Americans. It had an excellent physical education program, rare in India, a lot of intramural athletics, a debating society, and a variety of student organizations. Its record was second only to the government college in terms of the people who passed the final examination administered by the government. I think colleges like ECC had a disproportionate impact on how Indians viewed America.

Q: Was it coed?

McAFEE: No. It became coed about three or four years after I left. The Indians still felt that the women were not intellectuals. I was tickled to see that the outstanding student shortly after their admission was a woman.

Q: What were you teaching?

McAFEE: The main subject a person like me could teach was English. The students had had eight years of English and were going to have to pass a test on it. The government had these standardized tests that everyone had to take at the end of two college years; back then English was the Lingua Franca of the country. So, you taught English, specifically those works that were to be the subject of the tests.

Q: Were you under any constraints not to talk too much about the declaration of independence?

McAFEE: When you went into India you signed a note as terms of getting your visa that you would not engage in political activities. The college said that no matter how you felt, to abide by it. So we did.

Q: Were the students pressing you to find out more about America?

McAFEE: Yes. America they liked. England they respected very highly because England had ruled them, but they liked America. On the other hand, they were somewhat careful of expressing themselves. One scene illustrates this: C. M. Chattergee was the senior and very able warden for the hostels. He came to me one night and said to come with him to the station, so we grabbed our bikes and went down to the station where he went up on the platform and told a student standing there to come with him. We got back to the dormitory and C. M. Chattergee checked his bag. He made one mistake. He left the door open and the Indian students could look in. At the bottom of the bag he found a kukri, a Nepalese curved knife. C. M. gave a sigh, closed the door and said, "Now we will have to report this to British authorities because the students have seen it and word will be around the college and the government has informers in every college. If we don't report it we will be vulnerable for not reporting it." You didn't have long discussions on political topics.

The British really had a hammerlock on the country. Above all they detested the Bengal terrorists who would come up on a car, toss in a bomb and disappear into the following chaos. I never heard an Indian express sympathy for them but I wondered if down under some must have felt it was one way of getting back at their rulers. Since then I have felt that fighting terrorism needed two prongs; first to know who they are and to deal with them when possible; second, when possible to seek to address the basis for terrorism. I am aware that in the modern world there is for some extremists an appeal for terrorism simply for its own sake.

Q: Was Mohandas Gandhi a topic of conversation at that time?

McAFEE: Yes. Gandhi was the most revered figure in India. He had been an attorney in South Africa where he supported the rights of the Indian minority. When he decided to return to India to work for independence he made several sound decisions, unrealistically embracing asceticism, poverty and abstinence... Hindu traditions. He urged India to return to cottage industry, making the spinning wheel a symbol, and wearing a homespun dhoti [traditional slacks]. He selected clearly understood goals. In his march to the sea to make salt he was protesting the British monopoly and tax on it. His espousal of non-violent methods made him a world figure, though in view of the British hold on India it was probably the only feasible method. In India he achieved the rare distinction of being both a politician and a seer. During my time in India, he was in and out of jail. Once a friend of mine and I went down and bought tickets to Cawnpore to get into the guarded railway station and we saw him from a distance. The students respected and revered him; in some ways a more prominent local figure was Jawaharlal Nehru who was from Allahabad. Nehru came to the campus one day and a colleague and I asked if we could meet him for a session. We were told yes, to write him on Monday. Well, as you might have known, on Monday he was back in jail.

Q: Being a Christian university, how did you deal with the caste system in class?

McAFEE: There was no recognition of caste at all by the college though we had sons of rajah's, Brahmins, land owners and outcasts. I think we had 900 students when I was there and only 27 of them were Christians. A significant number of the others were Muslims, who got along all right with the Hindus. The students had their own little messes, where eight or ten of them together would hire their cooks, etc. After I left, a friend of mine, Al Kearns-Preston, started a combined college mess, open to all castes which was sort of revolutionary in India because you ate with people you normally wouldn't have eaten with. It worked out and is still going as the main college cafeteria.

Q: In 1935 you left India. Where did you go?

McAFEE: I came back home and taught in high school in Patton, at Kiski in western Pennsylvania, and at Altoona High. Then I went to Penn State to do graduate work in history and was offered a job teaching in the local high school, which I did while continuing graduate study until the war.

Q: You were in Oxford when?

McAFEE: Summer of 1937. It was a most rewarding course. No credit, just great lectures, and access to the Bodleian [Library].

Q: Was the Oxford Movement going on - we shall not fight for King and Country, etc.?

McAFEE: Yes, that debate had gone on, but I do not remember its being reflected in the

lectures, the seminars or the press. This was a more conservative setting than the normal undergraduate one. This is a subject that would have resonated with me. When I graduated from college in 1932 I considered myself a pacifist - I could not imagine the means of war resulting in a good end. I gradually changed over the years but Hitler put an end to any remaining pacifist convictions. I remember a symbolic moment in 1937 when mother, John and I were in Heidelberg looking down over the town and a sea of swastikas - powerful, pagan, sinister.

Q: Were the problems of Europe becoming pretty apparent?

McAFEE: I remember the final words of the chairman who was worried about what was coming. His words were "If God erases, it is to write again."

Q: When were you drafted into the military?

McAFEE: I went in on March 10, 1942 as a private; and as a private I got my greatest percent pay raise in history. I was getting $21 a month and it went up to $50. We left Altoona on a special train and the workers in the railway shops turned out to wave and cheer as we went by. Half the recruits then got drunk. We arrived at Fort Meade, Maryland, had a brief physical and were sworn in. It was a totally unpretentious ceremony - we stood in a semi circle just at sunset and took the oath. Somehow it was a moving experience. Later in the barracks you looked at yourself and those around you and wondered how we were supposed to face up to the Nazis. My army experience left me with the belief that the military is greater than the sum of its parts. I continue to value my military experience. Charlton Ogburn at one time in State, a man I liked and respected, put it best in his book on the Marauders: "We belonged to that which is older than any nation. We went back to the beginning of history; we were the beginning of history. We were the soldiery."

Q: Oh, yes.

McAFEE: The only difference the pay raise made was the poker games went on longer until card sharks cleaned out their regular victims.

Q: What sort of outfit did you end up in?

McAFEE: I was a private in the infantry, applied for officer candidate school and went to Benning “School for Boys,” the infantry school [in Georgie], and became a 90 day wonder. As a second lieutenant I was assigned back to Camp Croft, where I had had my basic training. I heard at that time that [General] Stilwell was looking for people to work with the Chinese army that had been driven out of Burma and was to go back in. He had a training center set up near Ranchi in India and I wanted to apply for duty with these forces. I was told I would have to apply for combat duty across the board which I did expressing my desire to be sent to India. I got orders immediately for troop duty in Europe. They were canceled by orders to military intelligence on the India desk. There was a very outstanding young officer in G-2 by the name of Bob Goheen, later president

of Princeton and ambassador to India. G-2 needed a good man to work on MacArthur's [public theater], whereas India was sort of a backwater, Bob was given the new assignment [to the Pacific] and they were looking for [his] replacement, for somebody who had been in India. My name was on file, I had expressed interest in that type of work and I was selected.

Q: You were working on the India desk for whom and what was the period you were doing that?

McAFEE: In military intelligence in the Pentagon. The chief of the office was a highly regarded Lieutenant Colonel Dean Rusk. It was interesting work. Actually, of course, India was not really a combat area. I was the officer for the Indian Army and I could tell you where every unit, company, battalion and regiment of the Indian Army was. I wrote a history of the Arakan campaign of late 1942 that some people agreed with, and some didn't.

Q: This is Field Marshal Slim's return to Burma?

McAFEE: Yes, though General Slim was not in charge of that operation. In his book Defeat into Victory, he tells of initial planning for the operation to go 90 miles down the Mayu Peninsula split by the Mayu ridge and with many opportunities for strong defensive positions. As commander of XV Corps, he developed a plan calling for a ground force to move down the peninsula, a small naval flotilla his people had patched together for end runs and Wingate's brigade to come against Akyab by the back door. Eastern Army, however, decided to take over direct command of the operations. They put no confidence in the amphibious force and Wingate's brigade was assigned other duties by an even higher headquarters. As Slim recounts it, things went well until forces were only a few miles from the tip of the Mayu peninsula and a carrier patrol reached the tip and reported no Japanese resistance. Slim then refers to "an unfortunate pause in the advance" which allowed the Japanese to bring up reinforcements, halt the drive and eventually force a British retreat. In the report on the campaign which I wrote based for the most part on the reporting of Colonel Lash, U.S. military attaché assigned to the area I mentioned, if memory serves me well, and it is now 55 years in the past, that the main British force as it neared the end of the peninsula and finding no resistance bivouacked for the night at 4:00 in the afternoon and renewed movement the next morning, meeting at that time the resistance from the Japanese who had moved back in. I expressed the view that the prudent thing to have done would have been to keep on going to secure the peninsula. I was commended later by a more senior officer (I was a lieutenant) and others challenged my position saying the prudent thing for a military force to do was to get secure for the night before dark. I was not and am not a military expert and looking back see how easy it was for a bystander to second guess the decisions in the field. I think General Slim's simple reference to an "unfortunate pause" may indicate where he stood. Even Americans who were in general very critical of the British had nothing but praise for General Slim.

Q: How long did you do this?

McAFEE: I did that from November, 1942 until October, 1943. If you ever want to impress a man know more about his writings than he does. Colonel Percy Hotspur Lash was the military attaché who followed the Arakan campaign, and wrote reports. I devoured them. When he came back I knew the reports better than he did. The Southeast Asia Command was set up by the Quebec Conference under Admiral Lord Louis Mountbatten. Brigadier General Wedemeyer was appointed deputy for plans and was looking for an aide. Colonel Lash one day told me that General Wedemeyer was going to give me a call and I should just answer his questions. I went up to see him when he called and it was very informal. He came around his desk and shook hands. He asked me a lot about the Indian Army and the northwest frontier and the Army's performance there, etc. Then he asked if he could ask a few personal questions, which he did. He asked if I would like to go out as his aide and I said "Yes, Sir." When I got down to my office John Christian, who wrote the book, Modern Burma, and was my chief, looked at me and said that I had just been relieved. It happened that fast. I then went out to India with General Wedemeyer. My years of teaching in India were now going to give me a view of the country vastly different from the one as a teacher.

Q: Incidentally, while you were looking at India, the Indian army, were you involved looking at the army of Chandra Base, the Japanese sponsored Indian army?

McAFEE: I did not get involved in the Indian National Army at all. They never amounted to very much military although they worried people more than as it turned out was justified. General Slim is high in his praise of Indian troops fighting along with British forces but states that the Japanese eventually gave up using the INA except in support, supply or deception.

Q: You went out with Wedemeyer from when to when?

McAFEE: We left in October, 1943 and went to New Delhi. A curious thing, a friend of mine who was in the Navy tried to get me to apply for a naval commission. He said if I did not, I would end up in some mudhole somewhere. Instead I ended up eating at the table of Admiral Mountbatten, which included Mountbatten and Sir Henry Pownall, three or four senior Britishers and several Americans and a few aides. Here I was, a junior officer, eating two meals a day at the same table with Mountbatten and the high command and it was interesting, everyone being open and friendly.

Q: What was your impression of Mountbatten's headquarters in New Delhi? There was an awful lot of grousing about it from Stilwell in particular. He talked about the imperial presence there and rather plush quarters and all. Stilwell did everything he could to get away from there.

McAFEE: There was always a Stilwell-Mountbatten controversy and later a Stilwell-Wedemeyer controversy. All staffs tend to regard all other staffs with suspicion, especially when the other one is a superior headquarters, which Mountbatten's was. On the simple issue of [accommodations] there probably was only a difference of what was

available. Stilwell's senior officers lived in the Imperial Hotel which was Delhi's best. SEAC [Southeast Asia Command] had better office space in Delhi having offices in the government complex. I was told that Stilwell's cook came from the Stork Club or the like - nothing wrong with making good use of everyone's talents. When SEAC moved to Ceylon under the assumption that it was to function as a forward headquarters it did have a beautiful setting in the Peridenia Gardens. Stilwell lost no opportunity to show his contempt for staffs. When he took over for a month or so in Mountbatten's absence from Kandy he turned Mountbatten's Cadillac over to his cook and drove himself around in a Jeep. Some thought it was great - others corny. It did nothing to improve his relations with the British, which was of no concern to him anyway, and was somewhat in line with his openly expressed contempt for the Chinats [Kuomintang/Chinese Nationalists] and the Gimo [Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek]]. Of more significance was his contempt for staff work. An officer from SEAC went to Stilwell's rear echelon in the Assam area, supplying Stilwell's forces fighting in Burma and returned saying they felt very much in the dark on Stilwell's needs and numbers. Stilwell was at home down in the jungle in a combat situation. One thing that people could not do was to go after Mountbatten personally. He had had a destroyer shot out from under him and was the last man off the sinking ship. When Wedemeyer went up to China and took over, Stilwell's chief of staff was General Hearn. After two weeks he said to General Wedemeyer that he would like to stay on. General Wedemeyer had decided on a change. Hearn said, "General Stilwell comes up to China, spends three weeks and at the end he goes down to the press hostel and talks to Ted White and we never see what he sends to Washington and he never tells us." Wedemeyer had poor staff [work] but good press relations.

Q: Tell me about your first impression and as it develops of General Wedemeyer because this is a foreign affairs oriented history and he was an important figure in World War II in our relations with China.

McAFEE: I liked Wedemeyer. He was informal, a brilliant man who did his own drafting. He had been the initial architect of the concept that you couldn't win the war by gimmicks. The soft underbelly wouldn't work. The only way to win the war was to go across the English channel.

Q: The concept of the soft underbelly was that somehow you should get up into the Balkans. This was Churchill's idea.

McAFEE: Yes. In his book, Six Armies in Normandy, John Keegan, British historian, had a section on Wedemeyer and he said America and the free world were very fortunate to have a planner who saw the way to victory. He said that he didn't think we would have won otherwise. Wedemeyer had gone to the German General Staff College and he knew their capabilities and that there was no easy way to do it. Wedemeyer believed we had to go across and fight them where they were. Keegan states that he had absorbed from the German staff school, where he had studied, their distaste for peripheral operations, and that Wedemeyer's plan largely determined where WWII would be fought. Keegan and others have commented on Churchill's navy background and the long British tradition of dominance which naval maneuver provided. Churchill also had looking over his shoulder

as it were the 60,000 British casualties on the first morning of the battle of the Somme. Keegan concludes that Wedemeyer's plan was one of the decisive acts of the war.

Let me digress for a moment on the question of peripheral operations; in South East Asia that meant Brigadier Wingate, who had caught the eye of Churchill and Wavell with his guerrilla activities in various parts of the Middle East and in Ethiopia, where according to retired General John Alison, he - at one point to get around inadequate roads - bought over 70,000 camels. In 1943 he led 3,000 British troops on a six week march into Burma to operate behind Japanese lines. Damage to supply lines was quickly repaired and casualties, often from disease, were high with over 800 of the original force not returning. [Because] the force depended for its security on mobility, it could not take along its wounded who were propped up against a tree, given a canteen of water, some rations, a rifle, and wished good luck. The British were able to make out of it a worldwide propaganda victory and Churchill had Wingate discuss his further plans at the Quebec conference in late 1943. For his second incursion, Colonels Cochran and Alison were designated to plan and [provide] support, and they devised an airborne invasion using ground troops, with gliders, and with light planes to evacuate the wounded. Innovative and aggressive, they made a major contribution to that type of war. Alison in a recent talk before CBI [China-Burma-India Theater] veterans conceded the regular military did not have a high opinion of the results, but he pointed out one interesting angle. When planned, the British did not know that the Japanese were going to be attacking Imphal at just the same time which was, as Wellington said of Waterloo, a near run thing. Japanese generals after the war said the [British] operation which interfered with their supply of the Imphal campaign had a significant impact on their failure. Murphy's Law says that if things can go wrong they will. Maybe we need a corollary law that says that now and then fate will smile.

Q: What were you doing in India when you first came there?

McAFEE: At first I was only [Wedemeyer's] aide though I also worked in his outer office. He shared headquarters with the British and there were many visitors coming through. There were a lot of personal things to take care of on his behalf. Later, when he moved to China, I spent much of my time as the assistant secretary of the general staff in addition to working as his aide. In India I had a great deal of contact with some of the British, particularly with my [counterpart] aides. Lieutenant General Sir Henry Pownall, Mountbatten's deputy, had been the deputy chief of the general staff and had been assigned to Singapore just before its fall. I respected him. His personal assistant was Foster Cox. Foster was senior to me, maybe ten years or so older, but we did a lot of business together. He would try out ideas on me, will this fly with the Americans, and, I would do the same with him. It was an interesting sort of sounding board which he always said was very useful to them and I am sure it was for us. I kept in touch with Foster until his death at 95 - my last contact with the British in SEAC.

Q: When did Wedemeyer go to China?

McAFEE: He went to China in late October of 1944.

Q: So, you were in India almost exactly a year.

McAFEE: Yes.

Q: What was Wedemeyer's role in India during this year?

McAFEE: His major role was planning. There was a vast difference between what Mountbatten wanted to do and what the Americans wanted to do. [These different approaches are] still being argued over. Mountbatten and the British wanted a series of amphibious attacks, the first one to be Rangoon, then Singapore and Hong Kong. They figured that with the British naval superiority, these were very viable operations. I went out on a strike with the British fleet in the summer of 1944 which was intended to try to draw out the Japanese fleet from Singapore.

The fleet sailed from Trincomalee, Ceylon, in the morning. As we moved down the harbor past other war ships there were honor details at attention and an occasional small band playing. The [HMS] Howe was then on its first mission after a thorough refitting at the Brooklyn Navy Yard; the sailors ate at small messes here and there throughout the ship and at least one of the crew told of visiting a U.S. ship and enjoying the wonders of a large cafeteria type mess. Of more significance the British had participated with Americans in a prior operation and were embarrassed by the greater efficiency of U.S. carriers in launching planes - they were determined to approximate our effort. The Japanese at Singapore were not about to come out and risk battle, so, after some bombing of facilities on Sumatra, the fleet turned back.

The Americans saw British plans as a strategic plan to regain the British empire with American assistance. Stilwell had been driven out of Burma. One of his first statements was that we had taken a hell of a licking and we had to find out what went wrong and go back, one of the famous statements of the war, so, he was devoted to going back through Burma, reopening the Burma road. U.S. policy was to keep China in the war. Wedemeyer was sent back on a conference on strategy in early 1944 and the British rolled out the red rug. They were trying to persuade him to favor their amphibious operations. Wedemeyer had just checked into the hotel when General Ismay, Churchill's military aide, was downstairs to see him.

Q: This was where?

McAFEE: This was in London. Churchill, who did not go, had us all down to Dover Castle as his guests. I missed by just one grade having lunch at Chequers. Churchill invited Wedemeyer and a number of others to Chequers. Wedemeyer often took me as the only extra one because you then didn't have any rank problem as I was just his aide. But, in this case it went by rank and [the cutoff was] right above me.

One of the invitations of interest was when Prime Minister Churchill invited General Wedemeyer to a dinner at No. 10 Downing Street and the General said to me, "Mac, set

up a car at quarter of." The invitation was for 7:45. He said, "If I start from here at 7:45, I will get there at 8:00." I said, "General, for the prime minister you had better be on time." Anyway, I talked to his driver, and she agreed the car should be set up for 7:30. We drove down and one of the things that amazed me was the informality. You just drove up to the door at No. 10 Downing Street. At 7:45 he went on in and I went home. The next morning he said, "Mac, you saved me from great embarrassment. I got there at 7:45 and at 8:00 the King walked in. If I had arrived there politely late, it would have been embarrassing." I mention it because obviously they were using all their ploys to get Wedemeyer on their side on strategy. The British did a good job that way.

Wedemeyer then came back to Washington for conferences. The decision was for the U.S. to put its main effort through Burma. The British simultaneously were going ahead with plans for amphibious operations. That was the only way you could get agreement. You can still argue the case either way. As Learned Hand wrote some issues don't get resolved and recede into history where they are again argued over by historians. Strategic differences may have been influenced by China policy. The U.S. wanted a strong Nationalist central government. The British, because of their colonial interests, in particular Hong Kong, were not fully in agreement.

Q: In October 1944 could you talk about the circumstances that called for Wedemeyer to go to China?

McAFEE: This, of course, is the whole history of the relief of Stilwell. Stilwell had not much use for [Generalissimo] Chiang or his [Kuomintang] government which he thought of as corrupt. He called him “peanut” when he knew it was going to get back to him.

Q: This is Chiang Kai-shek.

McAFEE: Yes. Whatever you think of a foreign leader, if you call him “peanut” you don't really expect him to trust you very much. The history of this has been thoroughly investigated and written. The Japanese in the spring of 1944 opened an offensive to close the air fields from which the U.S. had hoped to support operations in the Pacific and bomb Japan. The early success of their offensive worried the U.S. Joint Chiefs. As pointed out in [the official Army history] Time Runs Out in the CBI, they thought that if Stilwell were placed in command of all forces in China, Communist as well as Nationalist, we might be able to hold the field. Hurley urged the Gimo to accept Stilwell as such a field commander. Though initially agreeing, the Gimo reversed himself. He was not going to accord Stilwell such a command, among other reasons in view of Stilwell's contempt for the Chinese Nationalists; a major factor was his concern over U.S. cooperation with the Chinese Communists.

Q: I might point out that "Gimo" stands for the abbreviation of generalissimo for Chiang Kai-shek.

McAFEE: Yes. Chiang requested that Stilwell be relieved. The whole kettle of personal feelings and animosities came to a head and Roosevelt finally relieved Stilwell. Then, the

theater was split. General Sultan became commander of India, Burma and Wedemeyer of China. Roosevelt shelved the idea of having an American as commander of all Chinese forces, possibly because the difficulties of such a role were obvious, possibly because U.S. forces in the Pacific were moving so rapidly that China bases were no long important.

Q: You went with Wedemeyer to China?

McAFEE: I was the only officer who went to China with Wedemeyer for the initial two to three weeks.

Q: What was your impression of Stilwell's staff and how were they dealing with the relief of their commander?

McAFEE: Stilwell's closest associate was General Dorn and he was quite unhappy about it. As noted earlier, the second in command. General Hearn, said to Wedemeyer, "I would like to stay on because you bring me into the picture." I remember when Wedemeyer moved in the staff closed at 4:00 because Stilwell didn't use it, didn't like staff work, didn't care about it. There was sort of a mixed feeling. He tended to have the loyalty of his troops and the people he was close to, but I think there was a sense that the theater was going to become integrated into overall [allied] planning when Wedemeyer took over.

Q: You were in China from October, 1944 to when?

McAFEE: To April, 1946. But in the late spring of 1945, I asked to be relieved and I was with OSS [Office of Strategic Services] for about four months. After training, I was assigned an operation on the Luichow peninsula [in southern China]. The Chinese Nationalists were going to mount an assault on Fort Bayard in mid-August so they could open up a port and the hump would no longer be the limitation on supply. I was assigned to take a team onto the peninsula to try to interdict any Japanese reinforcements from Hainan [Island]. Well, of course, the tenth of August brought the initial indication from the Japanese that they would surrender, but I was told to continue to prepare, but eventually everything was canceled. I remember clearly reading the press ticker item posted in the mess hall telling of the atomic bomb.

I still have mixed feelings about OSS and our assignment - I had a team of four: second in charge, Lieutenant Rich Anderson, radio man, Lieutenant Greg Coutoupis, a graduate of Brooklyn Polytech, and a weapons man, Marine Master Sergeant Bob Jones, and an interpreter, Private Fritz Mote who went on to be in charge of Chinese studies at Princeton. They were all good men. At Kaiyuan south of Kunming where we trained the type and amount of training was left up to each individual team. Men like John Singlaub worked hard. We did too, but you were on your own and I did not know much about work in the field. After receiving our assignment we had a briefing on the strategic importance of the area but no detail on the area we were to operate in or the Chinese we were to work with. Colonel Ken Piers, OSS, gave me clear orders on people I should see

near the operating area but when I got to Nanning headquarters, the initial Japanese surrender offer was in. I was told to go to Pakoi on the coast and be ready to infiltrate across in case the operation was to take place - that they wanted someone on the ground before the materiel was dropped (we had loaded a C-46 or B-24 with arms and ammunition). I was gung-ho for the operation then but looking back realize how unprepared I was on major issues such as issuing rifles to local Chinese who were allegedly ready to fight the enemy, controlling and organizing them, making sure they did not just disappear with their new found wealth. Maybe OSS just figured that at that point of the war everyone knew his business and I know OSS did a lot of fine work but I always thought a more structured approach would have helped me.

Q: Let's stick to the October, 1944 period to the surrender of the Japanese in August, 1945. What were you doing?

McAFEE: I was working in the theater headquarters, both as aide to the General and as assistant secretary of staff. There are things that you can do as an aide that may be useful. After Wedemeyer took over in China, he became involved in a dispute with Mountbatten over allocation of support - in particular U.S. air lift capability. One afternoon he drafted a feuding telegram to Mountbatten and told me to get it out. I read it and realized it would add a personal angle to a policy dispute and took it to General Caraway and Colonel Frank Taylor. Both agreed it should not go as drafted and then I suggested we wait until after dinner and raise it with the General which we did. I told him the message was in my safe and I could go and [transmit it] if he insisted, but that we all thought he ought to redraft it. He looked at me and went to his room. The next morning he drafted a strong telegram minus the offensive parts. A year later when we were back in Washington he read the letter President Truman sent to Paul Hume, the Post's music critic, who was caustic in his assessment of Margaret Truman's recital. Truman had vented his spleen. The General said to me that in preventing him from sending the telegram to Mountbatten a year before, I had earned my year's salary.

On a different note - Captain Upshur Evans in G-2 came to me one day and said that there were American missionaries who were going to be cut off by the Japanese drive against U.S. air fields in south central China. He drafted a telegram which I took to the General, and eventually about seventy families were air lifted to safety in planes that otherwise would have returned empty. Later, a representative of theirs came to the headquarters to express their thanks.

Q: What were you observing?

McAFEE: Wedemeyer accepted Stilwell's plan for the 39 divisions (later 36) and their supply and for equipment for a certain number of Air Force units and continued to press for more supplies over the hump. He wrote a whole long series of memos to the Generalissimo, not only on strategy but on the Chinese Army's pulling up its socks and getting itself into a combat ready role. He included memos on pay for the troops. In the Chinese Army system the pay went to the commanding general and he took his cut and everybody else took his cut and the soldier at the bottom might or might not get anything.

Also there was a great reluctance on the part of the Chinese Army to shoot off its ammunition because that was capital in the bank. I remember an officer from China coming back and talking in G-2 Washington, when I was still there, saying he had gone into one of the front lines where the Chinese and Japanese were across a river from each other and there was traffic across a bridge back and forth. He said, "Why don't you shoot?" "Well, we are in a stalemate." Simultaneously communications would be coming out of China about battles being fought, victories being won or lost, which convinced a lot of Americans how vital the Chinese Army was, whereas, actually it was just sitting there, saving its supplies and ammo.

Wedemeyer instituted a system of U.S. advisory officers with various echelons of many divisions to try to ensure planning and directions and supplies all the way down to the fighting units. This took a lot of effort on his part. He traveled all over China and worked hard to try to get it into place.

Q: What about relations, from your perspective, of the Dixie Mission? Was that in place while you were there?

McAFEE: Yes.

Q: Would you explain what the Dixie Mission was?

McAFEE: The Dixie Mission was our mission in Yenan, the Communist headquarters. It was set up to provide intelligence on the areas of north China which were under Chinese communist control or where they had guerrilla agents and intelligence sources. Initially it comprised under twenty people - Army, OSS, State. The Chicoms were highly interested in intelligence type gear, such as radios which would help them communicate with agents and a great deal of this was eventually supplied. They also pressed for as much recognition as possible. Later the Mission got involved in planning to utilize the Communists in fighting the Japanese, and provision of considerable amounts of arms and ammo was discussed which greatly upset Hurley who was trying to negotiate peace between the Chinat and the Chicoms. It was a center of all types of activity. One not as widely recognized as the above, was a hope that we might improve our intelligence on what the Nationalists were doing. For most of the Nationalist held areas we depended for info on SACO (Sino-American Cooperative Organization) which was responsive to the Nationalists. It was known that the Communists had excellent sources on the Nationalists whom they considered the eventual enemy - actually right up to high command levels. I have no idea how much info on the Nationalists we gained through Dixie. I never got there. I almost did, but not quite. Colonel Yeaton, who was a fairly right-wing American Army colonel, came out from the U.S. with an assignment to go up to Yenan. He stopped and consulted at Wedemeyer's headquarters and said, "Mac come along with me." I said, "I would like to, but..." "No need to clear it with the General, I just want a local officer along with me." I said, "You had better clear it with the General." He talked with the General and said that he was going up to Yenan with Mac. Wedemeyer said, "With whom?" He said, "Mac." Wedemeyer said "Mac is not going." I knew he wouldn't have anybody from his personal staff there, so, I never got there. Yeaton eventually assumed

command of the unit. Wedemeyer was not happy with the lack of hard military intelligence coming from the mission and wanted an expert on communism whose views he trusted in charge. Actually the Chicoms probably were not all that cooperative in providing hard intelligence on areas under their control. Intelligence was an asset [for bargaining].

Q: What was the impression in Wedemeyer's headquarters and knowledge about the Communists?

McAFEE: Wedemeyer had always been fairly conservative and very suspicious of the communists. I think he felt the same about the Chinese Communists. I think there was a sizable feeling among Americans that the Chinese Nationalists were just not going to be able to cut it, a phrase in use was that the Chinats' mandate from heaven had run out and therefore we ought to maintain our links with the Chinese Communists, among other reasons to have whatever influence we might have if they should come into power.

After the war I was interviewed once by State security about the China hands. They asked me about one of the officers and I knew that wasn't the purpose of the interview because he was one of the more conservative ones. I took the opportunity to say that I worked with all of the China hands and they were brilliant people and when they had an opinion they signed their name to it and put it up front. If somebody did that how could you accuse him of disloyalty or subversion? I think what some of them thought was what we called Titoism before Tito. I think it was a perfectly viable course. Stilwell's headquarters had much less confidence in the Chinats than Wedemeyer's did. Then, when Wedemeyer got his program started, I think the confidence rose some, but the underlying concern about their postwar potential was always there.

Q: Was there pretty good feedback about what the Communists were doing?

McAFEE: There was constant feedback from the Dixie Mission in Yenan. Then, you also had, of course, feedback from the Chinats, who were worried about how the Communists were positioning themselves. Jack Service, who I liked and respected, called me after the war to ask if I remembered a report that he had submitted. Near the end of the war he [did] a report showing how the Chinese Communists were positioning themselves in various locations where they thought the surrender of the Japanese might take place so they would be able to get the arms and ammunition that the Japanese were going to have to give up. I couldn't locate it in State files. I told him I would be happy to go to the General's files over in the Pentagon. He asked me not to at that point, so I never did anything more. But this kind of report showed that people reported on all aspects and did it well. This was a clear alert to Communist plans.

Q: You were getting these reports about the Chinese Nationalists reporting great battles and great victories, yet, when we went down to look at it, it was basically a static situation and a sort of a live-and-let-live thing. I would think this would tend to diminish one's acceptance of Chinese Nationalist reports. What about the reports you were getting from the Dixie Mission? Were you able to verify what the Mission said the Communists

were doing? Was there the feeling that the Communists were fighting the Japanese and the Nationalists were not?

McAFEE: There was that sentiment, but we were uncertain how much the Communists actually were fighting the Japanese other than in their attempts to get weapons. I think both sides were doing exactly what we expected them to do. They were harboring their resources for the fight against each other after the Americans had defeated the Japanese. The great need of the Chicoms was for arms and ammo, situated as they were in the interior of China. They had a very active program of bribing Chinese puppet troops of the Japanese to sell arms. After the Dixie Mission was [established] the program went into high gear. Yu [Maojun] in his book, The OSS in China, lists prices paid - $20.00 for a rifle, $30.00 for a pistol, etc. Working through the Dixie Mission the Chicoms in late 1944 proposed a joint U.S.-Chicom effort against the Japanese. Yu characterized it as a Normandy style operation. At one point when Wedemeyer was in the U.S. his deputy went to Yenan and a major program was discussed. The Chicoms were so taken with the prospect of U.S. support that, according to Upshur Evans whom Wedemeyer had sent to Yenan, Mao and Zhou En-lai proposed coming to the states to meet personally with President Roosevelt. Those working on these proposals were attempting to get as much help as possible from all sources in fighting the Japanese, but it was also pretty clear that such programs would have major impact on our relations and programs with the Chinats. An interesting sidelight on a telegram Upshur sent from Yenan to Chungking. It started with a derogatory phrase the Chicoms used in referring to Hurley. Hurley took major offense and wanted Upshur relieved. Wedemeyer refused and it made for friction between him and Hurley. The telegram showed that while negotiating with Hurley, the Communists did not respect him.

Q: Were you so involved in what we were doing that this was something you realized afterwards or was this a realization at the time you were there?

McAFEE: I think a little bit of both. All of us had a lot of reservations about how effective the training program for the Chinese Nationalists was going to be. It may have changed a little after the battle of Chihchiang, one of the forward air bases in China. The Japanese decided to roll it up [in a campaign during April-June 1945]. This was not a major Japanese offensive but in the past such forays had been successful. This time it was not. The Chinese Nationalists turned back the threat and held the airfield. Romanus and Southerland in their excellent official Army history Time Runs Out in the CBI describe the battle in some detail noting that the command and liaison system showed results. Chinese troops in Burma had fought effectively under Stilwell but these divisions were American trained and equipped. At Chihchiang the bulk of the Chinese units had minimal training under U.S. liaison and fairly little prior supply - [making them] much like the bulk of the Chinese armies. The authors note several factors at work at Chihchiang: no problems from Chinese domestic politics, American [liaison] provided reliable information on movements, the 14th Air Force supply position was good, and there was "an atmosphere of mutual cooperation between the Chinese and Americans."

They note that at one point the Gimo by-passed U.S. liaison and sent orders direct to the

field. When Wedemeyer protested to him, the Gimo said the message was only advisory. The authors note Wedemeyer's accomplishments were shown to be considerable particularly since his system was not in full operation. The Japanese in their summary of the campaign found distinctive the air lift of the New Sixth Army and that Chinese tactics showed a "great advance."

Q: Within the staff, had some people developed an affection for the Chinese cause, whatever that was, or did you find they split along liberal and conservative lines in that?

McAFEE: Wedemeyer was devoted to aiding and assisting the Chinese Nationalists so I think the staff reflected that. There is a little sideline of history which has been written up. Wedemeyer's chief of staff was Major General Robert McClure, who came from the Pacific [Theater]. General McClure, I think when Wedemeyer was back in the States, was up at Yenan and he really wanted an all-out agreement to aid and supply the Chicoms for action against the Japanese. McClure was probably influenced by reports from the Dixie Mission and OSS. He came crossways with General Patrick Hurley on this. Hurley blamed McClure's efforts for breaking up his negotiations to get the Chicoms and Chinats to bury the hatchet - a hopeless cause on which General Marshall later spent much effort. Probably the main criticism of Marshall's effort was that he continued it long after it seemed clear that it would not succeed. At a dinner at General Wedemeyer's, McClure had a little too much to drink and threatened to knock the daylights out of Hurley.

Q: Patrick Hurley who is not really a general but an Oklahoma politician.

McAFEE: Yes. He was quite a striking figure. I liked Hurley but would not have liked being on his staff. One night when Wedemeyer was out to dinner, Hurley kind of relaxed and said in effect, Roosevelt needs a new secretary of the Army, Stimson is getting old. When I bring peace between the Nationalists and the Communists, I just may get the Nobel Prize for Peace and I will be the ideal candidate for that. I think he had in mind then that he would also be the Republican candidate for president. He tried to get the Chinats and Chicoms to work together. Later he changed totally and accused State Department people, who talked about having the two sides work more together of being disloyal. So, yes, there was all sorts of conflict as to what we ought to be doing, which was our best way to go, etc.

Yu's book refers to people who had been in China before the war who returned and tried to set up their own intelligence units so that they could influence the situation. On the military side the major split was between Chennault's 14th Air Force, strongly allied to Chiang, and Stilwell. Joe Alsop, who was active in all this refers to it in his autobiography. He was hated by Stilwell's people. Wedemeyer, however, kept in touch with Alsop, valuing his intellect and insights.

Q: You stayed on through the surrender of the Japanese about six months. Were we, our staff, playing any role about where the Chinese Nationalists were accepting surrender and moving troops in, etc.?

McAFEE: Yes, in a major way. U.S. forces played a large role on helping the Chinats deploy forces after the war, helping move over 400,000 troops. The U.S. Army played the major role in getting the Japanese Army and civilians back to Japan. We moved millions. Fifty eight thousand Marines guarded ports and rail lines. General Wedemeyer, as the advisor to the Generalissimo, tried to persuade him to limit his goals. He said you cannot take Manchuria and you cannot take Taiwan and hold on to your position in mainland China. But the Chinats put their best divisions there - at the end of a LOC [line of communication] 1000 miles [long]. [Wedemeyer] suggested some kind of UN trusteeship for Taiwan and I think the same for Manchuria. The Generalissimo insisted that he had to go into Manchuria because his was the government of all of China. Wedemeyer told him that by doing that he was going to extend himself and then at any point of the Communists' choosing they could strike with superior forces and win, which is what happened time after time. Wedemeyer really offered excellent advice to the Gimo, but the Generalissimo and his people had their own agenda.

Q: What was your feeling and other members of the staff about corruption within the Chinese system?

McAFEE: There was a universal feeling that corruption existed not only in the military but all through. I noted the generals getting all the pay and taking their cuts before any money filtered down, with the lowest ranks possibly getting nothing or very little. Trying to root it out was literally an impossibility. There was a great sense that corruption and bribery were going on with everybody getting his cut, that it was a way of life which I think it had been for a long time.

Q: Was there the feeling at that point that the Chinese Communists were really something different?

McAFEE: Yes. There was that feeling. Yenan was a Spartan headquarters, clothes were plain. It was a goal oriented environment and the Chicoms were smart enough to capitalize on all these attributes. I think there was a tendency to idealize them and this may have carried over to their views and programs, with a failure to assess fully their devotion to communism and their zeal to impose it on China. I am not at all sure that there was an awareness of how harsh the takeover was going to be when it finally came, that they would be as thorough and as intensive in wiping out what they considered opposition. Estimates of those liquidated run into the millions - a forgotten holocaust. Many probably thought we could do business with them and influence them more than we were able to. The Chinese through history and various rulers had been able to maintain their Chineseness. I think there was a feeling that one way or another the Communists were going to put their own imprimatur on whatever system they ran and maintain their own identity, that it would be Chinese, not Russian. There was a certain realism among Americans in trying to adjust to what seemed inevitable, and making whatever impact we could on it.

Q: When you left China in April, 1946, what was your gut feeling about whither China?

McAFEE: I think my own gut feeling was that probably the Chinese Nationalists were not going to be able to hold it together, although I was never ready to commit myself to that point. General Wedemeyer had his last meeting with President Roosevelt in April 1945. Again I missed by a hair meeting Roosevelt just as I had with Churchill. Wedemeyer said he would tell the President he had some charts and would get me in, so I waited outside the Oval Office. But at that meeting Hurley did most of the talking and then Roosevelt had Wedemeyer come back for a session by himself. He said to me that at the end of the session, the President asked if he had any other comments and Wedemeyer said he would substitute realism for our present approach to the Soviet Union. Being close to Wedemeyer and working with him, I imbued a certain amount of that sense that we were going to have difficulty making any kind of rapprochement with any communists. So, I was schizophrenic. I wasn't willing to risk going the Chicom route and I wasn't sure the Chinat route was going to be viable.

Q: What did you do after April, 1946?

McAFEE: I came back to Washington and in September joined State. A final comment on the military. In the summer of 1951 my mother, my brother and I headed for Maine for vacation and to visit Aunt Grace and Uncle Thompson. We crossed the recently opened Delaware Memorial Bridge. I thought then, and still do, when I cross it, of all the mostly young people who did not make it back.

Q: Can I ask you about your impression of the embassy and how did they fit, particularly when Hurley was the ambassador?

McAFEE: Total friction. There was one episode which I was always sorry about. One morning we were at breakfast and I received a phone call from the headquarters saying, "Mac, do you know the U.S. embassy is burning?" I said, "No," and I went back in and said, "General Hurley, I understand the embassy is burning." He was irate that the staff hadn't called and told him first. They said they were trying to save essential documents but Hurley held it against them for a long time. They were at loggerheads at all times on all issues. The most famous telegram, of course, was the George Acheson telegram while Hurley was in Washington saying in effect that Hurley's strategy of working with the Chinats was not going to pay off and they signed their names to it. They were all up front.

Q: Where did you go then?

McAFEE: Having worked with the people at the embassy, they suggested I come to work at State. (The first person who had suggested that to me was Max Bishop, down in Ceylon. He was the political advisor to the General). I went to the office of Chinese Affairs for an interview and they offered me a position. From September, 1946 until late in 1950 I was in the Office of Chinese Affairs.

Q: Which was certainly the focus of everything at that time.

McAFEE: It was indeed. I had very high respect for the old China hands. They were very

able people and good people to work with and for. [But politics interfered.] One Friday night [a letter landed] on my desk [signed by] eight congressmen, charging us with selling China to the Communists, [deadline for] an answer [was] Monday. [There was a cover] letter came from Mr. John Foster Dulles, special assistant to secretary Acheson on the Japanese peace treaty. He said he had never believed the charges that the State people were trying to sell China to the Communists, but, in view of the evidence [attached to] his letter, he now admitted to some questions. I had handled all aspects of the case.

[Dulles' evidence was that when] a Chinese destroyer put into a Pacific island, where we had a base, in early June, 1950, and the captain said that he needed 5 inch ammunition desperately. The base commander pointed to a tarp covering surplus 5 inch ammunition. The captain asked for it and was told he had to go through Washington before it could be sold to him, so, we got a note from the Chinese embassy requesting 5 inch ammunition. I think Phil Sprouse was then the director of Chinese Affairs, and he had a rule that when a request like this came in we get it to the Pentagon that day, so I put a note on it requesting info for a reply and sent it over by courier to the Pentagon. Well, the Korean War broke out June 25, 1950 and the Pentagon decided that previously surplus ammunition was no longer surplus. They told us there was no surplus 5 inch ammunition in the Pacific. We said that in a note to the Chinat embassy [mean to] hit Congress saying their man saw it and now the State Department tells us there isn't any. It was the outbreak of the war in Korea that made the difference. I wrote that back in a letter to Mr. Dulles and we never heard about it again. But, we were constantly getting besieged with letters like this. It was a pressure cooker all the time.

Q: It was a critical period in domestic relations in the United States, the McCarthy period and our China policy was under fire. Could you talk a bit about the composition of the China desk when you arrived and how it evolved?

McAFEE: The first chief was Everett Drumright. He tended to be the old line, close to the Chinats. Then Arthur Ringwalt was the next chief and he had more of the view that the Dixie people had. Then, Phil Sprouse and Tony Freeman. I don't know if Tony was the director or the deputy. He was my all-time candidate to be under secretary for political affairs with a great range of abilities. The last chief was Edmund Clubb. They were bright men and I liked and respected them. They were all outstanding directors. They all delegated. There was a clear line of authority. I never saw any attempt anywhere to duck an issue though they might get overruled. They had no great confidence in the Nationalists. Once DOD asked for our position on transfer of some air force type material to the Chinats. Thinking the directive was fairly clear that we were still to process such programs, I drafted a reply saying go ahead. Then it got revised at several levels. When it was finally signed two weeks later, Marshall wrote a note saying he had signed but wasn't sure what he had signed. The Pentagon then said in effect, we don't know what you said so we are going to go ahead the way we interpret your response. Which, they then did.

The reason I got out of Chinese Affairs was that the FSOs of my age had 15 years of experience in China and the language, etc. I had none of that and had no desire to try to become a China hand. I handled basically military matters. I was the senior civil servant

in the political side, along with Walter Jenkins and Richard Johnson. Kathleen Dougall was a senior civil servant, a very thorough and able person. It was a very good staff at all levels and I enjoyed working with them. On Saturdays we would be in just trying to keep our heads above water (from the work load) and officers from other areas of the FE [Far East] Bureau, who has come in just to show up, would come around to socialize. We enjoyed the visits but told them to just wait and their turn handling countries in chaos would come, too.

Q: Right in the middle of this period the Chinese Nationalist army was defeated, Chiang Kai-shek moved to Taiwan. What sort of reports were you getting about the Chinese Nationalist army?

McAFEE: We got a flow of reports from the Pentagon. There were lots of them that were fairly brutal and frank - not fighting, not defending a position, etc. When the China White Paper was written...

Q: This came out during the Truman administration.

McAFEE: Yes, in 1950. I knew it was being drafted but we were not formally told. Finally I was called in one day and told that I had a week to add a military chapter. I said that I had to have more time and they gave me a couple of weeks. I worked day and night using mostly military sources for what I wrote. Instead of trying to quote State Department officers, I quoted military aid directors, generals and colonels assigned to work with the Chinats. For example, Major General Barr, head of our military advisory group wrote that in the late forties no battle was lost by the Chinats for lack of equipment - rather because of the world's worst leadership.

Q: Was this a conscious effort in order to head off attacks at this particular point in time, the attacks on the State Department?

McAFEE: Exactly, I figured if you quoted a State man saying that they didn't fight, etc. critics would say this was more of the same tripe, whereas if you quoted a general saying it, that charge couldn't be leveled. It was essentially that. Secretary Acheson put in a line in the introduction saying nothing we could have done within reasonable limits could have changed the results and nothing left undone contributed to it. Phil took it out and sent it back up and Acheson put it back in. I think Phil took it out twice, but Acheson insisted.

Phil came back one day and said, Acheson was reading the White Paper and he finished the military section and said, we really don't need anything else. I think it was in the White Paper that we had one quotation from the Generalissimo himself saying in effect how can you defend your position when your troops won't fight. It was a conscious effort to show that the military leaders had come up essentially with the same position as State. They might come up with a different conclusion, to go ahead with aid, but they still faced up to the very great weakness of the Chinese Nationalists.

Q: During the time that you were on the China desk, 1946-50, how good did you find the information we were getting, particularly handling military affairs, about military battles?

McAFEE: I think the combination of military reporting and CIA and State reporting gave us a pretty good picture. Once we got a commendation from the Secretary of State on military reporting. Phil Spouse was up talking to Acheson and he called down and said, "Bill, I need immediately a map of the Chinese Communist positions, " and hung up. I knew he had called from the Secretary's office. I went back to see Walt Jenkins who said we had a map of their position six weeks ago. We had both been following the situation closely enough so we drew a new line saying since then they had taken this city and that city, etc. I took it up and said, "This is where they are now and where they were six weeks ago." It was a total seat of the pants operation. The secretary said to Phil to extend his congratulations to the people down the line. At this point it was useless to follow the positions closely, the situation was deteriorating rapidly.

Q: As a member of the desk, when did you start, or did you start, feeling the heat of the anger from the Republican side?

McAFEE: All the time. As I said on one day I received eight congressional letters which I had to answer. It was evident all the way through. It was a controversial job at all times. There were two very different views on what we should be doing and we were in a cold war.

Q: Did you feel that there was any foundation for the attacks on American policy there?

McAFEE: Not at all, in terms of the loyalty or integrity of the State Department people involved, but there was room for policy differences. Some State officers felt the Chinats were not going to make it and there was not much use in further support; others thought we should stick by an ally and make a major effort to prevent a communist take over. The opponents of State were picking up on things like this. I talked to General Wedemeyer about this problem at one point because I was unhappy at some of his testimony on the Hill. I said in effect, "General you know you talked to these people during the war and gave them open access and listened to them." He said, "Yes, but I never accused any of them of being communists; what I did say was if we had followed their advice, China would have gone communist sooner."

Q: Did you feel the hand of Eleanor Roosevelt in the policy? Particularly during the war, Eleanor Roosevelt, who was sort of the leader of the liberal wing of the Democrat party, did not seem to face up to the magnitude of the horror of the Stalin regime. Did you have any reflection of her and her side of the political spectrum?

McAFEE: No, I don't think so. Only a most tenuous incident has any bearing on her general role. I remember a man [with whom] I went to officer candidate school had shown a group of us a letter on White House stationery from Eleanor Roosevelt to one of his compatriots. We were all duly impressed. Later, when he learned I was in military

intelligence, he got in touch with me because he was under a security investigation for what were considered leftist views, and asked me if there was anything I could do. I thought of him as a very able officer and had seen nothing to make me question his motives. I went around to Army security and was told, "Mac, drop the case, no use your pursuing it any farther." He was assigned as a post exchange officer somewhere. I don't know anything about the case other than that some friends of his had some communication with the White House. I think Mrs. Roosevelt probably was open that way to all views and looking back on her involvement we respect her for it. But, no, I had no sense of her involvement in China.

Q: One always hears about the attacks on the Foreign Service, particularly the old China hands and you were right in the heart of this. But, you were a civil servant, did you feel any particular heat yourself?

McAFEE: You were very much aware when you prepared a position paper that there were two views and that history was going to be looking at everything you wrote.

Q: So you were using dignified phrases covering your ass.

McAFEE: There probably had to be some of that. On the other hand, I worked primarily on military matters. For instance, my final assignment basically was handling State's role in a $125 million aid program, which Congress voted knowing it wasn't going to reverse the course of the war, but they wanted to make a gesture, doing just what you said. At one point the Chinats came in asking for a whole lot of highly sophisticated electronic equipment. I was absolutely certain an order like this was going to be meaningless without backup gear. My superior said, "It is their program, it is their decision. If they sent in a formal request, get it over to the Pentagon," and we did. Much of the program went to waste because it went for much more sophisticated material than they could use in a chaotic situation. I drafted occasional memos that were more forthcoming from the standpoint of aiding the Chinats than Chinese Affairs may have believed useful, but the memos were redrafted. The Pentagon then reinterpreted them. Basically I think the old China hands stated their views clearly and honestly, and as they predicted the Chinats did not make it. I do not think any aid program which the U.S. was willing to muster would have changed the outcome.

Q: Did you see a change in morale and ability to perform towards the end of the time you were there?

McAFEE: No, they were solid hands. They knew the country and I think they had confidence whether you agreed with what they said or not, that what they had predicted was happening. I think they were ready to stand up and defend their positions.

Q: At the time too, Acheson was the Secretary of State and was the feeling that he stood behind them?

McAFEE: Yes, Acheson tended to be very supportive that way. An interesting sidelight

on an incident. General Wedemeyer was asked by General Marshall who was in China negotiating between the Chinats and Chicoms to be the ambassador to China. He had sounded out both sides and gotten agreement. Actually the Chicoms probably never had any intention to agree for they knew Wedemeyer was not impartial. The General told me later he got a call to see Mr. Acheson who told him that General Marshall had sent in a telegram saying that he withdrew his request for Wedemeyer's nomination. It was dated about a month before that interview took place but Acheson had continued to let Wedemeyer get ready for the assignment. The General, rightly or wrongly, felt it was a purposeful delay.

Q: When did you leave the desk?

McAFEE: In late 1950, I didn't want to be a China hand and started looking around and took a position as coordinator for current intelligence in INR, which was an interesting but hopeless job. INR was hoping to preclude CIA from getting control of the current intelligence field and after I took the job, one man, I found CIA had over 300 people in their office of current intelligence.

Q: It wasn't to get away from the China situation?

McAFEE: No. By 1950, China was down the drain, the Nationalists had settled on Taiwan and [assumed the persona of the government of China].

A comment on one job I had during my tour in Chinese Affairs. Arthur Ringwalt, the director, had his hands full with China matters, and asked me to be the bureau's representative on the Policy Committee on Arms and Armaments, which functioned under the aegis of the Department's political military advisor, General Crain with Colonel Swett as chairman. Its members over several years included McGee, Timberlake, Hare, Labouisse, Sohm, Spencer, Auchincloss, Matlock, Blaisdell, Cummings, Sullinger, Dahl, with Bob Margrave as secretary. Our charter was to seek to limit the arms races particularly in developing countries by limiting the export of sophisticated weapons, and for a short period we had an impact. The concept was ended by two forces - one arguing who were we, with all our arms, to be denying the sinues of national strength to others, and the second more powerful argument that all we were doing was blocking sales from the U.S., while others were filling the requests. We took our work seriously and I am glad the Department at least made the effort.

Q: When did you leave?

McAFEE: November or December, 1950.

Q: Before we leave this, the Korean War started June 25, 1950. Were we concerned that Communist China at that time might join in with the North Koreans or was this not really thought about then?

McAFEE: I think the most famous dispatch was from Panikar, the Indian ambassador to

China who passed on a report that if we went up to certain areas the Chinese Communists would come in. Of course, that got argued both ways. Some thought it was a political ploy to dull our military effort. Others thought it was probably a serious warning. A great deal of thought was being given to any and all intelligence on Chicom's intentions. Actually, I think it was George Kennan, who sometime before the Korean War asked CIA and the Pentagon for an assessment of where the communists would strike if they decided to move militarily instead of diplomatically. The answer, which may have been a special memo, was Korea. In this case Kennan was right in saying he was worried about aggression and the intelligence community pin pointed to the right place. My recollection of the above is at variance with a study by Miss Cynthia Grabo on our early warning mechanisms [in her book Warning Intelligence]. She noted that the CIA Watch Committee was asked about two weeks before the war broke out to consider areas as potential sources of conflict with the USSR. South Korea was listed after Indochina, Berlin, Iran, and Yugoslavia. We on China affairs worked very closely with the China hands in INR and other agencies in order to get as much information as we could on Chicom intentions. I have no idea what conclusions, if any, I reached on Panikar's warning, or what the position of the office was.

Miss Grabo notes that an attempt by indications analysts to flag reports of a Chicom buildup in Manchuria was opposed by others who felt the Chicoms were more interested in moving against Taiwan, and by order of battle analysts who found the evidence inconclusive. She writes that not until after the first contact with Chicom troops did the intelligence mechanisms take seriously the threat of Chicom invasion. She notes that Mose Harvey of State (the head of INR's research on the USSR) phoned her to ask that a report on the situation include reference to the fact that the previous day in a celebration of the Soviet revolution speakers had given unreserved support to the North Korean cause, implying a commitment by communist powers to the defense of Korea. Miss Garbo notes that the next week the joint committee studying indications of hostilities did provide a warning of a major attack - about 10 days before it actually took place.

Q: As you left this job, what was our estimate of the survivability of Taiwan?

McAFEE: I think probably the estimate was that on Taiwan the Chinats might have a better chance. It was a more controlled situation. Because it would require a substantial amphibious operation we weren't concerned about an immediate assault. Edmund Clubb, who was the director of Chinese Affairs then, assigned me a job, I didn't suggest or request it. He said to draft a directive for a military advisory group for the Chinats on Taiwan now that the mainland had fallen. There was a feeling they would be under the gun eventually, but they weren't just at that point.

Q: Bill, you mentioned there were a few things that had been raised that you would like to develop some more.

McAFEE: A couple of points, first on the influence of policy on intelligence. Some of my military friends contended all along that a meaningful military aid program could have kept the Nationalist in power, whereas critics of Chiang never gave him a chance. Later, a

striking difference in intelligence estimates occurred over Vietnam. An INR analyst wrote a paper that included a discussion of differing estimates of communist strength in Vietnam before Tet. CIA, DIA, and INR figured the insurgency base as 600,000 including militia. The embassy and military in Saigon put the figure at 300,000. My guess is that the people on the spot felt they were winning the war and this resulted in different figures. It is part of human nature to read the tea leaves as you choose.

Secondly, you asked me about the Indian National Army, a Japanese puppet force, which caught me by surprise. Slim, in his book mentions the battle of Impal, which was during March, 1944. Slim said that if the Japanese had been able to break through into India they could have isolated Burma and China, and India would have been sitting there ready to be stirred up, particularly with the Indian National Army there. The Indian National Army had a division there which performed ingloriously, as he put it. He said after that they were mostly used by the Japanese as coolies and porters. My guess is that the Indians became disillusioned with the Japanese and did not want to be their pawns. For instance, later the British captured one side of a river and the next morning a boat came across with two Indians who said their units were ready to surrender. The British went across and the whole division surrendered. Individual small units of the Indian National Army apparently fought well. Bose, the INA commander, tried to get a pledge from the Japanese promising India its freedom but they never complied. Slim had a high opinion of the Indian units that served with him. I mentioned that I was the India desk officer for the Indian Army in military intelligence. I once called on a general who had been the military attaché in Russia, but who for some reason had been sidelined. I feel [his name was] Famonville, but I am not sure of that.

Q: It could have been because Famonville was demoted and kicked out of the Soviet Union. He had been a major general and was demoted to a colonel.

McAFEE: He had been in North Africa. I called him about the 4th Indian Division, and he said it was the equal of any division in North Africa when it went into battle and fought with distinction. Then it took approximately 15,000 casualties. He said after that as a fighting unit it was way down. Again, he gave high marks to Indian units.

Q: All right. Let's move on. You went to INR when?

McAFEE: I left Chinese Affairs [in mid-1951]. I didn't want to be a China hand as I mentioned earlier. I was then forty, too old to learn new tricks.

Q: What was the role of INR when you arrived there in 1951 as you saw it?

McAFEE: [Of course, INR didn’t become a bureau until much later. In fact, in 1951, the organization was called Special Assistant, Intelligence, and used the letter “R” as the organization’s acronym]. Most of the analysts were area specialists interested in long term developments. The research unit had been the jewel of OSS according to Yu but it was still quite an orphan within State. The basic group had come over from OSS, about a thousand people. State really didn't want them and never made any bones about it. The

coordination of sensitive operations, which later I went into, was then handled by people who worked out of the under secretary's office, so, that part was totally separate. I was brought [into the Office of Intelligence Research, OIR] as the coordinator of current intelligence and told to hire a staff. I interviewed a few very good people and they were interested. I told them not to give up their present jobs because I couldn't guarantee the money. We just never had it.

Q: At that time what was current intelligence?

McAFEE: A lot of people in INR hated the phrase. They thought you were demeaning the real meaning of intelligence. They were devoted to long range research, the basic trends and what may be coming down the road. Current intelligence meant comments on day-to-day developments, supposedly as relating to the big picture. I had a small current intelligence staff, who were part of other divisions but we met once a day to approve memos. Let me give one example. Ted Wertime of the East Asian office came in with an interesting piece. This was during the Korean War and having studied the propaganda and several other [indicators], he said that we could expect a peace initiative in Korea in the near future. I took this draft to the senior estimates group and they said it was all based on propaganda to which our answer was we were assessing all the time from Soviet propaganda. But, they wouldn't put it out and I don't blame them. However, Ted was right; the peace initiative happened within two weeks. This was taking a look at some recent action and trying to make a comment that went beyond what other people could see. We were seldom as prescient.

Q: I would think when you look at intelligence within an operational organization such as the State Department, long range research is obviously one thing but when somebody asks what is going on you can't say that you will tell them in six weeks, because the whole State Department acts on what is in the paper today. I find it very difficult that there wasn't in some guise or other somebody who was able to say that this is what is happening here.

McAFEE: Actually, analysts were doing that all the time; we in Chinese Affairs depended heavily on INR for both info and current assessments. Many intelligence memos responded to specific policy bureau requests. Having been in a policy bureau I know exactly what you mean about the Department making decisions on a day to day basis. You are a little overwhelmed by the day to day demands and I think this is one of the reasons why INR had such a rocky start. The policy bureau might be interested in receiving a long paper but they weren't necessarily going to spend much time reading it. A lot of them had their own connections direct with CIA and Defense for estimates and for comment on current developments.

At this time both CIA and DOD had quite detailed daily intelligence publications which State received at all levels, both in INR and the policy bureaus. Both CIA and DOD had a regular and steady flow of individual reports from their people oversees, subsumed and commented on in their publications. One curious example. In early June of 1950 General Willoughby, MacArthur's intelligence chief, sent in a field report that the North Koreans

were going to launch an attack later that month. In his weekly summary of intelligence [an intelligence unit in Korea] said there was a constant flow of such reports and this one did not seem any more reliable than prior ones. [Later] everyone was berated for not believing the first report. There were plenty of people saying what was going on - they just often disagreed. Tom Hughes, a former director of INR, in a short pamphlet on intelligence noted that one of the dangers in everyone's thirst for current intelligence is that it drives out consideration of more estimative intelligence.

When the first INR budget crunch came the first casualty was current intelligence activity. I think the feeling was we had too small a staff to compete with CIA and the bureaus had their own connections, so we were going to get out of that field, but I think it became quite clear for the State research people that their significance fairly much depended on how close they were to their country desk and how much they were working on things that were of current interest to the desk and senior policy people. However Tom Hughes cautioned against the policy officers tendency to use intelligence as a drunk uses a lamp post - as something to lean on rather than for illumination.

The organization of State intelligence was under consideration at the time of the Russell plan in the late forties which, as I remember it, broke up the central INR units and spread the people among the policy desks. This was not yet implemented when General Marshall became secretary and he reversed the order saying that any good G-3 (operations officer) needed a separate G-2 (intelligence officer). After INR got geared up later on, its daily intelligence summary which was all source compared very favorably with the publications of the intelligence community. McCone, the DCI [CIA - Deputy Chief of Intelligence], was very unhappy with his staff after a White House meeting with President Kennedy during some crisis - Kennedy was working from an INR memo and McCone wanted to know why such a fly by night outfit could get its material to the President's desk. Hilsman was good at meeting needs of senior policy people in and out of State.

Q: We will keep coming back to this theme all the time and obviously this is an unclassified interview, but we are always talking about something that was 40 years ago or more. What was your impression of the CIA and what you were getting out of it?

McAFEE: I have always said that any outfit that had prestige and money can quite quickly develop a pretty good cadre. CIA had a great public name. Their motto of "Bigger than State by 48" they met. They had the money to hire people. A friend of mine, who had left State for CIA, asked me to join CIA where he could get me an immediate promotion. I had an interview at CIA but, he came back saying it was much more fun working in State, which is more open and I withdrew my application. But, they had the funds to hire people. I frankly felt, from the first, that they were quite productive and often very good. When I was in Chinese Affairs, we counted on the division of research in INR, but they in turn were all the time working with CIA. State was certainly closer to CIA in its appraisal of Soviet threats than it was to the Pentagon, for instance.

Q: Let me pose something at you which came from somebody I interviewed on this

particular aspect. Somebody in INR was saying that in many ways CIA might have the data, but the problem was that their research people were not particularly action oriented. The CIA would get the information but their interpretation wasn't very useful from the point of view of the State Department because the State Department essentially had to act on this. Often the CIA people weren't as aware of what the issues were from our side. We got far better information from the National Security Agency where they had access to communications and our people would know what the issues were at the time and therefore fit it into what we were going to do as opposed to the CIA which would give a general discussion that wouldn't be action oriented. Was this a problem?

McAFEE: That opinion may have come from a signals intelligence specialist. CIA and NSA were both highly valuable. I think over the years the most effective units in INR were those that were close to the policy bureau. I think this was a major advantage. They knew the papers that were being worked on and knew the topics that they had to address to the Secretary. This enabled them to bring their research closer into line. CIA spent a lot of initiative on meeting policy needs. There were all sorts of committees set up to work out requirements so that they would be responding to policy needs. But, there is no substitute for proximity which INR within State enjoyed. (The National Security Advisor enjoys this advantage too with respect to the President.)

On the question of CIA trying to respond, at one point, when Carter was president, Turner, the DCI, had a big dinner out there to which the head of INR went. Turner had a major slide show. The intelligence committees had worked for weeks and weeks on what our priorities should be for the President, National Security Council, State, Defense, etc. He finished his presentation and Carter, who could be quite anti-establishment, said, "Well, they may be your priorities but they are not mine." So, all of a sudden a top level committee was set up to find out what his priorities were. The White House was supposed to have a top man on it, I think the National Security Advisor. At State it was going to be the under secretary for political affairs and at CIA it was going to be the deputy. They never met. Finally it worked down to working level types who said, "Look, we have gone over the requirements so many times we don't have anything more to say. If President Carter won't tell us what his priorities are we are at a dead end." In the requirements work, both CIA and Defense had large staffs but it tends to become a mechanical exercise after a while. The Washington Post recently had an article about a new DCI initiative to develop and serve all requirements. The intelligence community spends great effort in trying to be responsive to policy, but policy officers often won't give intelligence the time of day. CIA, however, is traditionally closer to the NSC [National Security Council] than any other intelligence arm which may account in part for the strong White House support it enjoys.

Q: How long did you work on current intelligence?

McAFEE: The first budget crunch came about 1953 or the beginning of 1954 and that was when the current intelligence staff was [disbanded].

Q: When you first started were you at all operative or was this all in the planning stage?

Did you have a staff and were you supplying information?

McAFEE: People out of the research divisions were detailed to handle current intelligence and I would meet with them individually, and with the whole committee once a day. We put out a daily intelligence comment which sometimes had good material. It was intended to be as close to the policy picture as we could make it, but, I never felt it was a very effective vehicle. I think our product was better when the divisions themselves had direct contact with the policy bureaus. When they disestablished a separate current intelligence program, I don't think anybody lost all that much because in the current intelligence field, CIA was too big and too competent and the Pentagon, including NSA, was too big and too competent. In later years, INR produced first rate current intelligence by making this a top priority.

Q: Did you get a taste of the CIA wanting to be more activist during this time? This is an era of still OSS types who wanted to get out and parachute people into places, etc. I think we are reaping some of the results of this today.

McAFEE: I did not get into the operational activities until 1966. I had other assignments for quite a long time. I am sure that CIA during this period was very active on the operational side, but I was not involved in that. On your comment about our later reaping some of the results of covert operations, one comes to mind. When I was still in Chinese Affairs handling military activities the office director told me that Frank Merrill, retired Army general whom I had known slightly and respected, would be working with us and that he might ask me questions. I was to be as helpful as possible and to ask no questions in return. It became plain to me that we were mounting some program of military assistance to the Chinese Nationalists covertly. The Communists quickly rolled up any effort and the Chinats involved retreated into northern Burma where they used their arms and ammo to seize control of the drug traffic in the Golden Triangle. They remained a headache for years and may still be as far as I know.

Another activity that I knew about involved aid to Tibetans to ward off Chicom control of their area. Again, it did not work and there was a major problem of resettling them. Having learned from the Chinat case the CIA moved effectively in resettling the Tibetans it had worked with.

After they disestablished current intelligence (around 1954) I had a very interesting job as State representative on the National Indication Center (NIC). State, DOD, CIA, the AEC [Atomic Energy Commission], FBI [Federal Bureau of Investigation], all were represented. We were way down in the bottom of the Pentagon next to the [National Military] Command Center [NMCC]. We had a directive from Eisenhower to look at any and all indications of possible hostile action against us or our allies. This was when the inter-continental missiles were coming on line and people were getting worried. The directive said nobody can deny any information to the NIC because of security, you have to provide it. Everyone on the staff had to be acceptable security-wise to all other agencies. It was a very interesting job. J. J. Hitchcock was the CIA director and a very good man.

Miss Garbo, whom I have mentioned earlier, wrote an excellent summary of the Watch Committee and the National Indications Center for the *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* (Volume 3, 1989). Initially assigned in 1949 as part of a two person watch effort by the Army, she later served on the NIC staff for its full life from 1955 to 1975, being in many ways it substantive backbone and institutional memory. A very able officer, she describes indicator intelligence as preparation of lists of possible actions any nation might take in preparation for hostilities, lists of assistance to both collectors and analysts as long as they were not taken as bibles.

Q: When I was in Yugoslavia we would check the foreign ministry and ministry of defense to see if the lights were on on a weekend, which never happened in those days. But, were we getting fairly good information or were we being alerted more than we need be?

McAFEE: A combination. Your illustration of the lights being on, yes, all of that came in telegrams on the movement of senior officials, or on a [possible] senior meeting or on any kind of a military movement. There was a close watch kept on the demilitarized zone in Korea, and certain military areas or on any information that might [contain an] expression of hostile intent. This was not only Russia versus us, but anywhere in the world where somebody might be moving against us or our allies.

One of the more amusing incidents came fairly early on when the Dew Line up in Greenland reported hostile flight towards us. What to do? Should we alert the top command? J. J. Hitchcock said he would go back and take another check before informing anyone. They came back and said, "Sorry, it is the full moon" which had just come up. Only rarely were there false alarms.

We went on a tour to NORAD, out in Colorado, where they had a great big map and a chart with all the possible indicators, economic, political, military movements, etc. bearing on hostile intent. Then they had across the top of the chart various stages of alert. When a light turned red it meant high alert. I remember one of the operators saying if and when all the buttons turned red then the President notified by NORAD was going to have a tremendous decision on what to do. Nobody that I knew of felt that you could set up a mechanical approach to produce decisions. The intelligence people up the line in NORAD had a realistic view [-indicators could suggest when a decision point was close at hand, not what that decision should be].

Q: In a way we are talking about what happened to the Von Schlieffen plan in World War I. The Germans had such a mechanized mobilization plan based on attacking France and couldn't mobilize against Russia without attacking France. Hence, World War I started because of a mechanized plan.

McAFEE: Kegan in his book on World War I writes that attempts to prevent the outbreak of war were frustrated by ignorance and misunderstanding of how the mechanism of war plans, once started, operated. He credits the British ambassador in Russia and the French ambassador in Germany as realizing that one mobilization would have a trigger effect

across the board. I share your concerns over any activity becoming too routinized. Anytime any view or procedure gets set in concrete there may be trouble. Winterbotham in his book The Ultra Secret on the great value of our breaking [the] German codes, notes that [the Germans achieved] surprise in the Battle of the Bulge [in part because we relied too heavily on Ultra], since previously it had given us chapter and verse on German military plans. Prior to the battle the Germans went to great length to preserve signals security, so there was no Ultra, [on which we were fixated] to rely on.

Q: You were at NIC for how long?

McAFEE: About two years, from about 1954 until [March] 1956.

Q: There were two things that happened in October, 1956, the Suez crisis and the Hungarian uprising.

McAFEE: Yes, I was back at State by then [in the INR Office of Intelligence and Research].

Q: I would have thought that if anything might have stirred the juices, this might have done it.

McAFEE: Very much so. One reason I remember that time is totally inconsequential. I was brought back as an assistant to Park Armstrong who was the head of INR. I remember the flares. We were on the first floor of the New War Department building, then main State, and the magnesium flares were lighted so TV could get pictures of senior officials' movements. There was a real sense of urgency in assessing the risks involved - whether we did anything or nothing. In the Suez crisis we had leverage against the British and the Israelis, but the USSR presented a different type challenge in Hungary. As you said, there was a high level of concern particularly after reports that the Soviets had alerted parachute units in southern Russia. Miss Grabo notes that a special meeting of the Watch Committee chaired by General Cabell carefully reviewed available indicators and concluded a British, French, and Israeli attack was imminent. It came within 36 hours.

Q: Were there any other intelligence issues while you were at NIC?

McAFEE: There was intense interest as to any information bearing on Soviet missile capabilities and their development of missiles. I was there for the most part just before the U-2 became operational. I did not know about it, although J. J., who was from CIA might have known about U-2s which came on line in 1956. We didn't get the satellite that monitored the Soviet Union until 1960, but, there was great interest on any intelligence concerning Soviet missiles. As you know, Jack Kennedy made a major issue of a non-existent missile gap. I do not know how much he was briefed before his election. There was major constant attention to Korea, the Middle East and China. Miss Grabo writes that the Berlin crisis of 1961 was a trying time for the NIC and Watch Committee. She also notes the problems created from time to time by reports which had to be proven

false before they could be dismissed, like the one charging that the Chicoms were about to declare war on Japan - a report from a proven fabricator. I would add that during the Cold War there were pressures to see the Soviets as 10 feet tall and coming over the ice cap the next week. A failure to be alarmist meant that you did not comprehend the communist threat. The NIC and the Watch Committee handled their roles under these pressures with credit.

Q: When you left you came back to INR and worked for the director as his special assistant?

McAFEE: [In early 1956], Howard Furnas was the special assistant and I was his [assistant. By February 1959], I became special assistant to the director.

Q: You did this from when to when?

McAFEE: From late 1956 until May 1960.

Q: Who was the director then?

McAFEE: The director at first was Park Armstrong and his deputy was Fisher Howe. I had a lot of respect for Park and Fisher. Park wasn't as tightly wired into the Foreign Service or the top command as Hugh Cumming who followed him about mid-1957 and was a regular FSO. However, various requests did come to our office. I remember when Ed Freers, the director of SOV [Soviet Desk], came to us and asked when the Russians were going to put up a satellite. We didn't know and we put a requirement on the Pentagon and the CIA as to when it might happen. He was very much concerned that they were going to get it up in the near future and over the extent of the propaganda and momentum victory that this would mean. I remember standing by the AP [Associated Press] [news] ticker towards evening, October 3 or 4, 1957, when the ticker jingled and the Soviets announced they had launched sputnik. Later, we found, curiously enough, that a study of Soviet unclassified publications would have revealed the time pretty clearly. A couple of electricians who were installing some of the electrical work wrote an article in a Soviet journal which our people picked up and shipped back. Their conclusion was that the satellite would be launched in the early fall. It was right on the nose, but that was read afterwards. [Open source] publications can give you valuable information.

Q: You mentioned that Park Armstrong was not as well plugged into the Foreign Service establishment. How did that manifest itself?

McAFEE: He attended the Secretary's meetings, but I don't think he was personally involved with senior people calling him and asking him to run down specifics as much as Hugh Cumming was when he was director with his seventh floor contacts [who involved] him in policy discussions. Park was a good man and I respected him. I think he ran a good outfit. [During Cumming's period, two things came together]. You had a policy person who was ready to consult, and a somewhat activist intelligence director who pushed and reached out. [I think Cumming also got INR raised to a bureau. There was

some reorganization of offices.] Roger Hilsman was probably most outstanding in the latter course. He was exceptionally active in keeping in touch with the policy bureaus. During any crisis he got himself in the middle of it. During the Cuban missile crisis he made significant input and received a high commendation from Kennedy.

Q: What was your impression of the INR team opposed to what you were familiar with in CIA and the Pentagon?

McAFEE: It was a first rate outfit. The INR senior estimates group passed on all the current intelligence pieces we sent up so I saw them daily. Allan Evans was the chair, a very broad gaged person. Phil Trezise, his deputy, went on to a distinguished career ending as an assistant secretary. Charlie Stelle was an old China hand and went on to become an ambassador. Dick Scammon, ultimately became a nationally known election expert. Clint Knox went on to become an ambassador. Mose Harvey was one of the outstanding Russian specialists in the government and after retirement headed the University of Miami's Russian Studies. It was a great group. Joe Yager ran one of the most productive units in State. Forty years later his staff has regular reunions. Henry Owen, secretary, later headed policy planning and worked at the NSC. Charleton Ogburn became a nationally known author for his books on the Marauders and on Shakespeare [Ed: The Mysterious William Shakespeare: The Myth and Reality (1992)].

Q: What was the feeling about the world in those days? I am thinking particularly about Communist China and the Soviet Union because that is where things were really ticking.

McAFEE: I remember one of the long standing arguments with DIA was whether China was a subservient partner to the Soviet Union. INR always said no, that the Chinese put their distinctive stamp on everything. INR also felt, for instance, that Vietnam was not going to be a part of an overall Chinese Communist hegemony. It was communist but INR certainly expected that they were going to maintain their own distinctive personality. [This debate gave way to another] after the Soviet and Chinese border skirmishes. Bob Baraz, who was a Soviet expert in INR, had on the wall a framed five dollar check from Danny Graham, who was the head of DIA. Graham had bet that the Soviets and Chinese were going to go to war and Bob bet they wouldn't. He was right. Neither the Russians nor the Chinese wanted war.

I know our Soviet specialists felt that however active Russia would be and however quick they would be to take advantage of a break wherever it occurred, that they were not as adventuresome as many people thought in terms of risking war with U.S. The Soviets had their own power base and weren't going to lose it by some impetuous act. We were more cautious [about Soviet aggressiveness] than the military and somewhat more cautious, I think maybe, than the CIA. [Note that on Duba] Khrushchev took such a risk and was later removed.

INR always stressed the internal problems facing the Soviets with a small segment of society living well and the rest on the edge but I don't think anyone in State or elsewhere predicted the sudden break up that occurred. The Soviet military had been the defender of

communism but the drain it placed on the economic system was a major contribution to that system's problems - there were plenty of other problems too. [Just to leap ahead,] Bob Gates in a recent review of Cold War intelligence noted that the intelligence community's projections of the mid-eighties on Soviet forces and future developments were too high, possibly as a result of the criticism from the right that they were too low. It was during Bush's tenure at this time as DCI that Panels A and B were established to provide an outside look, with Panel B coming in with an alarmist view of Soviet military growth. It makes me think of the comment that everyone is free to have his own opinion but not his own facts. Most analysts in State (and in CIA's Russian area) thought that Panel B put its own twist on all intelligence.

Gates in his review stated that not until 1989 did CIA awaken to the possibility of a collapse of the Soviet system. As he stated, they had a lot of company. He does note that in 1989 in his role in the NSC he established a highly secret planning group to prepare for a possible collapse.

Q: In this period of the fifties, was there much attention paid to what was still pretty much a colonial empire area, Africa?

McAFEE: While I was special assistant to Park, Frank Wisner, who was deputy director for plans at CIA, said he wanted to hold a meeting in his office, which was then down along the tidal basin, to discuss Africa. For some reason or other I was tapped to go. Also, is there a Leo Cyr?

Q: Yes, he was a northern Africa specialist and later ambassador to Rwanda.

McAFEE: He was there. Wisner opened the meeting by turning to him and said, "Leo, tell us what is going on in Africa." Leo said, "Frank, I am so busy [he was in the policy officer] handling day-to-day issues and congressional's that I am simply overburdened by day-to-day activities." Wisner went ahead saying that we had to pay attention to this area because sooner or later it was coming around to bite us if we didn't. It was a good initiative and I reported back, although I didn't have any idea what the next follow up was to be. It took a while for the government to gear up. State then had one office to handle all of Africa. I am afraid our concerns for Africa involved the Cold War rather than conditions on the continent for too long.

Q: Of course, really until 1960, with few exceptions, it was still pretty much a colonial area. What about the Near East? Was there much attention paid to Iran, Iraq, Egypt, etc.?

McAFEE: There was always a lot of attention paid to Israel and the question of its security. The general estimate, I think in terms of military capability, was that they had the ability to defend themselves against simultaneous attacks from all sides. An interesting question, of course, was to what extent the Soviets would back their client state Syria in a confrontation. The Middle East was the subject of all sorts of estimates, long term and short term, often controversial.

Iran became front and center when the overthrow of Mossadegh was engineered. When you mention people wanting to get out and do things, I think that was very much the case of CIA's Kermit Roosevelt's getting out and running what was considered a highly successful operation to restore the Shah. In postmortems years later, after the Shah was out and Khomeini was in, people said it might have been better to have somebody like Mossadegh as a transition than what we got. You can argue it both ways.

In the fall of 1978 I was in Iran, as well as Turkey, looking into some facilities problems. We were becoming very concerned about the stability of the Shah's regime and the outlook for our highly valuable listening posts overlooking Soviet sensitive test facilities. The embassy thought the situation unstable and was awaiting the opening of colleges in a short time to get some gauge of popular sentiment. Fearing violence against Americans who had been the Shah's strong supporters embassy personnel took different routes to and from work each day to avoid an ambush. The Shah had been pouring a vast amount of money into highly sensitive electronic equipment and other gear suitable for a sophisticated world power, raising questions not only in Iran but in parts of the U.S. government, but again we were seized with Cold War fever - there was plenty of reason for concern on Soviet intentions but I think at times we had unrealistic assessments of some friendly capabilities.

On Egypt, I remember after the resolution of the war in 1956, the question rose as to how effectively they could run the canal. Some people felt they couldn't do it, but we had no real alternative but to wait and see. Joe Alsop in his autobiography traced the downfall of the old WASP establishment's influence on foreign policy to U.S. actions at the time of the Suez crisis. In his view it was unthinkable that we undercut Anthony Eden and the old line British establishment.

Q: If I recall, the old colonial hands and conservatives were saying that the Egyptians could never handle the canal, they were just a bunch of wily oriental gentlemen. The right wing were the status quo people. I think this was considered a real issue.

McAFEE: Yes, I think you are right, but they ran it well. A major contact that I had with the question of colonial independence movements came when I was assigned to the Griffin Mission in 1950, the first aid mission to Southeast Asia. Allen Griffin, an able conservative Republican publisher out in California headed it. Sam Hayes, from State, his deputy was an outstanding economist. I was on it because China was then down the drain, had been lost to the Communists by 1950. Jim O'Sullivan would have been the person who should have gone, but if Jim had gone on the mission there wouldn't have been any backup, that is how thin the Department was on Southeast Asia. I was delegated to go along as contact with the missions. The current thinking was that Acheson was changing his stance from letting the dust settle to being more aggressive on Southeast Asia. During the mission, Rusk replaced Butterworth as assistant secretary for FE. Acheson wanted to get first an economic mission to be followed up by the Melby-Erskine Mission six months later, which was the military aid mission; he didn't want to have the first approach to Southeast Asia be through the military.

As Sam Hayes pointed out in his book The Beginning of American Aid to Southeast Asia Acheson felt that given the disarray in the area many countries were susceptible to subversion and penetration which could not be stopped by military means. As Sam wrote, the Administration recognized that it must build closer relations with the nationalists movements in the area lest there be other Chinas for whose loss it would bear the blame. The shift in policy reflected two concerns - containment of communism and economic development. Mr. Butterworth, the assistant secretary for Far Eastern affairs had written an initial memo on an aid program and secretary Acheson elaborated on it in early 1950. Sam notes that the mission was not to propose major programs along the line of the Marshall plan but to provide a "missing component" and that in all the mission recommended aid totaling $66 million for various programs of economic and technical assistance, involving for instance engineering units, medical assistance, agricultural supplies, road reconstruction, publications and training aids, etc. Hayes states that the recommendations formed the basis for the Economic Cooperation Administration's initial programs in the area.

Griffin wired ahead and asked and got to see MacArthur, who I think later was quoted as saying that nobody from the administration ever consulted him about Southeast Asia. But, Griffin made it a point, it was the main purpose of the stop at Tokyo. The staff met with General Willoughby. I wasn't at the meeting but Willoughby apparently said that there were a lot of barefoot men running around the jungles of Southeast Asia with weapons, and what we need to do was give the French a word of encouragement and they would handle the situation, not recognizing its nationalist component. There was a similar division to some extent inside State. EUR wanted to be sure we backed France. Among other things they [focused on] all that French land, and they looked at NATO and what it meant. The Far Eastern bureau was convinced that these movements had genuine support. That was a real division in the government.

Q: They wanted to keep France in NATO and this in a way was a cornerstone of our policy at the time. Did you feel this division in INR?

McAFEE: Not really. The people coming out of OSS into INR were generally more liberal than the average Foreign Service officer. Some had been intellectuals in Europe and elsewhere and were inclined to be more aware of the genuine thrust of nationalist movements and independence movement, I don't think there was ever that split within INR.

Q: You were doing this job as special assistant to about the middle of 1960. Then where?

McAFEE: [With the arrival of the Kennedy administration, Roger Hilsman became INR Director. In May 1961,] I was assigned [as Deputy Director, INR Coordination Staff,] to an office that handled both requirements and certain [liaison functions] with the Pentagon (military intelligence) and with [the] CIA (defectors). I had a curious, added, assignment. I was named the interdepartmental coordinator for publications procurement. State wanted to take over management of this essentially overt field from CIA. There were

nine or 10 State [publications procurement] officers overseas and we were trying to take steps to make them more responsive to State. That was just one of my various titles. At this point I started [serving] more in the coordination mechanism than I had been before.

Since that time, I have had a soft spot for publications procurement. Shortly after I took over, two CIA men who had been looking at publications procurement in Latin America talked to me and were very dismissive of the State effort there saying that in most areas it was non existent, only in Panama City was there an active procurement effort. FSOs tended to give the program scant time but when you think about the issue, you realize that procuring publications of all types could give you an insight into what was going on and what others wished were going on. Barbara Tuchman in The Guns of August wrote that the French got wind of German uncertainty over the Von Schlieffen plan by reading German military journals where the staff fought out the issues. As I mentioned earlier, we could have gotten a fix on the first Soviet satellite launch time from Soviet magazines. Putting it another way, think of what a foreign embassy can learn about the U.S. from the wide range of our publications. An embassy can't spend all its time reading U.S. journals, but sent home they form a valuable resource on the direction and bearing of a country.

Q: You were doing this from 1961 to when?

McAFEE: From 1961-66. With a variety of increased duties including reconnaissance, defectors and certain collection programs.

Q: You had a real change in the administration going from the Eisenhower administration to the Kennedy administration. Did INR feel this?

McAFEE: Personnel wise, but otherwise not so much. Kennedy did let planning go forward as started during Eisenhower's days for the Bay of Pigs - which proved to be a disaster. At that time such activities were handled from the Under Secretary's office. Hugh Cumming was still [INR] director after Kennedy came in and I think Hugh was quite anxious to hang on to his job. Roger Hilsman had been designated to be the new director. Herman Pollock of personnel called me one day and said, "Bill, there is a file on Roger Hilsman, a security file. I think it is in INR. Could you find it and get it to me?" I said, "Herm, I don't have any idea about it, but I will check into it." I knew that the head of [the Office of Current Intelligence, INR/DDM/RCI], special intelligence, had to vet any clearances. I called down there and was told they had it. I delivered it to Pollock five minutes after his call. This was my role in the transition. Hilsman came in and was very active and perhaps his outstanding role in the government was during the Cuban missile crisis.

Q: We will get to that, but let's discuss the period before that, which was in 1962. Your role is what at this time, 1961?

McAFEE: I had been transferred out of the [INR front office] in 1960 and was no longer in a position to [see at close range] what was going on in INR [as] I had been when [I was special assistant]. I really couldn't comment on Hilsman's early days, other than that he

immediately sensed that in the Department there was a lack of what he called advanced planning. Back in the days of Kennan, S/P had been very distinguished. [As for me, I moved up to be the Director of the Coordination Staff in mid-1961.]

Q: That's the Office of Policy Planning [S/P]?

McAFEE: Yes. I think by the time Hilsman came in, 1961, S/P was less highly regarded. Harriman, assistant secretary, FE, came cross-wise with S/P over a memo Walt Rostow had written urging the bombing of North Vietnam, and told Hilsman he would look to him for planning. Hilsman developed his plan to have his own long range planning staff in INR. He brought in Professor Whiting from the University of Michigan and was going to detail Bernie Morris, who was a solid Soviet expert in INR, among others.

Q: Whiting was a China expert.

McAFEE: Yes, an able one. He was getting ready to build up a planning staff when the first budget cut came. He had transferred the NIS people who did the basic research on railroads, roads, ports, hospitals to other agencies.

Q: National Intelligence Assessment, something like that.

McAFEE: Yes - National Intelligence Survey. We had a good many of those very able people; he felt they didn't belong in INR and cut them. He thought when the first major cut for the Department came he would be spared since he had reduced the staff even though they were centrally funded and not budgeted by State. He wasn't and he couldn't believe it. He lost his chance to have a planning staff. Roger remained an activist and reached out to the bureaus and had good connections with the NSC.

Q: How did the missile crisis work?

McAFEE: I was on the Committee on Overhead Reconnaissance and among other activities we set targets for U-2 overflights. I had been involved in their coordination from 1956 [while] in INR's front office. I am very glad to say I had not been involved in [the] one involving the shootdown of [Gary] Powers. I was being transferred out of the office as of May 1, 1960 and the papers on the flight came in during the middle of April. I was not on that circuit. Before the Soviets announced they had Powers, the [U.S.] government came out with a report that a weather plane flying from Pakistan had gone off course and hadn't reported. And, then, of course, the Soviets came out and said they had Powers. Linc White, the spokesman for the Department was profoundly unhappy over being misled. I hope I would have objected to calling it a weather plane, but you never know what you would have done under pressure.

INR/DDC (the coordination directorate) did work to get State and the government to stick to "no comment" rather than getting involved in lies. The Pentagon at one point planned the launch of five reconnaissance drones over North Vietnam and prepared a cover story that essentially was a denial. INR took the position that they would be

detected by radar and might even be shot down. As a matter of fact one or more were brought down in North Vietnamese territory and put on display. McNamara then instructed the reconnaissance people to follow the “no comment” line.

We had trouble sometimes with chiefs of mission who wanted to deny that CIA officers charged with espionage were in fact CIA. We did not want to confirm that either and felt that the no comment on intelligence matters was more appropriate. We were pleased when Rusk finally put the matter pretty much to rest. There had been a considerable "dust up" in Singapore when CIA and the military tried to recruit a member of the local security service, and proposed he take a polygraph. He said he would think about it and left the building - within a few minutes we had three or four [of our] intelligence operators in the hands of Singapore authorities. Lee Kuan Yu, premier, tried to use this to blackmail the U.S. for $150 million. Nobody went along with that. The situation was resolved eventually, I think, through the intervention of Jim O'Sullivan, an FSO [Foreign Service officer] and a good golfer, who was playing with the Sultan of Jehore and took an opportunity to say we were not going to be blackmailed and to get the word to Lee. Lee withdrew his demand the next day. It was agreed that the U.S. would apologize and Rusk wrote Lee. Several years later the Secretary's office called INR and said there had been a press inquiry about such a letter which had been closely held. The people in INR who were called could find no record of a letter and Rusk denied signing such a letter. We had to go back and say he had so signed years before and he set the record straight and then directed that the Department of State not lie and if anyone proposed doing it he wanted to be informed. We used that directive to cement the “no comment” approach.

Q: So you were dealing with these overhead planes?

McAFEE: Yes.

Q: Was there any disquiet about these?

McAFEE: About flying over the Soviet Union, the disquiet was that we might lose one. We knew that they knew it, their radar picked it up, but the plane was too high for them to get. But, there was always the worry. Politically it was not a big deal. The Soviets, I think, sent a note and SOV just didn't answer it, figuring it was better not to say anything because they knew we were doing it. There was disquiet; intelligence is often called a destabilizer, which, of course, the U-2 flight was and Khrushchev used the May 1 incident to break up the summit conference later with Eisenhower. On the other hand, it had been stabilizing for a long time because it showed us exactly how few missiles they had and what their readiness was. So, it worked both ways.

Q: How did the Cuban thing come out from INR perspective?

McAFEE: The Soviets came within a hair of establishing a serious nuclear threat to the U.S. in its own backyard. The intelligence community came under close scrutiny for its failure to detect this before it did.

First, a little background info from the intelligence angle. We had received a steady flow of reports over many months about offensive missiles being installed in Cuba and they had all proved to be false, so the community was naturally skeptical about such reports. Also there was a mind set that the Soviets would not take such a risk. A Special National Intelligence Estimate of September 19, 1962, concluded that the Soviet buildup was primarily for political purposes, to strengthen the communist regime and its ability to defend itself. It discounted the possibility of either a submarine base being established or IRBMs [intercontinental range ballistic missiles] being installed as incompatible with Soviet practice and policy. Mac Bundy in a later meeting with McCone, the DCI who believed the Soviets were installing an offensive threat, dismissed the idea of an offensive threat as incompatible with Soviet worldwide policy.

The Committee on Overhead Reconnaissance planned the targets for the U-2 missions. The flight that detected them was on October 14, 1962. There had not been a flight over that area for six weeks. The history of that gap became a very controversial item, why there had not been flights. In that period, there was a September 10 meeting of senior officials and CIA operators always contended that Dean Rusk put his hand up on the map and said, "I don't want any flights west of this line." It was precisely west of this line the Soviets were installing their missiles. One record of the meeting, however, said the Secretary of State asked that we not combine peripheral flights around Cuba which were legal with overflights. Don't have one plane do both because that plane could then be vulnerable. He did approve four U-2 flights, two peripheral and two overflights. There had been two recent incidents involving U-2s. One had gone down over China and another had strayed over Sakhalin. Also in everyone's mind was recognition that with SAMs in Cuba, the U-2 was now vulnerable. The secretary hoped we could avoid further incidents just at that time. One record states that Rusk asked that the flights be limited to the Isle of Pines and eastern Cuba, and be over Cuba for a limited time. A later memo for the record stated that there was general discussion on avoiding SAM sites and that the primary concern at the meeting was avoiding incidents with the U-2 over Cuba. The President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board in its post mortem noted that though it could find no proof of a policy to prevent overflights of the area where IRBMs were discovered the operators were under the impression that there was such an injunction. Whatever the case, the State Department concurred with the need for coverage of that area in early October.

When the time came for a mission our committee set the targets and correctly specified the exact area where missiles were found. The military and CIA deserve the credit for this. I remember a clandestine service report telling of a visitor to Cuba who woke at night to rumbling and looked out his hotel window and saw an enormous missile going by on a truck. He got out of Cuba as soon as he could. Sam Halpern, a CIA operator with whom we had long and very profitable relations, always claimed, correctly I think, that given a short time the clandestine service would have reported the missile sites, but by then they might have been operational. I was called out to a meeting on the 16th and we were shown the pictures of missile sites and told the President was being briefed simultaneously. Of course, reconnaissance was immediately stepped up, both U-2 overflights and later lower level flights. McCone, by the way, as you probably know, had

been on his second honeymoon in France prior to the crisis. He kept sending back messages saying the Soviets were putting in SAMs and the SAMs were there to protect strategic missiles. As a friend of mine in the Agency said, "We didn't give wide dissemination to this view of his because we wanted to save the old man from his folly." McCone was right. His message of September 10 from France had a poignant end. After repeating his view that IRBMs were probably in the works he ended with the words that his bits of wisdom resulted from complete relaxation in his incredibly beautiful environment.

I was not involved in policy nor did I see the telegraphic traffic. Roger Hilsman debriefed us later on one aspect of his involvement. A letter from Khrushchev came in a day or so before the resolution of the crisis. I understand it was a two-sided letter. One side said he was a man of peace and didn't want war, and the other said they would blow us out of the universe. Hilsman said, "Let's try the trollop ploy. She is working the street and a man comes down and says, 'Can I go with you to your room?' And she says, 'I accept your proposition of marriage.'" Hilsman said to answer only the part where Khrushchev says he wants to be a man of peace. I think it was Robert Kennedy who gave Hilsman high marks for this suggestion. So much has been written on the crisis that I hesitate to comment from memory.

There was a curious coincidence. The Saturday before resolution of the crisis, I was in and was told in the afternoon to get over to the Pentagon and find out everything I could about the shootdown of the U-2 with Major Anderson on board over Cuba. I went over to the Joint Reconnaissance Center which was the center of all reconnaissance activity and they said that wasn't the only episode. Not only had a plane been shot down over Cuba, but a U-2 weather plane out of Elmendorf in Alaska had flown to the pole and was supposed to make a 180 degree reverse and come right back. It got off its bearings and the man knew he was lost and came out in the clear over the Soviet Union, over the Chukotskiy Peninsula and asked for directions and his base gave him his bearings.

The Soviets had their most advanced missile bases in the Chukotskiy, which would probably be activated first, and which we might have attacked first. A U-2 overflight of the Chukotskiy just then would have been most sensitive. There was limited speculation that this episode may have been part of the timing that got to Khrushchev and he said he would accept the terms offered. It was quite an evening. You had the sense of a real crisis building up. Hilsman, I think, deserves a good deal of credit for suggesting answering just the good part of Khrushchev's letter.

Q: Had Cuba been pretty far down on the priority list of your reconnaissance committee?

McAFEE: No, Cuba always had a high priority. After we knew the SAMs were there we flew the U-2 more often. The delay in detecting the IRBMs was caused by the misunderstanding between State and the CIA as noted. Normally the flights were every couple of weeks.

I suggested at one point prior to the crisis when we were trying to get information on the

situation that we bring back a side-looking photographic plane. We had cargo planes configured with immense photographic equipment. They could pick up things well inland. I wanted to see a program like that started, but, the Pentagon was using the plane out in Southeast Asia at the time and didn't want to bring it back. I guess my general approach in intelligence collection is to use the least sensitive means that will give us what we need.

Q: Were we looking in those days at developments in the Middle East using U-2s?

McAFEE: I don't think the U-2 was used much in the Middle East. When the SR-71 came on line, the Blackbird which could fly mach 3+ and took an enormous area to turn, it was used over Israel, Jordan, Lebanon and Syria for a while with everybody knowing and approving it.

Q: I was in Syria in the seventies and when those things went by you woke up. They are not silent.

McAFEE: No, they were not. An amusing little side light. A friend of mine, Lucy Witherow, lived in southern Pennsylvania, west of Chambersburg. She told me at one time that the day before there had been a loud explosion which no one could account for. Some thought munitions at the Letterkenny Army depot had blown up but this was promptly denied. I knew the JRC was planning to deploy an SR-71 from Edwards to a base in upper New York. Its flight path came directly east and it banked and turned over the area in question - the sonic boom being loudest when it banks. Sorry to say I never saw or heard an SR-71. When it turned, it took 150 miles. We used the U-2 over China, using Nationalist pilots flying out of an airbase in India. When the Chinese Communists punched a hole in the Himalaya Mountains, you could see the lights of the Chinese trucks which scared the Indians. They became much more ready to work with us, and gave us permission for a base in India. Nehru went down and visited the base. It was on his way back that he had his first stroke. It must have been a torment to him to allow the base.

Q: There is a story about a U-2 making a forced landing somewhere in Utah or Nevada or somewhere and out of this strange craft came a pilot who was oriental and spoke only halting English. We were training him to fly.

McAFEE: You are right, we did train some Chinats from bases on Taiwan. Did you notice the other day in the paper that the Air Force admitted that back in the fifties it had put out misleading reports in order to protect the U-2 and the other high performing planes? When people would say these were new planes or UFOs coming in, the Air Force, wanting to protect the secrecy of its programs, put out reports which they knew were false.

Q: And now it is part of the conspiracy theory that these are really alien space craft.

McAFEE: This, of course, plays into the hands of those who say you can never believe the government.

Q: Yes. While you were doing this were you getting films and the results of the U-2 work? Were they considered pretty good?

McAFEE: It was literally unbelievable. President Eisenhower is quoted as saying "Angle permitting, we could read a car license plate from 70,000 feet up." INR did not have people at that time working on the read out. Later we developed a limited capability from a couple of officers who were very able people. We always got from CIA excellent reports. The only real conflict we had on priorities came when one of the more sophisticated satellites came on line. The Pentagon in effect proposed giving every commander an instant read out capability, but was going to provide State the information by courier. We had to put that up to the Secretary to go to Defense and say that we wanted to get the information at the same time CIA, the White House and everybody else got it, so, we were given the instant read out capability. By and large we got excellent read outs from the Pentagon and the CIA. I think it was a Defense officer working at CIA who first spotted the Cuban missiles.

A comment on development of the U-2 which was a product of Air Force, CIA, Lockheed, and Kodak cooperation, to name the four principal operators. Kelly Johnson of Lockheed was the genius behind the plane. Since only the CIA at that time had authority to make contracts without competitive bids, Eisenhower, in the interest of security, made CIA the executive agent and within the Agency Dick Bissell ran the program as well as the program for the SR 71 later. Friends in CIA say he was a sure bet to be DCI until the failure of the Bay of Pigs derailed him. He was also behind the first photo satellite, the Corona, which [became] operational right after Eisenhower had suspended U-2 flights after the Powers shootdown over the Soviet Union. The Cold War produced a phenomenal burst of energy and imagination in the intelligence field. A CIA friend told me that at the time the above programs were being developed the operations directorate had a separate existence within CIA, having its own administrative staff etc. right down to its own separate medical staff. Money was never hard to come by for CIA.

Most of the time intelligence achievements will not be so dramatic. Richard Holbrooke recently quoted Kissinger as writing: "The fulfillment of America's ideals will have to be sought in the patient accumulation of partial successes." Much intelligence work will be in the patient accumulation of information that will enable the USA to make those decisions that have to be made in a timely and informed manner.

Q: After the U-2 had picked up Cuban missiles were we using the U-2 more to find out what was going on, not only in Cuba but elsewhere?

McAFEE: We continued to use the U-2 over Cuba, but, of course, we soon started low level flights that went right over the missiles at tree top level. The U-2 was used in China, as I mentioned. It was used over Russia until the shootdown. It was used at one point with the permission and consent of a Latin American government to look for poppy crops, and drug related things. It had a variety of configurations that increased its usefulness in various areas and could be used for collecting signal intelligence.

Q: There was the accusation at one time that the U-2 was being used to take pictures of French nuclear capabilities. Did you get involved in that?

McAFEE: Yes. It actually wasn't the U-2. That was a regular Air Force training flight out of Germany which was supposed to come down on a routine run, on international airways which passed very close to a French nuclear facility. The problem in this case was there had been a fire in the control tower in Charleroi, in Belgium so the plane had not been able to make it's second connection. They decided since the flight plan had been filed routinely and in advance with the French that they would just go ahead; they went down and back. This was at the time when the French were looking for a chance to jump on us for intelligence activities run from Paris, a Cold War intelligence hot spot. There was a big stink. As a result of that, finally, we were ordered to prepare a book on every intelligence activity and liaison we had in France or with the French - State - the military, everybody.

Q: That would be a virtual tome.

McAFEE: Yes it was a tome. It would say routine things like at such and such a time the sergeant in charge of communications at point X had liaison with the French army, etc. There were countless entries, a lot of them about high level contacts and major programs. By the time the study was completed everything had wound down and the French had made their point. Chip Bohlen was back and up in Tommy Thompson's office, the under secretary for political affairs, so I took the book up. Bohlen was lying down on the sofa. He got up and shook hands and lay down on the sofa. He leafed through it for a few minutes and said, "I have no more problems." I was glad for the answer because he was right, the French had gotten off the issue, but it had resulted in a large survey and many man hours of work. Having all that information in one book also probably presented a security risk.

Q: What was the point of the survey?

McAFEE: The French had made a fuss and had been assured we would look into our intelligence activities to see if we were doing anything that would be considered improper and that the higher authorities needed to focus on. Actually the military pretty well coordinated all their arrangements regarding reconnaissance, but you never can be sure that in the clandestine field people aren't doing something, because even though they are supposed to coordinate well through the station chief with the chief of mission, you always have somebody senior or junior who will go off on his own if he sees the opportunity. Over the years we have had periodic dust-ups with the French over aggressive collection activities since many third country activities were run from France.

Q: Now, we are talking still about the sixties. Within State were you picking up any disquiet about the CIA and some of its clandestine activities, etc.? Was there concern about the CIA doing things or was this an accepted thing?

McAFEE: There always is a lot of concern. Up until Hilsman became the director, liaison with CIA went through two channels. INR handled a wide variety of activities involving staffing, cover, substantive estimates, U-2 flights and all of that. Joe Scott was then in the under secretary's office, a special assistant, and he handled the covert operations, activities intended to change a situation, not to collect intelligence on it. Ambassador Cumming tried to get both sides folded in under him which would have made sense. Allen Dulles told him he would consider it, but it was one of those things he just kept considering, which meant he was not going to do it. Hilsman and McCone initially got along very well and McCone announced that Hilsman was the only man he knew of in State who was really alive. McCone agreed to have all liaison with State under one tent. Joe Scott at that point came into INR and became the deputy for coordination, later that was the position I was in. I don't know if, prior to that, the Department was unhappy about potentially risky covert operations. Theoretically, the Agency normally accepted its responsibility to keep State advised of covert operations. They knew they had to have the support of the embassy, so [their activities] were normally pretty well coordinated. I think the greater concern was in the clandestine collection field over what notification the chief of mission should get on activity with possible political costs, such as recruiting a senior foreign official. At one point there was a proposed plan to establish a mechanism for coordinating all clandestine collection at State. I was skeptical as to whether it would work, how forthcoming CIA would be and whether we wanted a center in State coordinating all clandestine activities. We felt the place to coordinate collection activities was at the mission. It would be better for security and better for on the spot knowledge on what the traffic could bear. At meetings on a directive, we wanted the wording that "the chief of mission shall be kept informed as he deems sufficient." The wording, after high level wrangling, came out, "he shall be sufficiently informed," which left it up to CIA to decide what is sufficient. CIA has always had support in high places on protection of intelligence sources and methods.

High level support of secret intelligence services is an ancient tradition since they were the monarch's arm against all plotters. Some of this tradition carries over into modern times. Winterbotham in his book, Ultra, speaks of the chief of the British Secret Intelligence Service in World War II as the last chief to defend the absolute independence of the Secret Service.

I think there was always concern about a CIA staff overseas as big as the rest of the embassy in some places, [looking] for targets, serving under State cover while running a mostly overt clandestine service. You mentioned the large CIA staffs. One ongoing problem involved cover. When CIA was set up, [it] envisioned State cover as temporary until [it] could get good private cover, but soon found they liked [it]. It gave [CIA officers] a secure working area, secure communications, access, and diplomatic immunity. CIA always admitted that cover would wear thin - that it was expendable. Congress and the press tended to beat on us at times, particularly after major incidents like the assassination of Mr. Welch, the station chief in Athens. Actually CIA had recommended that he not live in the traditional COS house and the State policy bureau did likewise, but he preferred it and was shot outside it. State I think over the years has done a good job of facilitating cover arrangements. The location of the CIA station in an embassy raises a

variety of questions including how much the local staff can observe comings and goings. It is prudent to accept the fact that in most countries and particularly in hostile or closed societies, the staffs of local employees will have contact with their own countries' security services. When I was in Brazil in 1980 I was favorably impressed by arrangements Bob Sayre, the COM [chief of mission], had worked out. The bulk of the station immediately adjoined the political section and had a door permitting them direct access to that section and to the ambassador's offices. Access the other way was controlled. Both sides felt it served both cover and access, and I suggested on return to Washington that CIA and State's Foreign Building Office maintain close contact as plans were made for new embassy buildings or for adjustments in older ones.

There have been embarrassing incidents involving cover. An AID director on the Hill stated that there were no CIA people under AID cover. We had to provide his office with the figures and he really would have liked them out of their posts literally overnight. We persuaded him that this would draw more attention to the problem than anything else we could do; he agreed and we phased them out over a period of time. Sometimes sensitivity over any connection with CIA interfered with potentially useful initiatives. Doug Heck, ambassador to Niger talked to me about using satellite photography in planning aid programs. He said they had scanty reliable information on rivers, whether the desert was advancing or retreating, on land and on back country roads, etc. We checked and found it would be possible to collect this information routinely and without cost to other programs. CIA immediately agreed to put up to several man years on such a project - using read out specialists. The AID director objected to the program because he feared an AID-CIA link. We then discussed in general the idea of non-military use of such photography, but never actively followed up.

Q: One of the things that I get from my interviews is that, yes, the CIA had large staffs and all, but they are essentially reporting on the same thing and that very little of value came out of these intelligence sources, most of which were the same sources that the regular diplomatic officer would have.

McAFEE: I went down to Latin America in 1962, when Mr. Bowles was the under secretary - - he had these meetings in foreign countries where a number of chiefs of mission would come in as well as the CIA station chiefs, and attaches, and people came out from Washington. When the one was set for Latin America, I was tapped to go. I remember talking to the political counselor at Lima and he said that the thing that [exasperated him was] when you had a good overt source in the host government and he dries up and you wonder what has happened. Then you see him going down the hall into the closed doors of the CIA and you know he is getting paid for what he gave you openly before. It was a great thorn and irritation. Why give anything for free if you can get money for it? Many overt sources disappeared this way but CIA also developed valuable intelligence from sources State could not have reached.

One of the duties I enjoyed was briefing chiefs of mission on intelligence activities at the post. I was briefing Ambassador Annenberg who was going to London. Part way through he [announced] I had been born 30 miles either side of our border with Canada in the

Calais-St. Stephens area. Actually, my mother *had* been born in Canada 30 miles from that border.

Most COMs took their intelligence responsibilities seriously, and discussed intelligence problems with State through the Roger Channel.

Q: Also, there is always the problem that I mentioned before that the basic relations between a foreign country and the United States is through the State Department and CIA is on the periphery. So, if the CIA is working somebody they are not really as close to the problem as the State Department person.

McAFEE: That is very often the case. On the other hand, many foreign officials felt CIA had better channels to the White House and cultivated contact with their staffs. Also in many countries the security services on which the executive depended and with which CIA was in liaison knew better what was really going on than the foreign office did. Another problem made it exceptionally hard for the chief of mission to evaluate staffing of an operation. A great many of CIA's personnel were justified on the basis of third country activities. In, say, Luanda we might be able to recruit a Soviet who would be useful later when he was in Europe so, there was a vast amount of recruitment going on of no interest then to the Department or post, with potential for disrupting local relationships but with possible later value. It was very hard to make assessments of this nature. They were operating on a totally different wave length in some of these cases.

Now and then it was suggested that State seek to get the authority for the COM to have access to the operational communications of all agencies. It would provide the best possible handle for the COM to learn of sensitive activities that might have political costs. I believed that since these messages contained information on sources and methods that CIA and the FBI would object and would be backed by higher authority. Ed Peck, at one point COM in Mauritania, during Gray's tenure as head of the FBI raised an issue on a specific activity concerning the COM's access to their communications. I did not think the FBI would accede, but in this case they did. Ed won that battle but it did not result in any State-FBI agreement making this a standard operating procedure. Ed later told me that the FBI wrote State in protest. I think we are going to have to look elsewhere for coordinating mechanisms.

Q: During your time in INR was there any effort to try to make sure that we weren't paying the same person for information or that these things were coordinated so that CIA went after sources that we couldn't get to?

McAFEE: During an Indonesian crisis in the late fifties both the military and CIA felt they had a good clandestine source, which they did. After a while he got lazy and just handed over the same version of his reports to each service and the duplication was quickly noticed - he had been getting paid by two services. We in State did not have a good handle with which to work this problem - it would have required a major concentration of sensitive collection of information back here. It is a problem that should be handled between the embassy and the COS. Back here basic efforts centered on the

directives governing coordination.

A major change in State - CIA relations came with Kennedy's letter to chiefs of mission where he stated that they were in charge of all activities of all agencies. Allen Dulles then approached the White House for a second letter saying except for intelligence. President Kennedy made it plain that he wanted all agencies included. CIA then told its station chiefs that just as they had coordinated covert action proposals they should now similarly coordinate clandestine collection activities and programs with the COM.

A redrafting of the National Security Intelligence Directive on clandestine collection was then undertaken. That was where State tried to get the language that the chief of mission should be kept sufficiently informed - I think the wording was after consultation with the Secretary of State. Finally arrangements were worked out that people the chief of mission might be seeing who were in CIA pay would be notified to him. We didn't want our chief of mission unknowingly dealing with Mr. X who is already being paid for passing info to the station chief. But CIA was fairly adamant about too much notification. They said, "If we recruit this young man in the foreign office, who is a junior officer, he may not be of use to us for twenty years. But, if too many people know he is in our pay, he is going to be put into jeopardy." I think they had a good case. We had cases where political ambassadors, I don't think it ever happened with a career ambassador, came back and wrote books where they did name people.

Q: I think one of the worse cases was the man in Kenya, Smith Hempstone?

McAFEE: Yes, The Reds and the Blacks. He felt the people he mentioned were already known.

Q: This is a recurrent problem for the Foreign Service. We may have a very professional staff capable of handling sensitive matters, but you can have a real horse's ass as the head of it because of political appointments and nobody in his right mind in any case would entrust him. It doesn't mean we haven't had very good people as political ambassadors, but we have had some who are just really social dilettantes or the equivalent to American remittance men.

McAFEE: By and large, in those cases, it becomes routine for the DCM to handle coordination and CIA prefers it in that sort of a situation. And they then accord the DCM most of the privileges that are reserved for the chief of mission. CIA often had good relations with political appointees, sometimes because of their links to the White House.

Q: Is this done without consultation?

McAFEE: This is more or less done as a matter of working relationships. The most definitive document on the question of coordination as mentioned was Kennedy's letter. I think State's main concern has been clandestine collection as opposed to covert operations. The main covert operations that have gone astray however, and this sounds like a State self-serving comment, are ones that were run at least around INR. In a normal

mechanism the Chile program would have been more thoroughly cleared.

Q: This was in the seventies when the Allende regime was in control.

McAFEE: That is right. Kissinger is a great writer. In his book, The White House Years, he mentioned that he had not paid particular attention to Chile. He was involved in other things. And, Nixon hadn't paid attention. Kissinger said he received this briefing from CIA which said in effect, there will be an election in a couple of days that may make certain that there will be a communist government in Chile. Kissinger said he never had focused on it and had to go in and tell the President that this was about to take place. I was the backbencher on the Forty Committee then, Alex Johnson was State's Forty Committee representative.

Q: The Forty Committee being?

McAFEE: This was the senior level committee that coordinated covert operations or highly sensitive intelligence activities. For instance, later on, the ship that raised the Soviet submarine, the Glomar Explorer.

I was there at the first meeting after it was plain that the electoral process was going to put Allende in power. Kissinger in effect said, "Just because they voted to go communist do you think we ought to standby and let it happened?" After that I was never a backbencher, we were thrown out. Later, Alex Johnson sent us down a series of minutes and we thought we were back in the picture, but actually there was a third layer where Kissinger went directly to CIA and had a whole series of additional activities planned to influence the situation. I don't think even Alex knew about that at the time. These were the activities investigated [by Congress] in the Church-Pike hearings.

Q: This was also a Henry Kissinger who enjoyed doing this and was heavily supported by the President, Richard Nixon.

McAFEE: Kissinger, I think, got a real kick out of doing it that way and I think Nixon probably did, too. I am not too sure CIA liked the assignment which they thought would not succeed. Normally they enjoy a direct assignment from the White House. With regards to Kissinger's interest in covert angles I have always regretted one lost chance. Jim Gardner (Rhodes scholar) who was in INR/DDC had reached the conclusion that Allende was likely to win. He did not think that a program to assist the right wing candidate would achieve any results in Chile. Tomic was a candidate considerably to the left of Allende but with little public following. Jim in a paper proposed that we aid and assist his campaign without his knowing it in the hope that he would draw enough votes from Allende to let Alexandre again be voted in. I sent the memo to CIA for comment but got none and Jim discussed it with the policy bureau which asked us not to give it dissemination outside State; I therefore held off sending it to the NSC staff. In his post-mortem during a Forty Committee meeting Kissinger concluded that we should have aided Tomic, for, if he had gotten a little over thirty thousand more votes, Allende would have been denied the election.

The most recent controversial activity was the Iran Contra operation which was run around INR, but not the Department of State.

Q: You are talking about Nicaragua.

McAFEE: Yes. The ARA [Bureau of Interamerican Affairs] assistant secretary was thoroughly involved but INR was not. By a directive from the Secretary of State, the assistant secretary of INR is charged with keeping the Secretary advised of covert operations. An officer in INR/DDC drafted a memo saying, "Mr. Secretary I can't keep you informed because I have not been kept informed." Mort Abramowitz, the very able assistant secretary, was about to send it forward when some of the staff people said, "Mort you are griping against another assistant secretary, don't do it." I think Mort probably regretted later that he hadn't sent the memo forward.

Q: Let's talk about this a bit. You say INR is not informed on certain clandestine things, what is the problem?

McAFEE: On covert operations, it has occasionally been the case [that] higher authority decides [it is] not going to keep State thoroughly informed. Kissinger talked to CIA on Chile and said to do it this way. And, I think the same thing happened on the Contra with Casey who was a real cowboy on things like this and loved it. ARA was involved. All the directives say INR should be kept advised and I think mostly we are.

Q: We have been going back and forth between the sixties and seventies, but essentially you were on this Committee for Clandestine Operations as sort of a watchdog? We talked about the Cuban missile crisis. Where else did you move?

McAFEE: The committee on clandestine intelligence handled requirements - not operations. You were mentioning the problem of an embassy having a large staff including many CIA people without a lot of knowledge of who was doing what. In terms of what to do, I think basically there is no easy answer. Take a look at the collection imperatives, based on requests that the CIA and the intelligence community are responding to. Before I had anything to do with the question of clandestine collection I remember an exchange between senior people at State and CIA. A State officer at a post said that State will do the political and economic collection and CIA responded at a high level that their charter authorized them to collect in any field, political, economic, whatever, where they felt there might be sources that would be profitable. The intensity of their response showed how strongly they felt about this. I think they were right.

You asked about clandestine collection. I was on a clandestine collection committee handling requirements. The problems are that the requirements are inclusive. Dean Rusk, when he was secretary, sent down word to us that he wanted us to bring up to him all of the requirements levied on a military attaché. We said to our front office, "Do you mind if we take them up in a wheelbarrow?" They are voluminous since the intelligence community feels that it has literally a requirement to know almost everything. I never

forget a mid-level analyst in some meeting saying, "Not even God Almighty can stand between an intelligence officer and fulfillment of a valid requirement."

One experience I had in this field was quite interesting. A telegram came in from Admiral Felt who was CINCPAC [Commander-in-Chief, Pacific] saying he understood that the Soviets were placing SAMs, surface to air missiles, in Indonesia. His telegram concluded with the words, "If they succeed in doing this, my position in the Pacific will be out flanked." The reconnaissance committee was immediately called in and the recommendation was that we have a U-2 overflight over Indonesia. Well, State played its usual dog-in-a-manger role. I was the representative. We did not want the U-2 over Indonesia because at that point Sukarno was having real political difficulties. At that time the Soviets had ships in the area that could detect the U-2, we knew that. We didn't want to give them any excuse to go to Sukarno and buck him up and strengthen his position by revealing what we were doing. Besides, we said that there were lots of other ways to get the information. The SAMs were suppose to be at a military base which our planes fly by and with side looking photography we could detect them. Our military attachés had access to much of the base. Our position was that, if we can't get it any other way, then use the U-2 as a last resort, but let's try these other ways.

The subcommittee that I was on validated the requirements for an overflight with a dissent from State. It went on up to the United States Intelligence Board where the director of INR sat. I briefed him, but the board validated the requirement and sent it on up to the Forty Committee. In so doing they passed a guideline that I think is just exactly the reverse of how things should be done. They said that analysts down in the woodwork, they did not mention me, should consider only the intelligence requirement and not the political costs. Political costs should be evaluated only later at the high level. This means the whole weight of the community gets behind a requirement and one man at the top is supposed to say "no." I believe activities [that will be politically sensitive] should not normally be the first resort.

It went to the Forty Committee. We briefed Alex Johnson and Alex as usual was very responsive. He said to the committee, "Well, I understand your interest but we have these objections." At the committee was Cyrus Vance, who was Deputy Secretary of Defense who was going out to see [Admiral] Felt [in Honolulu]. When he came back he said, "I asked Admiral Felt about this and Felt said somebody on his staff drafted the telegram and it didn't matter." The flight was dropped. But, this illustrates how the system works. The woods are full of requirements that people say *must* be met or the republic will be in jeopardy.

Q: Could you give a little bit of the framework of the committees you have served on?

McAFEE: I served on a whole lot over a period of years. I served on the Defector Committee, which could be quite interesting. One example of very close State-CIA relations came on that. The Damascus embassy sent a telegram reporting that a Chinese Communist diplomat had walked into the embassy at lunch time and the embassy wanted to know what the guidelines were. Although NEA and EA had concerns over problems

with the Chinese Communists and with Syria the agreed view was, "Look, here is a man who has put his life into our hands by coming over. We have to take him." It was put into the hands of DDO [Deputy Director of Operations] and the station chief to manage, with coordination with the COM.

Q: DDO?

McAFEE: CIA's clandestine covert action part. I kept in touch with Tom Karamassines, who was the head of DDO. They carried Chinese food in for him, etc. on a very regular basis. One morning Tom called me, (I never asked Tom what they were going to do in terms of getting him out.) and said that he would let me know by noon how it went. At noon he called me and said he was out. They continued carrying Chinese food in for a few more days and then trailed it off. It just got accepted. I think it was handled very well by the Agency and the embassy.

The most spectacular defector case was, I think, the Hungarian ambassador here. Dean Rusk handled it personally. It was the most overt defection in history. The FBI and all sorts of other armed people moved a truck up and cleaned out his house and his vault, at his request.

Several defector cases got a lot of national attention. Colonel Golynsky of the KGB defected with a lot of highly valuable information. CIA had good records on him, his place of birth, etc. The Agency told us at one point that he was deteriorating and about this time the Brooklyn Eagle reported that this valuable defector, who was the heir to the Romanov throne, was living in squalor in Brooklyn. Actually CIA had provided for him well and permanently. His false claim to be a Romanov spread rapidly and State eventually responded to hundreds of letters [alleging] such mistreatment.

The other case involved Nosenko who came over not long after Kennedy's assassination, saying among other things that the USSR was not behind Oswald. CIA was split on the issue of his credentials and he was kept in isolation for a long time.

It was a good committee and we worked fairly closely together. Normally there weren't a great many problems. Our problems were a little the reverse. A person in State called me once about a fairly senior Cuban, and said, "Bill, we have a defector here." I called the Agency and they said, "Is his name Fidel?" I said, "No." And they said that they were not interested. CIA was inundated with such requests. These people could be granted asylum which involved much less USG action. We worked very well together on defectors. The clandestine intelligence committee was less effective, being more of a paper trail.

One program which Dennis Kux, then deputy assistant secretary for coordination, pushed was countering Soviet active measures. The Soviets for instance would release in Europe what they identified as a U.S. government telegram on U.S. stationery to missions in Europe saying in effect that in case of a nuclear exchange the U.S. would sacrifice western Europe to save its own skin. These forgeries had a receptive audience and Dennis and CIA associates sought means to reveal the fraud and set the record straight. On the

question of a major national program to deceive the Soviets about our true intentions I was involved in a one-time meeting. I took the position that though misinformation in war was often essential our best approach in peace time was to rely on a straight forward explanation of our policies. The military took a similar position. Jim Angleton of CIA, who believed the U.S. had been totally duped by U.S.S.R. misinformation, favored an active U.S. program but as far as I know the issue of a major national program died then and there.

Q: When you deal with deception, you have a right hand - left hand problem?

McAFEE: Very much so. It was at this meeting that an example of individual agency initiatives in deception surfaced. A representative referred to a program they and the military had run. The military had conducted some tests in a field involving what we now refer to as weapons of mass destruction and found their approach unproductive. The two agencies decided to feed to Soviet agents continuing reports on the progress of the program even though the U.S. had discontinued it, eventually figuring that the Soviets spent a large sum in trying to duplicate our program. Later investigation showed that U.S. intelligence agencies, unaware of the deception program, had followed the Soviet developments with much interest and concern. At that point the follow-up was turned over to a very able officer in INR's politico-military branch.

Deception can obviously work both ways. When I was in SEAC, the grapevine had it that a highly sophisticated signals deception effort against the Japanese had equally deceived the British planners. Every major intelligence service has agents through which it can feed information to other countries. The most effective use of such channels that I had anything to do with came during the Berlin crisis after Khrushchev had figured he could handle Kennedy. The USG decided to put out word through all available means that we were going to hang tough in Europe. A considerable number of military units were activated or moved. Word of these movements was passed through these controlled sources and in four or five weeks the Soviets saw that the reports were true as units moved. The whole thrust in this case was not to deceive but to stress real U.S. intentions. Given the nature of intelligence such activities must be on going today. In wartime they are of especial importance. Churchill coined the phrase "In wartime, truth is so precious that she must be surrounded by a bodyguard of lies." Allied deception about a second landing persuaded Hitler to hold back his reserves and greatly helped the Normandy landings. Some military writers claimed that we did not effectively use deception later in the war.

Q: Could you explain, maybe you already have, what is the definition of clandestine intelligence?

McAFEE: Anything that is not normally available through overt collection, through the Foreign Service, liaison, attachés or other open sources. It means in essence a secret, and frequently illegal procedure where you are subverting a foreign national, illegally getting classified materials, listening to communications or anything of that nature. Overt collection may involve highly sensitive information but its method of collection is open;

clandestine collection involves secret procedures. We had what we called a Priorities Committee, which was supposed to define the priorities for clandestine collection. Despite whatever we did there were still so many priorities that an overseas staff could be kept busy for the rest of the century.

There was a Critical Collection Problem Committee which didn't last very long; it was set up to look at very specific problems as determined by USIB. At one point I think we were charged with Soviet missilery and we could draw all across the community on all sources on what the Soviets might be doing. There were, of course, all sorts of questions re China and the Middle East. The thought was that all information of all kinds should be available to a small group in Washington. That was an interesting committee, but short lived. It was staffed with generalists and each task required highly specialized knowledge.

The Committee on Overhead Reconnaissance was one of my most interesting assignments. It coordinated targets for the U-2 and the SR-71 and DOD photo satellites. I got heavily involved in this committee after the Powers incident in 1960. Over the years a number of lives were lost during reconnaissance activities. Bruce Catton in one of his great books on the Civil War noted a campaign where opposing armies were moving parallel, and he wrote that a balloonist high above the lines at night might see a rim of fire when patrols met at unnamed crossroads. I often thought of our reconnaissance programs in this light and hoped that State in working closely with DOD could keep the rim of fire to a minimum. Let me note an episode of a different nature. Most of our air reconnaissance programs directed against China during the Cold War stayed well away from their territorial limit - something like thirty miles out but they became the object of increasing harassment by Chicom fighters until this reached the point that the DOD felt the U.S. planes were being seriously jeopardized. These were large, slow flying planes with a dozen or more intercept operators on board in addition to the crew. At one point the JRC told us that within the U.S. rules of engagement they felt obligated to take steps to protect the flights. They said they planned to put a fighter high above the reconnaissance vehicle and if it were unduly harassed to take appropriate action, if necessary shooting down the Chicom fighter. We told State's senior level of the plan and informed the DOD that their plan had been noted. After [an] incident such [Chinese] activity ceased, and there was no protest.

It was curious sometimes the things you found out. We were sensitive in the Mediterranean about how close our nationally controlled flights should be going to Libya. The military always wanted to go a little bit closer. We thought 18 miles was a reasonable distance. The military said that line of sight counts and at four miles [closer] you collect signals from four miles farther back. After some head-knockings we got the 18 mile limit. Then, somebody later found out that the Sixth Fleet had routinely authorized people to go in four miles closer and had been doing that all along. So, you think, "Well, that was a battle that really wasn't worth it."

We had a long battle with the Pentagon about ship reconnaissance off of Shanghai. The Chinese Communists were very, very sensitive. If we put a junk up there, they would harass it and our planes, which stayed well away from their shores were harassed. At one

point, Admiral Moorer, who was always hardline, wanted to go in to 13 miles off Shanghai. State stood it off and it ended up at 18. But, the Pentagon was quite unhappy about that. We believed that the extra intelligence gained by a closer approach did not justify the risk of a major incident.

The two greatest incidents were the USS Pueblo and the USS Liberty. A ship similar to the Pueblo had gone up through the area a year before without incident.

Q: We are talking about a very small, electronic collecting naval ship.

McAFEE: Exactly. We were quite aware that it was going to be a sensitive mission and our representative at the Joint Reconnaissance Center came back and highlighted it. We drafted a memo pointing out its sensitivity. When we cleared it in EA we took it to Sam Burger, deputy assistant secretary, and he looked at it and agreed that it was sensitive but agreed it had been cleared appropriately through various channels. The deputy under secretary for political affairs was briefed and approved. We provided our vote directly to the Pentagon rather than through the NSC staff. That staff followed reconnaissance closely and frequently consulted State on political risks but we did not initiate any assessment discussion with them. Actually the Pentagon in top secret [congressional] hearings was very straight and direct. [It testified], "We got a very clear, unambiguous warning from the Department that this was going to be a highly sensitive and risky activity." The NSA did something interesting. They approved the operation and then the day after that they said it was going to be sensitive. A little bit of "we are macho, but you have to be careful."

I remember when word came in that the Pueblo had been seized and the next months we spent trying to figure out how to get the people out and post morteming all aspects of the operation. It was an extremely worrisome time - most of all I am sure for the crew. The curious end of the episode, and it has been written up, was achieved by Jim Leonard, who was in INR on the research side. He proposed a simple formula. The Koreans were demanding an apology for intrusion. Actually we had not intruded. He said, "Let's apologize for intruding and then say that was a flat lie, we did not intrude." Our general at the table said we apologize for intruding but, of course, this is a lie because we didn't intrude. That ended the crisis. It is a strange world.

Q: When you were plotting this electronic ship going in which was essentially unarmed and very slow and was picked up by North Korean surface ships, was there an automatic backup? In other words, if they get into trouble how far away is our support?

McAFEE: It depended for its security on the legality of the operation. That became a major criticism of the operation. To provide close military support for reconnaissance vehicles would change the collection environment. There was no surface backup close and air backup was a sizable time distance away. The Pueblo had some small arms. If it had used them and tried to flee and held off for half an hour or so air support probably would have been there, but there might have been a lot more people killed on the Pueblo than there were. There was just one [such incident] but one too many. It was a powerfully

unhappy time.

Q: Did that cause an awful lot of soul searching and was there a palpable change on how we looked on things on your committee after that?

McAFEE: These activities were cleared by the Forty Committee principals in each Agency and there was an extensive review, especially in DOD. We had always felt that North Korea and Libya were two totally unpredictable nations and that anything we did had to be done with great care. For instance, in the later overflights of North Korea we used the SR-71, which they couldn't do anything about.

Q: This was the high flying blackbird?

McAFEE: Yes. The U-2 flew up to 70,000 feet and the SR-71 another 10-20,000 feet above that. It was so fast [anti-aircraft] missiles couldn't catch it. We were very much concerned about the situation and suspended any ship reconnaissance off North Korea. There was criticism of the intelligence community for not having given the Pueblo an alert because the day before it was seized a North Korean assassination squad had approached the Blue House, the president's house in Seoul, and had actually gotten fairly close before a firefight stopped them.

Q: They were out to assassinate Park Chung Hee, the president of South Korea.

McAFEE: Exactly. The community was faulted for not, after that, giving the Pueblo some kind of alert to pull out. Tension in the area was high. We tried to keep an ongoing assessment of risks to sensitive operations but no agency picked up on that indicator. Looking back it seems impossible to understand. Compartmentalization was part of the problem.

Q: What about going back to a different period, this was in the seventies. When was the Pueblo again?

McAFEE: The Pueblo was in early 1968.

Q: Well, then a little before that there was a 1967 incident with the Liberty.

McAFEE: Yes, that is right, in June 1967.

Q: Which was essentially the same type of ship.

McAFEE: It was a much bigger ship. The Liberty was a converted [World War II] liberty ship. Its mission, as sent over from the Pentagon, called for electronic reconnaissance off the west coast of Africa. It would be staying off 20 or so miles and picking up what signals it could. The Pentagon sent a very clear chart. They were as usual well organized concerning the ship's mission - where it would go and how close and everything. It was a routine operation and this was approved without dissent.

One morning I got a call on the secure phone. When I answered it, the director of the JRC was on the line and he said, "Bill, the Liberty is under attack off Alexandria." I asked who the attacker was. He said, "Well, we don't know that either." The secretary's staff meeting was going on, Tom Hughes, INR's director, attending. I hurried up and asked a staffer to get him to come out and he said for me to go in. I told Tom and the meeting broke up immediately. Then the question was what happened? How did the Liberty get in there? The Pentagon the week before had sent out a brief memo saying, "Re the Liberty delete West Africa and substitute Eastern Mediterranean." We had a good man at the JRC but he missed the significance of the change and only entered the change into the monthly reconnaissance schedule. It was handled the same way in all other agencies. Not a single principal, like the director of INR was briefed. That memo, the way they crossed out Africa and put in Mediterranean, caught no ones attention.

Q: It sounds like somebody knew bureaucratic ways and was slipping this under the door.

McAFEE: I don't think that was the intent at all, but it was a very costly bureaucratic slip-up. Of course, a directive came from high immediately saying any significant change in an approved program should come by memo to all holders. There was a crisis in the Middle East and the Pentagon felt they had better get the Liberty there. It was to go no closer than 16 miles off Alexandria. The night before the Liberty came under attack the JRC realizing its position off Egypt sent out a message telling it to move out and abide by Sixth Fleet normal restrictions, which I think at that point because of the tensions were set at fifty miles. That is the message that the Liberty did not pick up, the Sixth Fleet did not pick up. It was this strange and tragic development that produced a cartoon in the New Yorker showing two people on a desert island fishing a bottle out of the water and saying it is a message from the Joint Chiefs to the Liberty. The Liberty to this day remains a highly controversial incident because its U.S. flag was flying bright and clear on it. The U.S. military said it was incomprehensible that the attacking Israelis didn't recognize it as such. They, of course, contended they did not. The military always felt very strongly that during repeated attacks, its identity could not have been missed.

Q: You still find a very strong group who still use this in a way to attack the Israelis, arguing that it was a continuous attack, it was not a one shot and the Israelis knew what they were doing. In a way it is incomprehensible. It served them no military purpose to do it to our ship.

McAFEE: The only reason that has been put forth is that they were getting ready for operations against Syria, and they knew the Liberty had the capability of intercepting what would be their extensive military command net and that we might object to the operation. Therefore they blocked us out. It is hard to conceive of this being their motive, but it is very hard to understand how they could attack it without knowing it was an American ship. We lost 34 Americans killed and many more were wounded.

Q: This thing at first had tremendous political repercussions because Israel has a very

strong support from the American Jewish community, and others, which is the most politically effective lobbying group in the United States of this era. Here was something as bad as it could be. Attacking an American naval vessel for maybe a short term gain. You are on the committee dealing with this problem. Were you put on more constraints than you would have if this had been an attack by the Algerians, etc.?

McAFEE: Not that I know of. As I said the Pentagon was told always to spell out any major change. Normally we did not send that kind of a ship into the Mediterranean. We had other ships that operated in there, but I don't think they operated that close in. I agree, it was a very upsetting incident and with any other country it would have become much more devastating than it was, but because of the Israeli support here, it ended more quickly. The Israelis eventually paid over $12 million in reparations. It immediately ceased to be an intelligence problem and became a policy problem.

Q: You put a young CIA officer out somewhere and tell him to go out and develop contacts. All of us who have been in any business know this isn't the easiest thing and when you do it you often run afoul of a political officer who is meeting him and you are paying off. We have already discussed this but I was wondering about whether you had the feeling that there was almost a quota and tremendous pressure on CIA officers to go out and develop people? This could cause a real problem.

McAFEE: One illustration, and I can't quote this from having seen any directive, but people in the Agency told me about it, involved Ted Shackley. I liked Ted. When we worked together he was responsive. He was a real gung-ho operator as the deputy in DDO. I understand that he graded station chiefs among other things on the number of recruitment's by their station per month. This presents the exact problem that you raised. In other words, go out and get somebody, anybody. Among other things you are not likely to get highly reliable sources and you can be sure if somebody is selling out that easily to you he is probably selling out to the British, Russians and everybody else on the block. Yes, I think there is much too much of that. We may gain some sources but there is a residual cost.

Q: Within your committee was this on your charter?

McAFEE: No, we looked only at the requirements. We had nothing to do with actual operations or how aggressive CIA should be. CIA enjoys great support from the NSC and the President and the Hill. It spends a lot of effort cultivating these contacts. No president wants to cut back CIA and then get caught short on intelligence in a crisis and be told you sold us down the river. When we were being cut and pared back, the CIA was building up. It is simply a fact of life that State is almost always in the dog house and CIA normally is being asked by Congress what more do you need and the White House is giving them encouragement. During the Cold War, they were regarded as a hard line first defense. It results in this imbalance in staffing. However, a good CIA station chief who will target his sources and get good sources can make a highly valuable contribution, particularly in closed or hostile societies, the countries we are most concerned about.

I don't know whether you ever talked to Martin Packman. He was the deputy assistant secretary in INR for [research] who prepared the morning briefing for the Secretary. I remember somebody talking to him and saying he would like to kill off a lot of the clandestine collecting. He thought there were too many people involved. Martin said, "Yes, but I would hate to prepare the morning summary without the substance we get from CIA sources." Martin made the summary first rate.

On the other hand, what we have is literally an overt clandestine service. I visited Latin America and I asked to talk not only with the station chiefs but people down the line and CIA agreed. Down in one of the Latin American countries a junior CIA officer in the consular section liked his assignment and liked State. He said, "If he were an outsider permitted access to the embassy, within 24-48 hours he could tell who was CIA. If we didn't let him in, within a week or two weeks sitting across the street he could tell who was CIA. That they operated that openly."

How to keep it within reasonable limits? On staffing I am a pessimist - on operations less so. We count on the chief of mission to coordinate all activities of his mission including those of the station giving him a pretty full plate from everything he is doing. Basically, I think, from looking at the record over the years, the places where State and CIA were happiest with each other were places where the ambassador was an activist, kept in close touch with a strong station chief and made certain that he was kept informed. A strong ambassador and strong section chief is probably the best answer to the problem. A strong COM can make it clear he wants to be kept informed and can judge political risks and a strong station chief can make on the spot decisions.

Another valuable arm is the periodic inspection under the Inspector General. The inspectors come around and talk to INR before they go out and we go over problems, concerns on staffing, cover, collection activities, relations with the embassy. Their reports were excellent. One that just knocked my eye out was by Bill Knight. Do you know him?

Q: Oh, yes, I know Bill.

McAFEE: I forget where he was, but, the Agency was a little bit unhappy with Bill. He sat down and asked each of their men what their collection priorities were, who established them, what they planned to do to fulfill them, what they were collecting that could be collected overtly. He didn't try to find out who their sources were but he did check on whether they were overworking local circuits. He had an exceptionally thorough review. He checked on coordination with the ambassador and embassy officers on the embassy's total collection program and on coordination with the ambassador on particularly sensitive activities. We asked the Office of the Inspector General [OIG] to bring that review to the attention of his inspectors as an outstanding example of how effective OIG could be. Most inspectors are not going to press quite that hard, and some ambassadors won't take the time required to keep in close touch with the station chief, and some station chiefs don't like that detailed a review.

Back here in Washington, the best coordination vehicle that I was involved in was with

the political bureaus, where the assistant secretary or his line deputy, a representative of INR, and the DDO chief for the area met weekly. I mentioned Ted Shackley a few minutes ago. Ted was in DDO when Phil Habib was the assistant secretary for East Asian affairs. Art Hummel who was Phil's deputy knew about these meetings because he had seen how effective they were in NEA. He said, "Bill, let's set one up," which we did. It was a good meeting, Art had people come in for just one item for detailed background. Phil asked "What is this man here for? What are we doing this for?" When it was all over Art looked at me knowing Phil wasn't going to sit still for this procedure.

After Phil became the under secretary for political affairs, by which time he had had another heart attack, I got called up to his office and he was lying on a couch in one of the back rooms. He sat up and said, "Bill, you know how I coordinated EA relations with CIA?" I said, "Sure do." He said, "I did it all on the secure phone direct with Ted Shackley." Then he looked at me and said, "I now hold you personally responsible for assuring that no assistant secretary handles it that way at this time." He then laughed and I did too, because he now recognized that the weekly meetings were a good mechanism. That is the best inside State mechanism. With a tightly controlled meeting, an agreed agenda and the assistant secretary or his deputy and the area DDO and one INR representative, people came prepared for a frank discussion. That was a good forum.

Because they were considered secure all source type meetings discussions were often wide ranging considering perhaps a specific covert operation - its status, prospects and concerns by all parties including DDO. State at times used that forum to ask DDO to develop specific covert operations. Clandestine collection was discussed with emphasis on concerns of various missions. Sometimes in the field the COS could say a collection requirement was levied by Washington but we were in Washington and could assess the validity of such requirements from the Washington angle more thoroughly than the field could. State often used the meetings to ask for a priority collection effort against specific targets in light of upcoming policy decisions. CIA used the meetings to express any concerns over the way things were going overseas and to suggest adjustments.

Q: One of the things I had a little experience in was when I was consul general in Greece and the Colonels were in control, 1970-74. I would be getting information from people who would walk in. The consular section has a lot of people coming in and out and you get a pretty good feel for things. I reported about tortures and nasty things that the military was doing. Almost invariably I would be shot down because the CIA station chief would say, "Well, we have our own sources and everything is fine." Well, the "sources" were the guys who were beating up and being nasty. If you say you have some secret information that sounds better than overt.

McAFEE: That is a good example of policy (in this case a CIA operation) influencing intelligence. CIA worked closely with the colonels. I agree with you totally [that there is an unhealthy tendency to believe] secretly collected intelligence. During the Russian buildup in Cuba, before we knew what they were up to, although we knew there were a lot of people going in, a Latin American ambassador in Cuba, who was respected, sent a report to his home office saying that the Soviets had sent in too many administrative and

industrial technicians and they were now being sent back to Russia. This report came into our hands. It was believed widely because it was obtained secretly and it was 100 percent wrong. On Greece I think as you say, State and the Agency were on opposite wavelengths.

Q: This was during the time of the Colonels.

McAFEE: And even before, when the Agency thought it might be appropriate to have some covert activity in support of a right wing party and the Department opposed it. INR opposed it actually. NEA was for it. We in INR took the position that the Agency, to be effective, would be using people that the opposition knew about and were watching. Secondly, we said, "Someday you are going to have to live with the situation. We can't impose a right-wing type government on Greece forever. We don't think they want to be communists and part of the Soviet bloc and it would be better to live with the situation." That decision, about half a dozen years before you went there, went up to Foy Kohler and he backed INR against the bureau. The bureau appealed to the Secretary and he backed us. But, I don't think that precluded CIA's interest in working covertly with the military. I feel CIA and the Greek military were working very closely together and they did not want reports such as you proposed coming out because they might disturb that liaison.

I was in Athens in 1974 and met with all levels of the embassy. The FSOs did not have confidence that the COS was leveling with them on internal developments. You can take such charges with a grain of salt in view of long term differences of approach and orientation, but I was struck with the universality with which this view was held. The military attachés then asked me to meet with them as a group late in the day. They provided me the same view only more strongly stated. They said the latest colonels' revolt had started at around 3:00 AM at a military base there and that when the embassy got word of it at about 7:00 AM they called the COS who professed ignorance. This they found hard to believe since the CIA station had informants on the base. Their conclusions were that the coup had taken place with CIA consent. I went up to visit with the COS but it was late in the day on a Friday evening and business had been suspended. I checked and found the COM was leaving town early the next day as was I so I made no further report to Athens. On return to D.C. I raised the question with NEA and DDO, which said the COS was due back in a few weeks and suggested we await his return. Before he came back the colonels had been overthrown - he was kept in place and the meeting never took place. I do think that in a few places at certain times there has been a segment of the station that works at cross purposes with the embassy as a whole.

Q: Yes. Did you get involved in the whole Vietnam business?

McAFEE: Very little. The Agency was used in Vietnam very heavily. It was literally used as an overt arm because of its great capability in supplying arms, training, intelligence equipment, etc. When you get into a war you do things anyway you want to.

One of the places we got heavily involved was with the USS Maddox in the Tonkin Gulf incident.

Q: This was when the North Vietnamese torpedo ships attacked or didn't attack, it is still not clear, the Maddox and then the Turner Joy, two U.S. destroyers.

McAFEE: That's right. The Maddox was sent in first on a mission that was cleared by all agencies. We later learned that a day or so before the incident there had been a raid by ships under CIA or military control against a communist outpost. Most of the people who approved the Maddox mission did not know about the other activity; down on the working level there was no info on it, the activity was separately compartmented. Whether knowledge of it would have changed our views is a question for Monday morning quarterbacks. The North Vietnamese at least [sortied] against the Maddox. To this day I do not know if they fired anything or not. There was a meeting in Vietnam sometime ago with some U.S. generals going out and they met with the top North Vietnamese command. The question was asked if they had fired at any time and they said, "No." On the other hand, that doesn't mean they didn't, because it is in the light of history in their interest to claim to be innocent.

Then the Turner Joy was put in and our representative at the Reconnaissance Center called me and said, "Bill, Turner Joy is under attack." He said that there had been 15 or so torpedoes and more were coming.

Q: That's a lot of torpedoes.

McAFEE: It certainly is. Then he said, "Hold the line." He came back and said, "The Pentagon people think that the destroyers are reading the sound of their own wake. So, forget this information all together." What happened is still being argued over. Whatever the case, Lyndon Johnson used the incident to get the congressional resolution to literally fight the war.

Q: On the Maddox incident, in a way the irony of so many things of compartmentalization is, that a raid is conducted against the North Vietnamese coast. Now, as far as the North Vietnamese are concerned, this is not a secret matter. They know somebody has come and raided them. So, the fact that it happened was certainly known to the enemy, but our own forces that were involved in it didn't. We divide it off and don't tell people.

McAFEE: Shooting ourselves in the foot.

Q: This happens again and again where often the only people who don't know are either the American public or maybe those who ought to know, because the enemy knows when something like that happens and our people who did it know that it happened.

McAFEE: And it is hard to believe when we raid one day and send in a ship the next day that the enemy won't consider the two actions a provocation that merits some kind of response. I agree. Charges have been made that those planning the two activities wanted an incident to justify escalation. I think it was more likely that the right hand did not

know what the left was doing. There is no easy answer in balancing security and need to know.

Q: What about efforts around the Soviet Union? There used to be something called Yoke flights and there were very electronic ships and air flights going in testing the radar and all. This was a fairly major effort on both our side and on the Soviet side. They were trying to shoot us down if we came in too far. Were you involved in this?

McAFEE: Yes, for the most part after it had been long underway when our office was told to handled coordination of the monthly reconnaissance schedule. I got involved with reconnaissance initially when I was special assistant to Park Armstrong and Hugh Cumming on individual missions or programs. The Pentagon would come over to see us and discuss the mission being planned. One of the very first that I remember was when it was decided to put 200-300 photo balloons over the Soviet Union, hoping to find secret military facilities. They were flown from Scotland. The Pentagon prediction was that they would fly over the Soviet Union and be picked up in the Pacific. I don't know what went wrong, both technically and in terms of planning, because a lot of them came down or were shot down in the western part of Russia, and the Russians with great glee showed the Norwegians pictures of their defense installations taken by the Americans. That was Program Genetrix and it was a disaster.

Then, eight or nine months later, a major came over and said, "We want a very much reduced program and this will be over southern Russia. They will be launched in the Pacific and will go westward. They are much higher flying balloons and will not drop down as far at night when it gets cooler and thus be vulnerable to being shot down like the other ones." They said that they were looking for secret nuclear installations. The proposal went all the way up to secretary Dulles, who approved six flights and they were launched.

Later, the major came over to talk to me and he said, "Several of the balloons are approaching [I think it was the Kiev area, I am not sure] and are slowly descending. They have moved much slower than we thought and without our knowledge or consultation with us, the people who were to collect them in the Atlantic had worked with the production people and put a cutoff date on because otherwise they might just fly across the Atlantic too high for us to get." He said, "They are now coming down [to ground] and we have communications intelligence that indicates the Russians are checking them." We waited for the next protest, which never came. As far as I know there never was a peep. I think the answer is there were only five or six and they were waiting for the rest of the 200 and they never came. The major, who was the operations officer for the project, got reprimanded and transferred for the failure of the program. He said he was not aware of the fact that there was a cutoff. The Pentagon does things very, very well in many cases, but in this case one hand didn't tell the other. We liked and respected the major. I think it was after this that the DOD set up the Joint Reconnaissance Center to coordinate all such programs.

From our standpoint, the Joint Reconnaissance Center (JRC) made life much easier. All

DOD recce programs came under it including the type you mentioned against the U.S.S.R. and were included in a monthly book of projected flights which came to us and other Forty Committee agencies for advance clearance. There were charts showing closest points of approach, number of missions planned and types of missions. We had a young FSO assigned as our representative at the JRC to handle the multitude of programs and changes and ad hoc additions. It was a good investment. He had access at the bureau level all across State and drafted the memos that went to the under secretary for political affairs for final clearance. At one point, State and DIA thought that certain flights were repetitive (unnecessarily so) and took the matter up with the JRC - which eventually cut 300 flights a month. The major incidents like the shooting down of the Little Toy Dog - a reconnaissance flight off the U.S.S.R. - came before the JRC was set up. The JRC could push for close approaches but it provided a good [open] forum for their consideration.

The JRC had great worldwide communications. One day a bureau officer at a high level called me and mentioned a specific flight which we had cleared with him. He believed certain developments made it necessary for him to withdraw his clearance. It was the day for the flight. I called the JRC and the officer who answered said "stand by one." When he came back on he said the flight then in progress half way around the world had been aborted. The JRC working with all services and agencies did a good job of limiting the chance for incidents.

Q: What other committees were you dealing with? When were you off the Reconnaissance Committee?

McAFEE: I dropped off the committee [around 1972] when I became the deputy director of INR and then later Deputy Assistant Secretary [during Ray Cline's tenure as INR Director]. My main focus then was on overall inter-agency relations with CIA and DOD. Covert operations became much more front and center.

Q: When did you move to this job?

McAFEE: I moved into the part of INR that handled this sort of matter in 1970 as an assistant to the deputy director. Then in August 1973 I was made the deputy director (later deputy assistant secretary). I worked in that field actually from 1966 through 1986, twenty years. I also was involved with reconnaissance because I liked it and tended to keep my hand in such activity.

Q: President Carter came in 1977 and left in 1981. Then Ronald Reagan came in 1981 and was there when you retired. Did you see a change in our attitude towards reconnaissance or aggressive covert activities with the arrival of the Carter administration?

McAFEE: You know it is a curious thing but I am not sure there ever was any clear demarcation. Carter certainly put human rights front and center, and that was a whole separate activity. Carter had Brzezinski as his National Security Advisor and Cy Vance as his secretary of state, so, he had two very opposite types. Vance, I think, generally

preferred the diplomatic approach whereas Brzezinski was very much a hard-liner with interest in the covert operations side. I don't think there ever was any significant change with the arrival of Carter. The Afghanistan program got started under Carter. Carter also, and most people don't remember this, in the middle of his term reversed the decline in the DOD budget started under Nixon.

Q: Even with Stansfield Turner at CIA?

McAFEE: Turner tended to have a low opinion of the clandestine and covert side. He tended to be much more technically oriented; spend your money on technical satellites and listening devices. He was very gung-ho but not at all gung-ho on covert operations. He was on DDO's most wanted list.

Turner had for instance a very low opinion of the plan to rescue the hostages in Teheran. Finding the USIB too large he had set up a small executive group with a State representative, officers from DOD and NSA, and himself. The Director of INR who was the State representative sometimes delegated me to go in his place, which I did after the failure of the [hostage rescue]. Turner, after expressing his low opinion of the planning and low chance of success, started a briefing on it - then quickly changed the subject. I would have been interested in what he had to say.

Q: You left in 1986...

McAFEE: In mid-1980, after I served six or seven years as deputy, I still wanted to work but requested to be stepped back. I think civil servants should have the option of getting into some of the senior jobs, but I don't think they should get there and figure this is a lifetime appointment, so I specifically dropped back a peg. But I was still involved, working until 1986. [My title until retirement was Director of the Office of Intelligence Liaison, INR/IC.]

Q: What about the whole El Salvador, Nicaragua business during the time you were there?

McAFEE: As I said earlier, at times covert actions have been run [outside] the normal mechanisms, Chile by Kissinger, and more recently Nicaragua... In this latter case it wasn't run around State because Elliot Abrams, ARA assistant secretary, was very active in it, but it was run around the normal coordinating mechanism. INR was cut out and both [programs] in the long run caused a lot more harm than good. I sound like a sour bureaucrat; who knows what positions we would have taken under the then current pressures.

Q: What was your overall impression during this long time when you are looking at intelligence operations from the view point of the State Department? I am not talking about traditional spying which we will talk about later, but did you get involved in covert operations fomenting rebellion and all this? I was wondering what your impression was during the time you were dealing with this sort of thing of its effectiveness?

McAFEE: For instance, the rebellion in Iran fomented by Kermit Roosevelt, which was before my day; I think State got involved willingly and it restored the Shah. There is nothing intrinsic that says you have to be against covert operations. But major ones can't be kept secret, and it is normally wiser to go the overt route. Lots of cases involved interfering in local elections. We go bonkers when we think the Chinese interfered in a presidential election in this country with money, but you would think the Western Hemisphere was [at stake] by the amount of pressure there was to try to get Cheddi Jagan down in British Guyana defeated. I remember a CIA man saying to me that we ought to be embarrassed because the votes were being carried in in bales. The most famous, and long term, and most well known covert operation was in Italy, one of the most successful.

Q: The election of 1948.

McAFEE: Yes, and later. It was initially authorized by NSC1/1. It probably prevented a communist take over of the Italian government. We didn't announce it, but we supported the Christian Democrats with funds and know-how over many years. Actually, we and the CIA agreed in the seventies that the time had come to get out. CIA particularly wanted out. Freddy Reinhardt made a trip back once asking that the program continue and not be phased out. He didn't want any election lost on his watch, but we continued to phase it out. By then the Italians were ready to run their own affairs. After it had stopped, President Nixon sent a memo over to the Secretary; somebody got to him. He said that we had to support our friends the Christian Democrats. The memo was sent down to us and we said that everybody agreed that the time had come to get out. It went back over to the White House and Nixon agreed. Over many years it made a major positive impact.

One of my earliest recollections on covert operations came when Bob Murphy called for an INR representative to be at his office for a meeting with DDO representatives. Des Fitzgerald and Tom Karamassines and I were at the meeting during which the under secretary spoke very directly of the Department's great unhappiness over the failure of an operation directed against Syria. It had been thoroughly compromised, achieved nothing and left us with a bad name for quite a time. State had apparently been assured of its secrecy. For the record, [often] the policy bureaus support or propose covert operations; they are the ones under the gun to produce results and DDO often could help. INR tended to be more reserved about the long term prospects for such operations.

In the early years of the Cold War, CIA operated a number of proprietaries - ostensibly civilian companies such as China Air Transport and Air America. These were effective tools of the U.S., but were soon recognized for what they were.

In covert operations, U.S. involvement is supposedly deniable but our involvement soon becomes evident. Most of the time it makes sense to do things overtly, though CIA's access to funds provides a lot of possibilities. On certain smaller type activities, CIA can conceal its hand. An ambassador in a Latin American country telegraphed an article in a local paper reporting with pleasure that people were starting to see the light. The stations chief had to tell him it was a plant.

Chile, of course, has been written up no end. We got heavily involved in Angola and you wonder sometimes what the final box score is going to be. How to prevent the communists from taking over Angola was a life and death matter with the Cold War going at full blast. We were backing [Jonas] Savimbi and his people [UNITA]. It means that an awful lot of arms of one kind or another flood into a country and soon or later you just lose control. Actually CIA was given a directive to try to insure that there be a good showing at the time of an election. Well, it was quite plain the current was moving toward the communist side and their sympathizers, but, CIA had quite an effective program for a while.

The other one that comes to mind is Afghanistan. I remember one of the senior officials of the Agency saying, "It looks as if it is going to be the first invasion by bus," because the Russians had so much transport at the border. There were questions of what to do. There was a massive program through Pakistan which didn't want to be fingered as being the base, but everyone knew it was run through Pakistan, to oppose a Soviet take over, a goal it achieved but we don't have a very happy situation in Afghanistan now, nor in Angola.

Q: Was there any disquiet expressed on your various committees about some of these operations?

McAFEE: These operations were coordinated by CIA directly with the policy bureaus and INR, with final approval by the Forty Committee. We opposed quite a few operations. We supported, for instance, the program for Angola and we strongly supported the one for Afghanistan. We supported Italy until we concluded that time had run out. We always supported Radio Free Europe, which is semi-overt. Back in the mid-sixties we opposed a program for Radio Free Asia. Its history is sort of an interesting insight as to how our procedures work. It was to be a $47-48 million program for the first three or four years. The argument was to look at Radio Free Europe and how it works, how good it is, and do the same in east Asia. We said that China, the chief target, did not present the same situation, that a new start up radio would not have credibility. We believed USIA should step up its broadcasts as much as needed. Dick Stuart, a very able DDC officer, (I worked with Dick thirty years before I knew he was summa cum laude from Washington and Lee) sat down and talked to us one day. He said that everybody had signed off on it. There was a committee, I think five distinguished people - one a major radio executive, the head of USIA, etc. - they all signed off on it. Dick said, that Bill Bundy had signed off on it, and that Dick Helms had signed off on it, but that none of them thought it was the way to go. They had approved it as a Cold War initiative. He drafted a memo for Alex Johnson and said that we didn't think the audience or credibility was there, the Chinese could jam it if they wanted to and we believed it better to go through present facilities, having USIA step up and adjust its programs as directed. We also said to Alex that this has been approved by so many people [reconsidering the program was] now heresy. If you really feel the way we do, that it is a waste of money and possibly counter-productive, take the initiative. Alex took the initiative and explained that China isn't Russia, the broadcasts would lack credibility and could be wiped out and we could do what was necessary

through USIA. The radio executive from the private section who had been on the committee was sitting there and said he couldn't agree more, although he had originally signed off for it. Bill Bundy, who had initially signed off in favor of it, had later signed off approving our memo to Alex reversing his position. The USIA man came out and made his position known saying they would welcome a directive to step up their broadcasts. Dick Helms said we developed this program because we thought we were responding to a common need and [he was willing now to withdraw support. It is amazing that] something that had the title covert could get started and have a full head of steam. Just as you said, people believe something because it is secret; they favor something because it is covert.

A program generally in the public domain, though details have not been released, concerned Portugal as it was emerging from years of dictatorship and facing elections. State and CIA, the embassy and station, all supported it and the ambassador and his top associate kept in close touch with an able station chief. The program was believed to have made a contribution to the favorable outcome of the election and there was no publicity over it. It was considered an example of when and how a covert operation should be run.

Q: During the time you were dealing with all of these activities, what were some of the thought processes that were going on about the Soviet Union being an empire with all sorts of different ethnic groups that really didn't fit together very well as witnessed by today when it is broken up into about 12 different component parts?

McAFEE: Let me start with a defector. I was in a military reserve unit and after a fairly key Russian defector was made openly available by CIA, we were able to corner him to talk to us because we had some press people in the unit. He said, "You know there is a lot of talk about breaking up the Soviet Union but this is nonsense. There are a lot of problems in the Soviet Union. I left it because of all the problems. But there is a very strong love of the motherland and this idea of breaking it up is just not going to get anywhere." He was taken up on the Hill and met with committees up there. A month or two later we had him back and he said, "You know what you have to do? You have to work on the Soviet Union; it is ready to split up." He had been subjected on the Hill and other places to the view that we could split the Soviet Union and he reversed himself one hundred percent.

We in INR thought that Brzezinski was in left field when he pressed for this option. Brzezinski favored a great deal of activity to spread disaffection among the minorities and we thought it was poppycock. Okay, what is the answer now? I just don't know. I don't think that when the Soviet Union was strong and in its power that we had any real leverage on breaking it up through covert operations.

Q: Would the question of doing something there crop up from time to time?

McAFEE: Yes, it was constantly coming up, frequently raised by people outside the executive branches and by and large the Russian specialists in State and elsewhere said covert operations for this end were just not going to get anywhere though everyone

supported Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. Developments that finally split the Soviet Union were much more basic than any activity that we could have started covertly.

Q: In fact, when it happened we were kind of unhappy with it because it was a little more difficult to deal with. At the time you were dealing with it we really didn't make any sustained effort to put ethnic group against ethnic group or something like that?

McAFEE: Not to my knowledge when it was breaking up but by the end of 1986 I had retired. There may have been a significant step up in broadcast capability. The U.S. was planning facilities somewhere to program material into the Soviet Union from another part of the world as opposed to RFE and Radio Liberty. I don't know the score on that which was not a covert operation. Intelligence collection of all types, human, technical were always in high gear.

Q: While you were dealing with these things was Cuba sort of kept off to one side?

McAFEE: Cuba always got attention. The whole CIA program to try to assassinate Castro predated my time in the covert coordinating mechanism. I have no idea how much State was involved. I was amazed when, after Kennedy was assassinated and people started asking whether Oswald was Castro's revenge, to learn that there had been so many programs attempting to get at Castro one way or another. Apparently there was obsessive pressure to get rid of Castro personally. There were also plans to harm Cuba economically by contamination of shipments of sugar and the like. The Bay of Pigs was the major anti-Castro effort.

Q: This didn't pass through your organization?

McAFEE: At that time, covert operations were coordinated by a staff in the under secretary's office. How such proposals passed through State I don't know. CIA later was critical of Rusk for opposing air support, so there was coordination with State. After the Church/Pike hearings got started in the seventies, a White House man called me and said, "I want to come over and look at your files on assassination." I said, "We don't have any." "Well," he said, "I want to come over and have access to whatever you do have." I talked to a group in INR's Directorate for Coordination [INR/DDC] and we ransacked the files and I do not remember anything at all coming out of our files about assassinating Castro, but, it was obvious that the question of Trujillo in the Dominican Republic had been the subject of high level discussion. He was done in by his own countrymen using arms they got separately, but, in our files there was evidence that there had been discussions about what do you do about Trujillo. Enemies within the Dominican Republic studied the routes he took coming home on weekends and staked them out, eventually catching him.

Q: You mentioned there was something else you want to talk about.

McAFEE: This is a totally separate matter, but it was kept amazingly secret for years. Whatever I talk about is open now. The CIA developed a plan to raise a Soviet submarine that sank out in the Pacific. It was first presented to the Forty Committee as a $28 million

research program to see what we could do about raising it. Everybody goes along. It gets approved step by step and eventually the cost is between $300 and $400 million. If that price had been set initially more questions would have been asked. They built the ship. I was deputy assistant secretary and the action officer for State. I was briefed by CIA and my secretary was briefed. The director of INR had clearance and the under secretary for political affairs was cleared, but when papers were coordinated I would carry them into the director of INR and sit there and carry them out. And I would do that with Alex. If Alex had to have more time he would say, "I'll hold this Bill and call you." But they never went through normal staff procedures. They were hand carried in and carried out by me. I thought the operation was high risk, that putting that big a ship in that area would catch Soviet attention; a warship even if sunk remains the property of its nation, but the Soviets never focused on it. The operation almost came off. When the submarine was being raised, the CIA had me out as the guest of honor Sunday for a briefing on the status [of the operation, so we] knew where it was and how far up it was. It was exciting. On Monday [came] the catastrophe when the ship wobbled. They had lost a good bit of the submarine. There never was a detailed release on what was achieved intelligence-wise. The operational failure came when one of the claws holding the submarine broke. Finally they decided on a second try. We thought that they were pushing their luck to think they could go back to that same area and do it again, particularly since twin crews had been briefed, but the ship was getting ready when one of the crew members got drunk in a bar on the west coast and told about being in on this macho project which got in the press. This killed it off. [Nevertheless], the whole project showed CIA's great operational capabilities.

When the Air Force planned to develop its stealth bomber, they went to CIA to talk security procedures because they wanted to know how Azorean, which had so many people involved, had been kept so secret. And, I think primarily it was initially a good cover story, deep ocean mining, briefing fully as few as possible, putting as little down on paper as you have to, not leaving papers where they can be worked over. It was a good security system, and the project certainly proved the feasibility of what was planned, politically and operationally.

Q: This was the "Glomar Explorer?"

McAFEE: Yes.

Q: This was about when?

McAFEE: The mid-seventies.

You know, there was another project that was kind of curious and I was quite amused at myself in this company. Bob Nacka was the assistant secretary of the Air Force for research and development. He called and asked me to be a member of a working group. I went over to the Pentagon and there were Nacka and a couple of lieutenant generals and one of the very senior DDO people, and Kelly Johnson, who was the designer of the U-2 and the SR-71 from Lockheed, and me. Technical substance wise, it made me think of

how people described Eisenhower's cabinet as ten millionaires and a plumber. Anyway, what they were talking about was a stealth capability, stealth before stealth became a by-word, and applying it to the SR-71. It would mean quite a lot of money to redo the SR-71 and give it that capability. I kept wondering what I was there for, but it came out at the end. We all favored the program if the money was available. At the end they turned to me and said, "Bill, the major problem with overflights, of course, is that they offend other governments and they become unhappy and send a protest to State. You all must be strongly in favor of this project because we can overfly countries without their knowing it and it won't have political costs. Will you start the memo up the line that says it is worth the expenditure?" In other words, would State say for political reasons it is worth spending x hundred million dollars. I said in effect it has a real capability and if you want to develop it, put a proposal into the NSC and let everybody think about it and we will put in our two cents there hopefully in support. Actually I wished they had gone ahead with the program and I was sorry when they later mothballed the SR-71.

Q: Did you get involved in the work of foreign intelligence? I am speaking about the British and other friendly intelligence.

McAFEE: Our office was liaison. I kept the portfolio because I liked it. We [had a] liaison [relationship] with the British, the Canadians, the Australians and the New Zealanders. Other agencies handled extensive liaison with other countries. Jim Angleton of CIA, for instance, handled liaison with Israel which is very sensitive. The Commonwealth countries always assigned absolutely first rate men to the embassies here. The U.S. is a big dog in the fight and they all had a high regard for our intelligence capabilities. The first liaison officer we worked with, Tom Brimelow, later became the permanent under secretary in the U.K. foreign office. Eddie Boland became an ambassador in one of the Bloc countries. Roger Carrick became the U.K. high commissioner in Australia. Most of the Canadians assigned became chiefs of mission. A New Zealander became assistant to the prime minister down there for years. One of the Australians became their ambassador in Moscow, another in Madrid; however their careers ended, they were outstanding people.

There was a great deal of substantive exchange. Dick Helms said once at some meeting that there wasn't any use for the Russians wasting their effort trying to do second story jobs in the U.S. because we had given everything to the Canadians and they ought to go up there and raid their files. I don't think he was making an adverse comment on Canadian security, but he was unhappy about the great amount of intelligence of all types being transferred. The Commonwealth had access to the best product of our intelligence system. I think it was a worthwhile exchange. We received in return their sophisticated intelligence analyses and their signals intercept product, the latter often unique. The British in particular had a reputation for traditionally strong reporting from certain key posts. We also had major intelligence facilities in most of these countries. The exchanges were by no means a one way street though I enjoyed telling our British friends that the exchanges would not be complete until they gave us in their reports from Washington. I am certain the exchanges were of great use to them and for us in supporting inter-governmental relations. New Zealand for instance was profoundly unhappy when

the U.S. cut off intelligence exchanges [in the mid-1980s], after they refused U.S. Navy visits unless we identified which vessels had nuclear capabilities.

Q: What was the impression you were getting about the ability of the Soviet and bloc espionage system?

McAFEE: We were always very much aware of the extent to which they carried on espionage at all levels and in various ways. I remember a briefing once with the idea that if you think your vault is secure, listen to this. We had a locked door with a combination, and then a locked walk in combination safe on alarm downstairs. Apparently the Soviets had an exceptionally high powered x-ray and a team that could work such systems to detect the combination on a safe and then open it. They spent money and effort and lives freely in espionage. I think early on some people were susceptible to recruitment because they thought communism might be an answer to some of the world's problems and thought in those terms as opposed to the [image of the] U.S.S.R. as an imperialist power. I think there was much less of that in the last 30 years or so.

I remember clearly a memo sent around State 50 years ago about a young officer and his wife, who belonged to a skating club in which there were Soviets with whom they became friendly. In response to a request they provided an unclassified military manual. Later the Russian told them Moscow had appreciated receiving it and offered or paid them a small amount of money and then asked for another manual - with a low classification. At that point realizing the score, they went to security and he was discharged. I thought that by that time he had learned and would not be a risk and was sorry for him, but maybe there was more to the case than I knew. Recruitment went on all the time at all levels. An officer in the embassy, Moscow, told of taking a boat trip, with a private cabin. In the middle of the night, a woman unlocked the door, came in and went to bed in the other berth. He decided the best thing to do was to ignore her. Going back to WWII days, their ability to steal the secrets of the atom bomb shows their capability. The Soviets may not have known how to run an economic system but they knew chapter and verse about an espionage system, and one of the reasons the Bay of Pigs failed was that one of the Soviets' first exports to Cuba was a security system. Look at their record of recruiting U.S. officials - Ames, the most famous, but also Howard, Walker, and Pelton to name recent ones.

Q: The Soviets used our system of paying people.

McAFEE: Yes. An ambassador to an African country, back in DC [on home leave] came to see me, and said that CIA wanted to conduct an operation and he spelled it out; they wanted to bug a man's house. They told the COM that they were looking for information on Soviet nets in Africa. In a small capitol city the cost of detection could have been significant. I went out to CIA to talk to them and it turned out actually they didn't think the man they wanted to target was in on sensitive Soviet activities, but they thought he might commit some indiscretions which would give them a chance to proposition him and recruit him, give him a small retainer now and then. CIA was working on its own net.

If CIA wanted to use a State Department employee, or his quarters, according to the terms of reference, which I am not sure they regularly followed, they came to me or the person in my job and to SY [Office of Security]. SY for the personal security clearance and us for the political clearance. There were times when a State person might be living near a Russian. They were anxious in this way or any way they could to penetrate a Soviet net because they were convinced, and I think correctly, that the Soviets were working literally every single facet in every country where they were. There was great respect for the extent of the Soviet effort.

Q: The power of money.

McAFEE: And ideology. One of the more productive achievements on our side was Penkovski. He was a most valuable source on Soviet missiles, but he was actually an ideological defector whose father had suffered under the KGB. If I remember rightly he made several approaches to British and American intelligence before we finally decided to respond. It is nice to say that was a triumph of espionage but it was more a triumph of happenstance.

I heard from an embassy Moscow officer the story of the day the Soviets wrapped up the case. An officer of the embassy planned to go downtown on a routine trip. The COM asked him if he would mind if an officer of the CIA station joined him. As the FSO was leaving the compound the CIA man came running out and begged a ride to town to make it look like happenstance. They agreed to meet again at a given time but the chauffeur, obviously a KGB agent, kept walking around and saying he wondered what had happened to the other man - he knew that when the CIA officer went to clear a drop he would be picked up. The CIA officer was, under regular procedures, not held since he had diplomatic immunity. If, in seeking to target terrorism and drugs and weapons of mass destruction, we move more into private cover where people do not have diplomatic immunity, we are going to have trouble arresting enough agents from the hostile countries for exchanges.

Q: Is there anything else we should talk about?

McAFEE: I'm not sure. We have pretty much covered the water front. Let me mention again one point. Overt intelligence gets underestimated. One of my early jobs was coordinating publication procurement; a vast amount of intelligence is available overtly in the publications of a country. People sometimes think that Foreign Service reporting is basically unclassified information but that is just not the case. FSOs talk to senior officials who have insights and these are the most basic exchanges on countries' national interests. I felt over the years that Foreign Service reporting did the best job of describing the meaning and bearing and what was happening in a country. Clandestine reporting is highly valuable but the essential direction of a country is I think picked up and described best in depth by the Foreign Service, and I think State never has done a very good job in selling that point.

The most famous single example would probably be George Kennan's report from

Moscow right after the war setting forth the concept of containment which was the basis for U.S. policy for the next forty years. Secretary Shultz assessed the value of Foreign Service reporting by saying it was the single most important source of information relating to foreign affairs, providing information on the thoughts and plans of foreign leaders; information on the factors which influenced their decisions; information on how decisions were made; information on how other countries would react to U.S. policies. I have always found that FS reporting revealed access, knowledge in depth, and first rate analysis. In a quick review years ago of such reporting in a limited area over a limited period a reviewer noted reports on: the Soviet attitude toward the Iran/Iraq war, Turkish plans re Cyprus, the PLO and the peace process, Egyptian concerns over U.S. actions in the Middle East, military plans in Cambodia during the dry season, INF and basing problems - hardly a tea and crumpets agenda.

Military attaché collection can be very useful. I served for a time on a committee that considered organization of the military intelligence community. Allan Evans was the State representative and Graves Erskine, a 4-star Marine [Corps] general, and Lyman Kirkpatrick, the third man at CIA comprised the committee. Allan then had to go overseas so I filled in. It immediately became evident that what the committee was going to recommend was primarily a Defense attaché overseas, senior to the service attachés, and DIA [Defense Intelligence Agency] to supervise Army, Navy, and Air Force intelligence here in Washington. The idea was [that] DIA would handle the whole ball of wax, and the other service intelligence units would wither away. We in State said it would be adding another level, which it certainly has done. The Defense attaché [system] was set up; DIA was set up; and the Army, Navy and Air Force intelligence units are bigger now than they ever were before. The services feel strongly, understandably, about having their own intelligence support.

On the value of military reporting, I remember one case in point when I was most grateful for attaché reporting. President Eisenhower was leaving Washington early one morning during the Egypt-Israel crisis of 1956, and asked State for a brief of intelligence received over night on the likelihood of war breaking out. It fell to me to review that and neither State, CIA, nor NSA had any info bearing on the likelihood of military action. The Army attaché in Tel Aviv was in with two reports; one reported the disappearance of civilian transport from the streets; the other passed on a report that a thousand beds had been requisitioned in local hospitals. He concluded this was either an expensive cover plan or a prelude to hostilities, which started later that day.

[The military attachés presented a control problem from time to time.] During the Cold War we had frequent incidents in the U.S.S.R. from attaché activities. There was some feeling that unless an attaché pushed the collection envelope to the point of creating an incident he was not doing his job. A famous case involved several attachés who traveled across the U.S.S.R. on the Trans Siberian railway taking along lots of sophisticated collection gear, photographic and otherwise. They were not closely surveilled much to their pleasure until they reached eastern Siberia where they were stopped and all their cameras etc. were confiscated - along with voluminous notes. The Soviets had sand bagged them. At least in some cases the number of incidents reflected the fact that the

COM was unwilling to spend the time to work with the attachés - though I do not think that was the case in Moscow.

Perhaps of more concern was the activity of military clandestine collection units. Each of the services at one time had these, with headquarters in the D.C. area or nearby. They had overseas units at a limited number of places such as Frankfurt. Not being part of the embassy staffs, coordination of their activities presented problems. I made a trip to Europe in 1977 to look into the problem and all the services extended full cooperation. In theory, the DCI had authority to coordinate all clandestine activities, but lines get fuzzy when dealing with military commands, and spending time coordinating the activity of others took time from CIA officers' own collection work. The Navy at this time decided to abolish its unit - not a response to my survey - for the decision had been in the works. INR at the time I retired in 1986 was mounting a major effort to improve coordination. I repeat here what I may have said before: it is good to have people push the envelope at times, but, made a way of life, it risks becoming counterproductive intelligence wise and certainly from a foreign relations standpoint.

Q: Any individual cases come to mind?

McAFEE: An interesting example of individual collection activity by a military officer came to light during the Cold War when an ambassador sent in a Roger (intelligence operations) channel telegram asking for any info on Operation Flat Pass. We went to CIA which professed ignorance and then to DOD which [after a delay] got back to us. In a country bordering the U.S.S.R. a military attaché had developed a plan with the host government military which included placing a transponder near the Soviet border in a sensitive area. This was to be carried out without notification to the senior military or the senior political authorities in the host government. EUR on learning of the operation said that if the Soviets had learned of it they would have brought pressure on the government that could have changed its political orientation.

State's concern is not to make sure its ticket is punched. There can be costs in too aggressive intelligence collection. In this case, major international pressure on a friendly country by a big and overwhelming neighbor. In the case mentioned earlier re Singapore, the prime minister thought a U.S. indiscretion might be worth $150 million. In India, when Madame Ghandi found we had suborned a cabinet associate whom she confided in, she was profoundly unhappy, but her resentment against us was dulled by the revelation that he was also in Soviet pay. A blown operation has costs for normal ongoing activities since a revelation is followed by tighter security. An officer who has been trained for years at government expense can be PNGed [persona non grata] ending his service in his country of concern. I think it is necessary to have aggressive collection at times - in the long run a creative tension between collectors and those assessing political costs is probably not a bad situation.

Q: Getting back to the reorganization issue, when the Defense Intelligence Agency was formed it just was an add on, and a lot of coordination problems remain.

McAFEE: Yes, that is the case. The other time I was on a committee considering the intelligence community was when one was established by President Ford, and I was the State representative. There were good people from OMB and CIA and DOD. Hank Knocke, who later became the deputy in CIA, was the CIA representative. The thing that was fascinating was to see the proposals that came in. CIA presented a proposal which was for a czar with the DCI in charge of the whole community and with line authority over the whole community including the funding. Defense reps entitled their proposal "The Strengthened DCI" and called for the DCI to set requirements and coordinate the final intelligence product, but it left funding totally with Defense for all of its projects. It was a strengthened DCI in facade only. I had asked Bill Deary to work with me in view of his drafting ability. We proposed a DCI responsible to the President for the intelligence programs of the U.S. Government, and to the Congress. He presented the budget to both; he was responsible for the substance of inter-agency estimates and papers and for the coordination of requirements to meet the needs of all agencies and departments - the NSC, State, DOD and to be responsive to Congress on the above; he tasked all the major technical collection systems; he was in charge of CIA, not the head of a separate staff as some had proposed. We felt he needed a staff which CIA could most adequately provide whereas a separate DCI would then need a separate staff. The different angle of State's proposal lay in its calling for a collegial community with all the agencies having a vote on major budget items. This must have amused CIA and DOD to see INR with its 300 staff proposing equality with them and their thousands but we thought of INR's vote as representing all the interests of State. Our view was that if you can't make a collegial community work, how can you make a dictatorship work. Interestingly enough, Bill Colby, the DCI, selected, and President Ford signed off on, a program close to State's collegial concept, which CIA almost immediately branded a total failure. The next time there is an overall review of intelligence look for CIA to again say the answer is a czar.

One example of how the collegial system worked. Phil Habib was our member at one of the very first meetings on major financial allocations. We got into the car to go to the White House and he said, "Bill, out of the various proposals tell me what is most important." Dick Curl, a very able officer, had drafted a paper giving our priorities and I emphasized them to Phil. One of the programs that he pushed for was a program that neither Defense nor CIA wanted to go along with, using some of our overhead capabilities for non-military targets. Phil said that it would not only be of interest to State, but we thought CIA and the military would learn a lot about who does what and where industrially. He got approval for $50 million. A year later we were pleased when the Pentagon, with CIA concurrence, put the program in for $150 million. I like a collegial organization, but it did not last long. The Congress, NSC and CIA want a czar, one person to be held responsible.

Q: Anything else you would like to talk about?

McAFEE: Well, we haven't talked about relationships with the FBI.

Q: Then, why don't you talk about that now.

McAFEE: Mr. Hoover was very unhappy that his reports sent to State were not being appropriately disseminated, so a unit of eight officers was set up to look at every FBI report and highlight everything pertinent to various bureaus and get it around. I knew from the people assigned to it that, though they were good people, they weren't going to be substantive, they did not have that type of prior experience. We later figured that it was costing us over $2.00 to distribute around State every FBI report, whereas the CIA and military reports that came in cost just pennies to circulate. Hoover after a while forgot about the program and we abolished the unit, but continued to circulate to all interested officers the FBI reports.

At one point, Hoover assigned representatives to a number of posts for essentially political reporting. He simply sent them out. He said he talked to President Nixon and the President said that he wanted people who would report directly to Hoover and him. A friend of mine was in Denmark when an FBI man arrived, not well briefed and he was soon withdrawn.

The most interesting confrontation over these assignments came in Tel Aviv. Owen Zurhellen was in charge of the mission. The FBI man refused to show him what he was sending. People were quite surprised when the man came and immediately started looking for something new and different. He picked up some old sources CIA felt were unreliable and we were concerned about the possibility of inflammatory reports coming in to the White House. Anyhow Zurhellen insisted he wanted to see the reports and the FBI man said he wouldn't show them. Zurhellen locked him out of the code room and refused him any access to it. The issue then came up at a high level between State and the FBI. State said our chief of mission has to know the kind of reporting that is generated. Zurhellen won that particular battle. Hoover didn't keep that system in effect very long. Now, I think, there probably is a new set of FBI people abroad to work on terrorism and drugs, a totally different assignment and more in line with the FBI's work here in the U.S. I think the coordination problem that is going to exist among them, CIA, State and other agencies must be reasonably complicated.

I once talked to Bill Cregar about their activities around Washington, where the FBI has the charter. They can subvert a foreign diplomat so he will tell them what his mission is doing and when he goes overseas they will turn him over to the CIA. They can penetrate foreign embassies. We thought some of their activities might be getting quite sensitive and I talked to Bill about political costs and he said, "No, that is our business. We judge the political risk involved in that." We went up the line and a group of us went down to the FBI. George Vest, a very good man, headed it up. The FBI officers were more obdurate in terms of what they were going to coordinate with State than CIA ever was. Their skill in doing their job was revealed by the fact that we rarely got formal complaints from embassies here. On occasion the FBI and State worked closely on cases where foreigners who were known espionage agents were planning trips to the U.S. When they planned to arrest a foreign embassy official in connection with espionage they normally gave us notification very late in the case. I remember one case when the FBI called and said that shortly before 5:00 PM they planned to detain an official from an

Eastern European embassy. I immediately notified State's policy bureau which asked if the FBI could defer any announcement until they had notified some people up the line. The FBI said sorry but the news release of the arrest had already been given to a radio station in the concerned city for release at 5:00 PM. I don't know what the score is now on FBI coordination, either between the mission chief, or between State and the Bureau. But, I can imagine it is a continuing problem.

Q: I'm sure it is.

McAFEE: A parting work about INR.

INR/DDC [INR's Directorate for Coordination or its later designation, the Office of Intelligence Liaison] was at the intelligence cross roads of State, CIA, DOD and the FBI, among others. That made for controversy and made the work interesting. On my last day or so I was involved in two such cases. The Near East Bureau had drafted a letter to Justice on the Pollard case. In their letter, NEA stated that his espionage only involved matters directly concerning Israeli security. [Pollard's activities] went much beyond that according to information provided by the FBI, so we did not concur in NEA's letter. When NEA reraised the issue it was resolved by INR's assistant secretary Mort Abramowitz, who sided with us.

The other case involved a memo Ed Peck, a senior officer and former ambassador, had drafted: a message from the Secretary to chiefs of mission on their responsibilities. He had come across a memo drafted in a prior time saying to the COMs that their authority flowed from the President to the Secretary, to the assistant secretary and then to him - a far cry from their role as the personal representative of the President. Ed proposed changing this in which we concurred (I do not know if the prior memo had been cleared with INR) and then said, in effect, that the President shared his foreign policy responsibilities with the Secretary and with the chief of mission. He then wrote that the concerned assistant secretary would provide the COM administrative support in his decisions. I though this down graded State's role and sent it in to the front office. Frank McNeil, an FSO and prior COM suggested adding the words, "He will authorize instructions in my (the secretary's) name." This struck me as a reasonable compromise but the ex-COM did not buy it and his draft then circulated, with INR's proposed wording as dissent. Every politically appointed assistant secretary insisted on using the INR language. Every FSO assistant secretary except one preferred Ed's draft. The exception was Roz Ridgway of EUR who sent Mr. Shultz a memo saying that she already had difficulty getting political ambassadors to accept her guidelines and with the new draft, her job would become impossible. The secretary as I understand it put the memo on hold. Roz's memo was written after my retirement, but the day before, a senior officer called and said he understood I was not willing to support the role of the COM. My last memo was to say to him, I thought I had through the years supported a strong and deciding role for the COM but the big decisions were fought out in Washington and the assistant secretaries played a major role in inter-agency coordination, far beyond providing administrative support to the COM. I thought it would be a mistake to weaken in anyway the department's role. That was my swan song. I am sure my position reflected the

jurisdictional prejudices of a Washington based "simple barefoot" civil servant.

Intelligence is always thought of as supporting policy which it should, but in the Cold War one of the duties of policy was to support the collection of intelligence needed for survival. Given the various threats we face that may still be true.

Thank you, I have enjoyed exploring the highways and byways of my past this way. I found my years of government service most rewarding and hope that some day the challenges it offers will come again to be appreciated. Forty years in State were all interesting and I always enjoyed the company. My mother used to repeat a line in her later years, probably from the Good Book but I am not sure: "The lines have fallen unto us in pleasant places." It certainly was true for me.

Q: Well, that is great. Thank you very much.

Note: In forwarding the draft manuscript to me, Mr. Kennedy invited me to add to or amend my comments. The above paragraph on the Arakan campaign reflects a considerable expansion of my initial remarks. There are a number of similar additions throughout this oral history. I kept no diary or record of activities either while in the Army or later at State. Events described are as I remember them, in the above case over 50 years later. When I use direct quotations, these are only to reflect my understanding of what was said.

End of interview