

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

AMBASSADOR JOHN W. TUTHILL

Interviewed by: Charles Stuart Kennedy
Initial interview date: 1987
Copyright 1998 ADST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background

Harvard and early career
Foreign Service interviews
Assignments in Europe during WWII
Potsdam conference
Working for Mutual Security/Marshall Plan
Minister of Economic Affairs, Paris 1956-1959
Negotiating OECD
Eisenhower administration and European unity
OEEC c. OECD

Ambassador to OECD 1960-1962

Secretary of state Dean Rusk's area of expertise
Political wavering on commitment to Berlin
Duties of ambassador to OECD
Chicken wars
Issues as ambassador to European community
Reason for appointment
Comparing Paris and Brussels posts
American staff in OECD and European involvement in Vietnam
President Johnson and administration's policies

Ambassador to Brazil 1966-1969

Embassy staff
President Castillo Bronco
Relations with newspaper editor, Carlos Lacerda
Role of US embassy in Brazil
Operation Topsy: budget cuts
Military attaché Vernon Walters
US effect on Brazil's government
US attitude towards Brazil
Brazil's support of new nations

Killing of American officer in Sao Paulo
Terrorism and hostages in Brazil
Role of CIA in Brazil

Conclusion

Good and bad aspects of career
Foreign Service as a career

INTERVIEW

Q: Mr. Ambassador, what brought you into the Foreign Service?

TUTHILL: I was at the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at Harvard, obtaining a graduate degree and teaching at Northeastern University in Boston. It was 1939, and I saw a notice on the bulletin board about the Foreign Service exam. It was evident war was coming, and the only question was what one might do to be useful. I looked over the requirements for the exam, and I found that a good many of the subjects I was teaching or knew something about, so I decided to take it. I took it in September 1939, just as German troops rolled into Poland.

Q: Was there an effort to boost up the numbers of Foreign Service at that time, or was it pretty much business as usual?

TUTHILL: I think it was business as usual. After I passed the exam, I talked with various friends at the Harvard faculty about whether I should go into the Foreign Service, and they urged me to do so because I was doing my graduate work and I was teaching in economics, and they said the State Department was so weak in economics that it was pitiful. But no, I don't think there was any conscious program for expanding the Service at all. I think it was business as usual.

Q: Did you go in with economics as the area that you planned to concentrate in?

TUTHILL: Well, not particularly. I had, obviously, more training in the field of economics than any other area, and when I passed the exams and then the orals, I said I wouldn't be available until June of 1940, because I wanted to stay at Harvard long enough to take my general examinations, the oral examinations. So I went in better qualified in the field of economics than other areas, and I did more work in the Foreign Service in economics, I suppose, than any other line of work of the Foreign Service.

Q: Just to get an idea of how the Foreign Service was at that time when you came in, were you trained right away, or were you sent out to a post to get training and then come back? How did that work?

TUTHILL: In the first place, those were the days when you were a Foreign Service unclassified for about five years, and I came in relatively late age-wise, in 1940. I was 30 in the fall of 1940. My first post was vice consul in Windsor, Ontario, where I was doing absolutely useless work issuing border crossing cards so that Canadians wouldn't sneak into the United States and sabotage us. Absolutely stupid work, because a Canadian would take a rowboat and row across the Detroit River. Well, it wasn't entirely useless, because while we had first a consul general, Marshall Vance, who seemed to be oblivious to the fact that the war was going on, later he was replaced by another consul general. I think his name was Donald. I'm not sure about that. But I told him that at that time in Detroit labor and management of the automotive industry were saying that they couldn't convert into wartime production without a six-month period of unemployment. I thought this was nonsense, and so I did a study in Windsor (where there are the subsidiaries of American automobile plants), to see how they converted to wartime production with very minimal unemployment period. And my study showed that this had happened. So I did do something which I thought was interesting and useful and consistent with my own background.

Then I went down to the Foreign Service school in Washington, the so-called Foreign Service school. It was about five weeks, and at the end of those five weeks, one had two significant interviews, one with the head of personnel, who was Jack Erhardt, and the second one with G. Howland Shaw, the assistant secretary for administration. Erhardt was a big, rough fellow from Brooklyn, New York. He looked at my record, and said, "Tuthill, you're from Montclair, New Jersey."

And I said, "That's right."

He said, "Did you ever play baseball on the Montclair Academy athletic field?"

And I said, "Yes, I did."

He said, "Remember that left field fence?"

And I said, "Yes, sir."

"Well," he said, "we played baseball against the Academy." Then he described to me--and took about 20 minutes--catching a ball up against the left field fence. He didn't like that left field fence. And he went on and on like that. He knew we had just half an hour. It came to about the last two or three minutes, and he said, "Okay, Tuthill, you've done a lot of work in economics and we need people in economics. Good luck." And he put out his great big paw, and we shook hands. Actually, later I became a good friend of Erhardt. He was the first American minister in Austria after the war. At one stage, he told me, "Tuthill, don't let them do to you what they've done to me." At that time he was about 55 years of age. He said, "I am squeezed dry. I have no more energy left, I'm exhausted, and I've done all these jobs. I haven't taken care of myself." It was good advice, because one thing I did learn during the war, at first I was appalled--because I finally ended up on Bob

Murphy's staff at Eisenhower's headquarters--I was appalled at the military taking time out to go riding or play tennis or golf with a war on. But gradually, it sunk into my skull that they were very sensible. They were keeping in good physical condition; they were better able to do their job. At any event, I had the benefit of the Erhardt conversation.

The second conversation was with G. Howland Shaw. G. Howland Shaw probably should have been a monk, and his office was sort of like a monk's cell. He sat there behind his desk, and he said, "Mr. Tuthill." None of that "Tuthill" like with Erhardt. This was "Mr. Tuthill." "Mr. Tuthill, what part of the work of the Foreign Service would you be interested in?"

I said, "Well, I think I ought to start probably in economics."

He said, "Well, you know we have a very interesting program in the State Department. If you've been in the Foreign Service for four or five years and if you've shown some talent in the field of economics, we can arrange to send you back for a year of graduate study in economics. Would that interest you?" My whole bio data was right in front of him.

And I said, "Well, Mr. Shaw, I think it would be quite delightful, but inasmuch as I have just finished six years of graduate study and three years of university teaching in the field of economics, I wonder if this is really a good use of State Department funds and time." So it was a pointless meeting. That was the Foreign Service school of that day. But there were some very good, able people around. As I say, Erhardt really--well, Shaw was a good man, I guess, in his role, but it did irritate me that the whole bio data was there, and he didn't even bother to glance at it.

Q: Moving ahead, you spent much of your career dealing with Europe sort of as an entity. How did you get into this particular field?

TUTHILL: Well, I was, as I said, first in Windsor, and then Pearl Harbor came, and I was here in Washington. My assignment to Bombay was canceled because I was married. Instead, I was sent to Mazatlan, which had been the center of the Japanese intelligence operations on the Pacific coast. We didn't have militarily anything between California and the Panama Canal, and the main job there was to find out about the Japanese submarines which were landing and to snoop around to see whether the Japanese were going to try any major landing on the Mexican coast. There are big lagoons, you know. Before going there, I ran around Manhattan, I had a World War I Luger pistol, so I bought bullets in about half a dozen different shops. I had field glasses for watching birds. So it was sort of "Terry and the Pirates," looking for the Japanese. I never saw them. I would get reports that they'd landed north or south of Mazatlan. Of course, I was always at the place where they had just been and left. And I would go up and look for them with the Luger, glasses and my wife. We had a little dog. My wife said, "What are you going to do if they appear?"

I said, "We'll just have to fight it out."

I was in Mazatlan only two or three months. Pierrepont Moffat was the U.S. Minister (therefore the chief of mission) in Ottawa. He was one of the few people who had read my report on the Canadian automotive industry. He asked me to come back to Canada. That was 1942.

But then the war became ever more destructive. I went over to the Marine recruiting in Detroit and tried to sign up, but by that time, the State Department had an absolute freeze on its personnel. The State Department had identified a few people that they were not going to let go, and I was one of them. I challenged legally their decision and failed to get my release. I finally said to Jack Hickerson, who was in charge of Canadian affairs, whose son was missing in the Pacific, "If you don't get me out of here (Ottawa), I'm going to resign from the Foreign Service the moment that I can legally do it."

Hickerson wrote back and in effect said, "Keep your shirt on. Bob Murphy is opening an office at Eisenhower's headquarters in Bushy Park in England and in Versailles," because this was late in '44. Then he said, "We'll move you to Murphy's office," which he did. So I moved over there. That was the start of my European exposure. I'd never been in Europe before. Also, my wife may have told you that she managed to get to the U.K. despite regulations forbidding married couples serving in the same theater of operations. Mrs. Shipley . . .

Q: She was head of the Passport Office, Ruth Shipley.

TUTHILL: That's right. My wife came to Washington and said, "My husband's gone over to London and Versailles, and I'd like to join him." For some reason, Mrs. Shipley agreed to issue a passport. She got to London. Murphy had a very small office, and he learned from me that Erna is trilingual in French and German and could do stenographic work, and he said, "Oh, my God, we'll hire her." So she was part of the staff. She got into Potsdam the day before I did, as a matter of fact, for the 1945 Potsdam meeting. Of course, it was in violation of all the military orders for a man and wife to be in the same theater.

My start on European affairs was during the war in Murphy's office at Eisenhower's headquarters, and then into Berlin starting at the time of the Potsdam Conference.

Q: What was your role at the Potsdam Conference?

TUTHILL: Zero. [Laughter] As a matter of fact, Murphy's role was close to zero, and his deputy was Donald Heath, whose role was also zero. I was supposed to be working with Heath and Murphy, and so I didn't have anything to do. We had a house in Potsdam, and I remember Caffery came up from Paris with . . .

Q: This is Jefferson Caffery.

TUTHILL: Yes, with O'Shaughnessy and MacArthur, and they had even less to do than I. The Newsweek man in Berlin was Jim O'Donnell. Jim keeps repeating the story and has written about it, that he came to me and asked about what was happening at Potsdam, and I said, "I'm the economic and political assistant to the deputy to Murphy, and he doesn't have a job, and Murphy doesn't have a job." [Laughter] So I didn't have any job either. I stayed in Berlin, however, through the foreign minister's meetings in 1947. Well, I went down to the Third Army in Munich for a short period of time. In '47 it was agreed that there would be meetings of the French, British, Soviet and U.S. deputies on the German and the Austrian settlements. Mark Clark was the deputy for Austria, Bob Murphy was the deputy for Germany. First we met in London for two months in early '47. Then we moved on to Moscow with the foreign ministers. General Marshall was the new Secretary of State. Ernest Bevin was the British foreign minister, and Bidault was the French. Of course, Molotov was the Russian. We started in London, Vishinsky was Murphy's opposite. It was agreed that there ought to be a peace conference on Germany. Vishinsky said, "All right, then the first thing to decide is who will be invited to it. We think we ought to do this alphabetically, and the Russian delegation nominates Albania." We said we didn't think that was a very good idea; we didn't think that Albania had played a very prominent and helpful role during the war. [Laughter] So we argued on this point for two months. You can start from the subject of Albania and you can talk about anything in the world. We spent two months in London never getting off the Albanian item on the agenda.

Then we went on to Moscow in March 1947 and started the same damn thing. After about two weeks in Moscow, I said to Murphy--I knew I was coming back to the Department-- "Why don't I go back to Berlin and let some of the other people on your staff come here and get this Moscow exposure, because we're not going to accomplish anything here."

Murphy said, "no, you've been on this thing now for so long that I want you here until the end of these meetings".

I said, "Well, what do you want me to do?"

He said, "I want you to show up at 11:00 o'clock every morning for the meeting of the deputies on the German settlement." I said, "Is that all you want?"

He said, "Yes."

I said, "What will I do in the meantime?"

He said, "Do you like the ballet and the opera and the galleries?"

I said, "Yes, of course."

He said, "Well, go to them." In Moscow, because it was a foreign ministers' meeting, a delegation could have fairly unlimited tickets to the Bolshoi. So during these two months,

every time there was a ballet in the Bolshoi, I was there. I got to the point where I could tell if there was a change in the corps de ballet, the second girl from the left. [Laughter] I did it so many times. We did nothing useful, but it was interesting because it was an exposure to the Russian scene and also one could see General Marshall in the flesh. He started slowly, but he was really just a wonderful man. John Foster Dulles was there. When Dulles became Secretary of State, a friend of mine said, "Do you know Dulles?"

I said, "Well, I lived right across the hall from him in Moscow for two months."

And this fellow said, "Ah! Well, then you know him well."

I said, "I didn't say that at all. I don't know him at all. I just lived across the--how does anybody know John Foster Dulles?" [Laughter]

Q: You started moving over into jobs dealing in Europe with Mutual Security.

TUTHILL: That's right.

Q: What did Mutual Security mean?

TUTHILL: Well, it was the Marshall Plan. That's what it meant. They kept changing the name of the people handling the Marshall Plan. Every two years or three years they'd change the name again. So Mutual Security simply meant those offices in Europe dealing with the Marshall Plan.

I also went down to Indonesia, the U.N. Commission for Indonesia, for a while, and the Danube Conference in Belgrade, but then I went to Stockholm as economic counselor, and there was a Marshall Plan mission Mike Harris was its chief--a very good man.

I went from Stockholm, to London as Special Assistant to the Ambassador on the Mutual Assistance Program, which meant the military (NATO) program. That very nice man, Walter Gifford of AT&T, was ambassador. He didn't have a clue as to what he was supposed to do. I took exception to the way U.S. arms were being distributed in Europe. We had the Third Air Force in England, which was about the only thing we had militarily. That was in 1951. Instead of giving the British antiaircraft guns and fighter interceptor planes, we were distributing such equipment to Denmark and all sorts of interesting countries. I thought this did not conform to our national needs. So I wrote a telegram blasting the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington, and I took it in to Gifford, and he read it, and he said, "Does the military concur with this?"

And I said, "No, of course not. They're playing politics with military equipment."

He said, "You want me to send off a telegram on military matters which the military doesn't agree with?"

I said, "That's right."

He said, "Well, I wouldn't think of doing a thing like that." It was as if it was sort of an improper proposal.

I said, "Well, that's your right. You're the ambassador. But also, in that case, you don't need a specialist on the Mutual Defense Program." So I left there.

This is a long way of answering your question. I went to Germany, where Mike Harris, who had been in charge of the Marshall Plan work at Stockholm, was the director. Mike asked me to come over as one of his deputies, which I did. Then after two years, he left, then I succeeded him.

I went to Bonn in '52 and succeeded Mike about '54. By that time, the Marshall Plan work in Germany was primarily Berlin, which was very active. Then secondly, there was the use of counterpart funds. An awful lot of funds had developed in Germany which were used for all sorts of purposes, useful purposes--by and large. But that's how I got into Mutual Security or, really, the Marshall Plan.

Q: When did you get involved with European unity from the American side?

TUTHILL: I was in Bonn under Dr. Conant (1953-56), who came over as High Commissioner and later as ambassador. I might say I've used his name frequently as an example of a political appointee who did a splendid job. I enjoyed working with him immensely. Unlike Gifford, Conant had an idea of why we were all there and worked at it. Both decent men, one totally ineffectual and the other one very effective.

In 1956 I was asked to go to Paris as Minister of Economic Affairs. I protested, saying I didn't know French. I had three years of high school French. I found the German scene something I knew about. But I was ordered to go and I did. That was in 1956, and that was a time when the European Army idea was collapsing.

Q: What did they call it?

TUTHILL: European Defense Community.

Q: European Defense Community. Where it would be one large army with maybe at the brigade level, various national units.

TUTHILL: That's right. And it was lost in the French Parliament under Mendes France. It was probably kind of a naive idea, because they never got over questions about such items as hats, you know. The Italians insisted upon those hats with feathers.

Q: Feathers. The Bersaglieri. [Laughter]

TUTHILL: [Laughter]

Q: I think I was talking to Douglas MacArthur, who was saying that the idea was raised by the French with the idea that nobody would ever accept it, it was so almost absurd. And then it caught fire to a certain extent for a while.

TUTHILL: Conant was in favor of it. Once I got into Paris, I became involved in the role of the French in European unity. For the first time, I met this man.

Q: You're pointing to a picture of Jean Monnet.

TUTHILL: That's right. It's funny. The other day--well, I've done this a couple of times for the Monnet Foundation, because I had a long relationship with Monnet. Then there's a man in Britain, Francois Duchene, who succeeded--oh, in any event, he was the second head of the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London. Francois is now writing books and articles. He's writing about Monnet's role in the OECD and the European Community.

When I left the service, I had several boxes of documents, and unlike Kissinger and a lot of other people, I turned mine over to security. I said, "I want you to go through these. I want you to declassify the ones that I can take home and put in my own closet, and you can keep the rest." Of course, they reduced the documents to those in a very small box. I left the service in '69, after all and hadn't time to examine these declassified documents.

But when Francois Duchene, who was an old friend, came and said, "What role did Monnet have in terms of the OECD?" which I had negotiated on the American side, I said, "Really very little." He said, "When did you first meet Monnet?" I said, "I think in 1958. But here are all these documents. Go over and sit down and read them." Well, it just shows how faulty one's memory can be because Duchene started picking up memoranda of conversations of Monnet and myself in '56 and '57 and the whole question of how to establish a new Atlantic relationship between the United States and the unified Europe. [Laughter]

So now this particular interview can be a little more accurate--thanks to Duchene. It's quite clear that after coming to Paris in the summer of '56, through '56 and '57, I was seeing Monnet quite regularly and became a convinced advocate of European unity. I was skeptical at first, but I became convinced that we couldn't have any long-term adequate relationship between the United States on one side and the individual European countries on the other, that technology and developments and everything else had made the idea of a U.S.-French or U.S.-German or even U.S.-British relationship of interest and of some importance, but that this was not a balanced viable long-term relationship.

Q: To develop this a little further, what would technology and all have to do with a relationship, say, with France?

TUTHILL: Well, the fact is that because of technology, the individual European markets were not large enough. We have a market of 240 million people; they have 40 or 50 million people. In many processes in the industrial world, the smaller market had to have access to a larger one.

Secondly, in the military field, it is ridiculous. In the first place, the French and the British are developing their nuclear forces, and there was no country in Europe that could balance the buildup of the Russians in conventional and, ultimately, in nuclear arms. So because of technology, both in economic and industrial field and the need for markets, and in the military field because of the relationship with nuclear to conventional warfare, it seemed to me that the national state was inadequate.

Incidentally, some of us are now talking about what we should do with the 100th anniversary of Monnet's birth, and I've stumbled on the idea that in Monnet's life, the villain of his time was excessive sovereignty. This is the big break between Monnet and De Gaulle. With De Gaulle, the nation was everything, and with Monnet, the nation had to give up sovereignty to have a sensible world wide relationship. And it seems to me that in the commemoration of Monnet, we can combine his fight against excessive sovereignty with one subject which can only be resolved in the international field, and that's environmental issues, especially in Europe, but even in the United States, the United States and Canada and other countries. Speaking in terms of the ecology, the nation state is obviously unable to resolve the issue. Just think of the Rhine in Europe. You cannot resolve it without giving up some of your sovereignty.

Q: Would you call yourself a disciple or a convert because of Monnet, or was this something that came from both your own examination and also from instructions from Washington?

TUTHILL: Well, not instructions from Washington, because they didn't really come through until the Kennedy Administration and George Ball as Under Secretary. Then we did have coherent instructions on that, because Kennedy accepted the idea--critically at first, but then later he accepted it. No, I think that bit by bit I became convinced that the individual European states, acting separately, did not represent a firm alliance relationship with the United States. They were too small, we could push them around, and a lot of people want to push them around. I heard the other day a lecture by Taft, the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Q: This is William Howard Taft IV, I believe.

TUTHILL: Something like that. And he said quite explicitly, "We don't really want to deal with a unified European military group; we want to deal with individual states." This is a short-sighted, small approach. It's going to result in a lot of unbalanced bilateral relationships. So that, no, gradually I think that the very force of the problems that confronted us, pushing me towards advocacy of some kind of unification.

No question that Monnet influenced me very much, because Monnet, when he left the Coal and Steel Community in Luxembourg and prepared for the Rome Treaty with the Common Market and EURATOM, established an Action Committee for the United States of Europe, and he always said the key word was "action." Monnet was not a great philosopher; he had a great instinct for political power. And on his action committee, he had in all the European countries the two main parties--the conservative, mostly Christian Democratic parties, and the Socialists or Labor parties and the trade unions. And he said to me, "You know, I'm not going to worry about governments. If I get agreement between the two major political parties in each of these countries and the trade unions, the government has to go along. So I'm not going to worry about the governments. I'm going to deal with the loci of power in country by country." So Monnet took what was a general idea on the part of a certain number of Europeans and a certain number of Americans and was the great do-er or action man.

But in terms of Washington, to come back to that, the Kennedy Administration, once Kennedy came in and George Ball became Under Secretary of State, there was a group--I called it a conspiracy, but I'm using the word "conspiracy" in kind of a facetious manner. There was a small group of us who were convinced that European unity was definitely in the American long-term interest. With Rusk and with Ball and with Kennedy, then I had instructions from Washington which were consistent with my own convictions.
[Laughter]

Q: Under the Eisenhower Administration, did you feel that you were preaching to deaf ears, or were you preaching on this as far as what you were reporting back?

TUTHILL: Well, it was kind of a mixed scene, actually, with Eisenhower, because Eisenhower recognized in the military field the need for increased unity. It was under Eisenhower that I negotiated the OECD agreement. And when the Kennedy Administration came in, George Ball came to me. I had known George when he was a lawyer here in town, and he said, "Look, this thing was negotiated under Eisenhower, and perhaps we ought to start all over again and renegotiate it under Kennedy."

And I said, "That would be very foolish. The way it's been negotiated under Eisenhower, it's open for all sorts of constructive work. It depends entirely on the role of the American government. If we get behind it, we can get the coordination of the economic and financial policies that we're talking about, increased and improved aid to the developing countries and that sort of thing."

I didn't get resistance from the Eisenhower Administration. Towards the end of that administration, I became more involved. John Foster Dulles had died, had been succeeded by Chris Herter. Doug Dillon was the number two man in the State Department. Dillon had been ambassador in Paris when I was there, a good ambassador. Dillon, while not a strong advocate of European unity, wasn't against it either. He was the one that made it possible for us to negotiate to change of the OECD into the OECD. So I didn't get resistance from the Eisenhower Administration, but I didn't get the clear policy line that I

got once Ball and Walter Heller, Bob Roosa and Jim Tobin came in with the Kennedy administration.

Q: Looking back on it, did you feel that your advocacy and belief of our participation in the OECD that you were able to play a role there? You were sort of, in a way, writing some of your own instructions?

TUTHILL: Oh, yes. I think that's always the way in the Foreign Service. Sometimes you pose a question to Washington and then go back to Washington to prepare the reply. That was pretty much possible during the Eisenhower Administration, because Chris Herter, a good man, was Secretary of State but not really interested very much in this. Dillon as number two man, who looked more or less favorably, and Bob Murphy as the number three man in the State Department. So we had people who were serious and devoted, even though they didn't have the conviction that I had as to what should happen, so that once we got the OECD, (if we jump from that to 1961 when the OECD started), these were, for me, really very thrilling days, because we had the new team. In the first place, George Ball was the key one. But the economic advisor, Walter Heller, Jim Tobin, you know, at Yale, the Nobel Prize winner, Kermit Gordon and Bob Roosa.

Q: Kermit Gordon, by the way, gave me a D- in economics when he was an instructor.
[Laughter]

TUTHILL: [Laughter] Well, this crowd that came over were just great, because they were convinced, just as Paul Volcker is today, that you really have to work out some coordination of economic and financial policy, unlike Feldstein, you know, at Harvard, who has just testified. I've just written an article about the State Department and Foreign Service, and I've quoted Feldstein (the guy who was chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors) saying, "We should take action on domestic issues without getting all involved in these international implications"--I think a very short-sighted, wrong-minded view. Paul Volcker is the exact opposite.

Q: To move back in time, were you getting any instructions that came really from Eisenhower about our movement to encourage the unity of Europe? Because after all, Eisenhower probably was the pre-eminent person who put together an alliance, albeit a military one, but it was as political as any alliance can be.

TUTHILL: That's right.

Q: To understand the power of a unified Europe. I would think that there would be something coming from him.

TUTHILL: Well, not only from him, you see, but from Bob Murphy, because Bob was part of that whole SHAPE business, you see, and Bob was also convinced that you could keep an alliance going, even in peacetime. So I didn't so much have direct instructions from Eisenhower and Murphy and the others, but I didn't have resistance.

As a matter of fact, the way we got started on the OECD, I came back to Washington in '59, and I wrote a paper, in effect saying, "The OECD has obsolete objectives. We should shut it down. We should start a new organization with new objectives." And Dillon was the one who approved of that. At that time, we had a meeting in December 1959 in Paris of the heads of state. There they were--De Gaulle, MacMillan, Adenauer, and Eisenhower, and they were talking primarily about NATO and the Soviet Union. I had a little paper which said, in effect, "Let's scrap the OECD and put up a new organization based upon coordination of economic and financial matters, more aid to the developing countries." Those are the two things I wanted.

Q: Had you included Japan at that time?

TUTHILL: No. That came later. The implication of this was that Japan would come in, and at that time we put Japan on the Development Assistance Committee. This implied later full membership in the OECD.

Q: As an entre to the beginning.

TUTHILL: That's right. So it was quite clear. This was discussed for a few minutes at the end of one of the meetings of the heads of government. I was told, "Go ahead, put this in the form of a resolution of the four." And that night I went back to the embassy, and we had this thing typed out, just a one-page thing. And then the next morning it was raised. I don't think De Gaulle paid any attention to it, because he didn't give a damn about economics. Eisenhower may have had some passing interest. He certainly wouldn't have objected to it. And so it went through because the heads of government really weren't paying any attention. [Laughter]

Q: [Laughter] This is how the gnomes of the State Department do their work.

TUTHILL: That's right. But they didn't get in the way, you see; they didn't obstruct it. Certainly Eisenhower's experience during the war with SHAPE and all the rest, and Bob Murphy's, gave a background of not being opposed to try to do these things.

Q: You were appointed ambassador to the OECD under Eisenhower, was this?

TUTHILL: No, under Kennedy.

Q: So you went in 1961.

TUTHILL: That's right. Well, I was there doing the negotiation with the rank of Minister Counselor, but I was appointed ambassador in early '61.

Q: One thing in our discussion here. Rusk doesn't play much of a role. I had an interview not long ago with William Tyler, who said that when he was the head of European

Affairs, that when he would raise Europe, Rusk would very quickly direct him to George Ball. In other words, Rusk's interests were really with the Soviet Union and with Asian affairs.

TUTHILL: That's right. Absolutely right. No, I agree entirely. I would have given you the same comment that Bill Tyler did. Now, an example of it was that when I was in Brussels, I went from the OECD to the European Community in Brussels, and this was '62 to '66. It was right in the middle of the Vietnam business. Rusk came out and met primarily with NATO. Doug MacArthur was the ambassador to Belgium. I was to the Community. We had a dinner primarily for the European Community. Dean Rusk was the main speaker. We had briefed him, and he was all right. He gave about five or ten minutes on European unity, didn't say anything that gave us any problems. Then he talked for about an hour about Vietnam. And here we had Hallstein, the President of the Commission, and all these guys, Jean Ray and Robert Marjolin and Sicco Manshold there who wanted to talk about European unity, and Rusk wanted to talk about the Southeast. So Bill Tyler's comments are absolutely right.

Q: How was your relationship with George Ball?

TUTHILL: Well, any relationship with George Ball is an interesting relationship, because Ball--incidentally Francois Duchene knows Ball very well, too, and he recently went to Princeton to talk with him, and he said it's interesting. Ball is now approaching 80, but Duchene said, "You have a feeling with Ball you're dealing with a force, a man with convictions and a man who wants to do things." And Ball was very close to Monnet, of course.

I first met George, I guess--my memory may be slipping on this--I guess in 1959, when I went back to the Department. He was legal advisor to the French Government. I have found it a very fruitful relationship. George can be bullheaded on things, but we all can. But I find him one of the more creative people that I've been associated with.

Q: Did you find that you were playing the role with him of sort of reigning him in a way, as far as going, say, for European unity to perhaps the detriment, at least, in the short term of American interests or not?

TUTHILL: No. I entirely agreed with him. I agreed then and I agree now that a long-term stable relationship would be enhanced with some kind of European unity. Let me give you one example, though, in which I had a rather violent disagreement with him and with Monnet. The Kennedy Administration was new in office, and I was then living in Neuilly. I had Ball and Monnet for lunch. It must have been only the three of us. Kennedy was worried about the Berlin situation. People in the White House were saying, "We're on a collision course in Berlin." And after luncheon, Monnet and Ball... (end of tape)-

This illustrates, I think, the point that you raised earlier about whether the concentration on European unity, clouded views on some other things. Kennedy was concerned about

the Berlin situation. This was before he went to Berlin and said, "Ich bin ein Berliner". And so Kennedy was asking or inquiring whether we could reduce our commitment to Berlin. Monnet and Ball were discussing with me how one could modify this situation. I finally blew up. I said, "You cannot modify it. You cannot change it. We have an obligation. We have an obligation which, if we ever change, it would adversely affect our relationship with all of Europe." And I said, "Nations and individuals take on certain obligations which they are honor-bound to keep and to maintain." We had, really, quite a set-to, because this illustrated the fact that both Monnet and Ball wanted to concentrate on European unity. This was a distraction, the Berlin situation, and they were seeking some way to modify our commitment there. I felt very strongly that the only thing you could do would be to enforce our commitment there, that you could not retreat from Berlin, which would mean turning it over to the Russians. So, yes, there were occasions, but this happens in any healthy relationship between people. You can have people that have an emphasis on a particular point which one may feel distorts their view of related but slightly different issues.

Q: Tell me, what does an ambassador to the OECD do, an American ambassador? It's quite different, in my conception, than the ambassador to France or something.

TUTHILL: Well, it is indeed. It's quite different, and, I must say, in my view, much superior, because it's much more substantive and interesting. Especially in those first two years, we had an administration in Washington that was committed to the idea of international collaboration of economic and financial issues and increased aid to the developing countries. Some of the other delegations had this view and some didn't. But we had an objective, and we had experts coming from Washington, like Heller and Tobin and these other people. Bob Roosa, who was very important, who was Under Secretary of the Treasury at that time, and Dillon was the Secretary of the Treasury. So my basic job was to sort of orchestrate the issues that would be discussed, the specific issues, on economic and financial collaboration or coordination and aid to the developing countries. To get the experts from Washington in--and I might say one of the difficulties was that once you got up to the ministerial level the discussions became more and more vague and general in nature. The useful meetings were the meetings with the experts. My main problem at ministerial meetings was that Ball gets bored very quickly. When people are just making routine speeches, and he would sit there writing little limericks. [Laughter] But I didn't blame him. The most useless part, by and large, was the ministerial meetings.

One of the other things which was, to me, very important, my last post was Brazil. That was the only bilateral ambassadorship I ever had. Bilateral ambassadors have so much fluff and social entertaining without any substance that one bilateral ambassadorship was enough for me. While in the OECD and the European Community the people I worked with were working on the same subject. The social and representational thing was substantive all the time.

Q: It was far more a meeting of specialists of experts. What were the type of discussions that you might get into? What were some of the problems that you had to deal with as the American representative?

TUTHILL: Well, I think one of the basic things in our relationship with Europe was the whole question of agricultural trade. Orville Freeman was the Secretary of Agriculture, and Orville came over and was very useful. One of the big problems was to get individual nations to understand that there was no such thing as an international agricultural trade issue. There were issues which involved domestic policies and international ones. One of the high points for me was when, after lots of conversations with Orville, we got him to state at a meeting in Paris that you could not deal with international agricultural issues without dealing explicitly with domestic issues which affected the international scene. That doesn't sound very sensational, but it's very difficult with Ministers of Agriculture.

Q: Ministers of Agriculture or Agricultural Secretaries, the policies are probably as political as any in each country. It's probably the most political ones.

TUTHILL: That's right.

Q: I wonder if you could comment a bit about--didn't we have some chicken wars while you were there?

TUTHILL: We sure as hell did. [Laughter] We had a terrible time on the so-called chicken war. As a matter of fact, several Ph.D. theses have been written on the subject of the chicken wars. It was very time consuming, and the Europeans were putting restrictions on imports, and that was just at the time when the chicken-producing industry was really expanding in the United States and worldwide with, in effect, industrial plants, you know, where they have those poor damn chickens that are up on sticks all their lives. And especially this was true in the state of Arkansas. Fulbright was then Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and Fulbright was just raising hell about this--in my view, excessively. But actually, we resolved it in such a way that it did no serious harm, but it was very, very bitter at one stage, and it had in it the seeds of more serious troubles if we hadn't resolved it.

Q: How did you, as the American representative, help resolve this in dealing with the European counterparts?

TUTHILL: I was at the European Commission in Brussels, and I had to make the arguments with Manshold, who was head of agriculture, and Ray, who was, in effect, the foreign minister, and Marjolin, who was finance, to try to get them to modify their program and their restrictions on imports in such a way as to take out the politically explosive aspects of the issue. I spent many, many hours talking about ways in which they could do enough to take off the pressure from Fulbright and chicken producers in the United States.

Q: Did you have any weapons with which to threaten them, in a way, or was this pure power of persuasion?

TUTHILL: Well, it's persuasion, but, of course, in the background there's always the question of countermeasures.

Q: Restrictive tariffs, this type of thing.

TUTHILL: That's right. And we always held open the possibility of going to GATT and increasing tariffs in the United States on certain products in the United States. We finally did go to GATT, but we went to GATT with a formula that was fair enough so that Europeans, inasmuch as they were going to keep on some restrictions which were, we felt, inconsistent with GATT, we could take countermeasures. We took countermeasures primarily against products from countries which were giving us the most problem, so we did raise tariffs on cognac, champagne and perfumes. [Laughter] Which I think was all right.

Q: This was a carrot and stick type of operation.

TUTHILL: That's right.

Q: Was there a difference between your being an ambassador to the OECD and to the European Community? How different was this?

TUTHILL: Well, the whole idea of the OECD--my idea was to bring experts from capitals together. Before the OECD, the central bankers and the finance ministers never met together, let along with their foreign offices. The central bankers met in Basel, the treasury people met in various places, but they didn't meet together. My emphasis was to bring in experts to Paris and to set the stage for some sort of agreement. In Brussels, it wasn't a question of bringing in experts. We had to do it ourselves. It wasn't that kind of thing, so it was more an action oriented thing in terms of the direct responsibility of the ambassador to do things instead of the orchestrating job which I had in the OECD.

Q: What were your goals, either instructions or goals, in the European Community?

TUTHILL: There were two important issues during the time I was there. The basic political issue was British membership. The basic economic issue was the Kennedy round trade negotiations. On the first, of course, it was De Gaulle's--this is what put me even closer to Monnet--De Gaulle's veto of British membership in the fall of '62 and January '63. The final action took place in January '63. De Gaulle's veto of the British was on the basis that the British would--one of the main arguments--be a Trojan horse for the American interests. By that time, Chip Bohlen was American ambassador in Paris, and I disagreed violently with Bohlen on this. Bohlen was totally disinterested in European unity. He had a Gaullist orientation in terms of the importance of the nation-state. He said, "It's not our issue at all about British membership."

And I said, "Well, did you read about what De Gaulle said?" In any event, we never agreed on this. So there was this fascinating political issue, and I felt very strongly, as did Ball, as did Monnet, that Britain should be in the Common Market. The other big issue was, of course, the Kennedy round trade negotiations. Mike Blumenthal was in Geneva, and the big negotiation was between the European Commission and the United States. The Japanese were in. They were important, but not all that important yet. And so there was a fascinating time working with Mike Blumenthal. I didn't really know him before, but became a very close friend, because he came to Brussels often and I went to Geneva very often, trying to coordinate the American position with the Commission and in the Geneva negotiations. So this was a fascinating issue, which, was resolved very satisfactorily with considerable reduction in tariffs in both sides.

Q: How were you in both these ambassadorships? I have the feeling that politics didn't enter into the appointments. They appointed somebody who knew what was happening. So often ambassadorships are up to whoever is close to the party in power. Were these reserved, or was it sort of implicit that these were reserved for somebody who knew what they were doing?

TUTHILL: Yes, I think this was true. You see, the first ambassador to the European communities was David Bruce, who was a very strong advocate of the European Army and European unity in general. He was succeeded by Walt Butterworth, who was also a very strong advocate of the sort of things that I'm talking about and have supported. I was succeeded by Bob Schaezel, of the same orientation. He was succeeded by Joe Greenwald, who was a trade policy man, not quite as much of an advocate of European unity as the rest of us.

Q: But at least he was of the field.

TUTHILL: He was a professional. He had been American ambassador to the OECD, later Tom Enders came in and Dean Hinton, who was very much the same orientation as myself. Then George Vest, who was also of the same orientation. The first change of this, from professionals, was in the Reagan Administration, when Middendorf was assigned there. Middendorf had been at the OAS and at one stage had been in The Netherlands, apparently didn't want to go and didn't seem interested in the basic issues.

Q: He had been Secretary of the Navy, I think, at one time, too, hadn't he?

TUTHILL: I think so, yes. That's right. He didn't stay very long. I guess his wife never did go. She didn't want to go to Brussels. Then he was succeeded by another--I think some fellow from the White House staff. So up until sort of the middle of the Reagan years, there were always professionals there, regardless of our domestic political orientation.

Now, the same is not quite true with the OECD. In the OECD, I was succeeded by John Leddy, very much a professional, and there's a professional there now, Ed Streater. But in between, there were several non-professionals, not bad. It was sort of a mixture.

Q: You think maybe the difference between Brussels and Paris might have had some political pressure?

TUTHILL: I think that's right. Sure. I think that just as the military, when they talk about where they want to be located in Africa or the Middle East, they all want to go to Kenya, because it's a wonderful place to live. At one stage many American companies were opening headquarters in Paris, not because they had done a study of markets and the economy and all the rest; the guys wanted to live in Paris. And the fact is that when we moved from Paris to Brussels, people would say to us, "Oh, too bad you have to leave Paris for Brussels." I like Brussels better than Paris. In the first place, I liked the work very much, because the European Commission at that time had the cream of the crop from the six governments. Young people went to the Commission because they had something they wanted to do. Monnet used to say there were two types of people in the world--people who want to be somebody and people who want to do something. And the people in the Commission were almost all of the second category.

Q: How were we staffed in OECD and European Commission? I'm speaking of the American staff.

TUTHILL: Yes. Well, in both cases, the ambassadors pretty much could control their own staff--that is, who came, why they came, what kind of experts we needed. We never had a large staff in either place, and I and Schaetzel, Vest, Leddy and Greenwald, all of us were pretty much able not only to say the type of person we wanted on political or economic work, but to identify the individuals we wanted. And as much as we had administrations, which were well disposed towards what we were doing, we pretty much had our way. When I went to Brazil, we had almost 1,000 people reporting to me.

Q: I'll come to that later on, yes.

TUTHILL: But in the Community and in Paris, I had small staffs.

Q: How did you identify people? Let's say you wanted somebody. How did you reach into the bowels of the State Department and get people you wanted?

TUTHILL: Well, again, sort of facetiously, I used to call it my secret intelligence service. I'm always very skeptical of the bio data. A guy went to school and did this and that. It doesn't really necessarily mean anything. So I had a pretty--by that time, you see, I had been in the Department over 20 years, so I had a lot of friends around, and I asked people that I trusted whether "Mr. Zilch" was any good or not. And I did it whenever possible. I couldn't control--but I didn't need to--the people that came over for EURATOM, from the

Atomic Energy Commission, but the fact is that the ones that they sent to me in Brussels were all very good. I didn't know how to clear them personally.

Q: One last question on the European side of your career. What was the role of our involvement in Vietnam? Was this a problem for you?

TUTHILL: Well, it was a problem that only manifested itself when, for example, Dean Rusk came and lectured to all my friends in the European Commission about Vietnam. I used to go to Bilderberg meetings occasionally, and I remember at that time I didn't know explicitly, but I assumed that George Ball was in disagreement with Vietnam. It turns out now that he documented his disagreement in writing to both Kennedy and Johnson. George used to go to those meetings pretty regularly, and I've sat there and watched George defend our position in Vietnam. To somebody that didn't know, you couldn't for a moment suspect that he was in disagreement. While he was in the government, he explicitly gave the rationale and the arguments for our being there. So that it really didn't bother me very much.

In Brazil, it became different, because the Brazilian Government actually wanted to get involved in Vietnam. The students and intellectuals and a lot of other people thought it was a great mistake. The government, at one stage, wanted to send a ship. We were turning over some over-aged destroyers to them, and one fellow in the foreign office suggested that we turn it over to them just off the coast of Vietnam, where the likelihood was that the North Vietnamese would attack it, and that would give the Brazilians an excuse for entering. [Laughter]

Q: They wanted to send another expeditionary force a la the Italian campaign.

TUTHILL: I wouldn't say this was their position, but there were people in the Brazilian Government who had a strong anti-communist line which manifested itself in terms of wishing to support the U.S. government position in Vietnam.

Q: One further question. Was there a difference in the way your assignment was handled dealing with Europe as a whole between the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations?

TUTHILL: Well, not really, except that Johnson, of course, was destroyed because of Vietnam, and it took so much of his time and energy that he didn't really concentrate on other issues. I was lucky with Johnson. Johnson could be very disagreeable. He came to Brussels when he was Vice President. You just couldn't get him to do anything substantive. He was difficult. MacArthur wanted to have him all the time, and I said, "That's fine. You can keep him all the time." [Laughter]

But I came back to Washington several times when Johnson was President, because I stayed on in Brussels, I guess, a year and a half during the time when Johnson was President. And each time I came back on a substantive issue, and with him we stuck to that issue. One time I came back, when he addressed the joint session of the Congress on

discrimination, especially against blacks, he gave what I considered a great speech. And that next day I saw him on Common Market things, probably trade negotiations or British entry or something. When he acted as a courtly Southern gentleman, he could really pour it on. So when we finished talking, he walked down the hall with me. I said, "You know, I heard you last night, and I just want to say what a privilege it is to work for a President who will take this position for our country." It was entirely a domestic issue. And I felt it 100%. Subsequently, as I say, Vietnam destroyed the man.

But in terms of European unity, Ball was still there, and I think Johnson would have been pretty much like Dean Rusk; if anybody had started really a serious discussion on European policy, he would say, "Go to Mac Bundy or George Ball." So Johnson, while certainly not as convinced as Kennedy, didn't alter things.

Q: How did it come about that an economist dealing in European affairs ended up as ambassador to Brazil, which, while there were economic concerns, a major concern was a rather oppressive military dictatorship?

TUTHILL: Well, the specific way it came about was I had been in Brussels close to four years, the longest I'd ever been any place in the Foreign Service, and I got a telegram in the middle of the night from Rusk and Ball saying, "Is there any insurmountable obstacle to the President naming you as Ambassador to Brazil?"

I immediately sent back a message saying, "Well, if total ignorance of Brazil, total ignorance of all of South America, total ignorance of the Portuguese language, no inclination to correct any of these deficiencies, and, as you both know, an oral commitment to join the faculty of Johns Hopkins University, (without, however, a specific date), if these are not insurmountable, I'm obviously just what you're looking for."

Well, we went back and forth, and I agreed to go for two years. I stayed, actually, two and a half. But I suppose--and of course, Fulbright, when I came before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said, "Why in the world are you being sent to Brazil?"

Well, the only way I could answer that is, "You'd better ask the administration. It wasn't my idea." But I suppose the closest thing to a rationale was the fact that we had a \$300 million a year aid program, and I had had a fair amount of work on the Marshall Plan. I knew something. I wasn't afraid of dirtying my hands on economic and financial things. And also, I found out subsequently that when Linc Gordon left--and he was a great ambassador in Brazil--they asked who was going to replace him, and he said he didn't know, but he said, "I'm going to recommend Tuthill."

Q: You two came from basically the same background, didn't you? I mean, as far as having worked on the Marshall Plan and being economists.

TUTHILL: That's right. Of course, Linc had much more of an academic record than I did, and also much more of a record in terms of Latin America.

Q: He had dealt with the Ford Foundation and actually had been to Brazil a number of times prior.

TUTHILL: Oh, yes. He was an expert on Latin America, I think, to the extent that we have any experts on Latin America. Though I resisted, I'm glad I went. I looked at the list of personnel in Brazil (we used to have lists of people in those days). I didn't recognize even the name of a single Foreign Service officer. I knew the head of USIA, Mickey Boerner, because he'd been in Germany, and I'd heard of General Walters, who was the . . .

Q: Vernon Walters.

TUTHILL: Vernon Walters, who was the military attaché. But I didn't even know the others. The others were, for example, Frank Carlucci and Herb Okun who is now Walter's deputy in New York, Sam Lewis, who was ambassador to Israel. I had quite a group of people. As a matter of fact, when this came out, I talked with Bill Harrop, who was at the American Embassy to Belgium. I asked to Bill, "Who are all these people?"

And Bill said, "Well, I don't know most of them." But he said, "There are two people I do know, and you'll find them very useful, and that's Frank Carlucci and Sam Lewis." And he was right. [Laughter]

Q: We're talking about the time when there was a strict military rule which seemed to be getting worse, if I'm correct. I mean, it was not moderating its role in Brazilian politics at the time you went there. There was a great deal of criticism of our role in Brazil, in the United States. What were your instructions when you went out there?

TUTHILL: I didn't really have any instructions, you know. [Laughter] We didn't have much in the way of instructions. But actually, there was a change while I was there. The man who became President, Castelo Branco, during the so-called revolution in '64, was an honest, patriotic, hard working, devoted man, who had some obvious weaknesses, namely he was skeptical of the universities, youth and trade unions. Fortunately, he had gone to Ecole Militaire in Paris, so he knew French, and so he and I talked in French. I respected him. He was honest and he was decent but he was also narrow-minded on some issues, but he was an able man. He was replaced after about a year or so--because he said he was only going to stay for three years; he stuck to it--by the next military senior man, Costa e Silva, who was almost totally unqualified for the job and was insecure. That led to a sort of nationalistic outbreaks from time to time. And I had a lot of trouble with Costa e Silva, because Frank Carlucci and I saw a fellow named Lacerda who was the editor of a newspaper in Brazil. He and Linc Gordon disliked each other, and it was not much of a newspaper. But he was one of the real intellectuals.

Q: This is Carlos Lacerda.

TUTHILL: That's right. He was part of the political opposition but not of the terrorist end. He made a lot of charges.

Q: An organization called the Front, I believe. La Fronta or something. [Laughter]

TUTHILL: Something like that. The main vehicle he had was a newspaper, and he made constant attacks. Frank and I agreed that the time had come that we ought to see him, so I had two meetings with him. Of course, I didn't try to hide it, because, you know, Brazilians were listening to telephone conversations. Costa e Silva raised this with me. At that stage, I had been there about two years, and I felt my time was about up anyway. Costa e Silva was furious about it, because he felt it was being "disloyal" to him, and he gave me a lecture on this. After he got through with this lecture, he said, "Mr. Ambassador, I would appreciate, therefore, if you would not any more see Lacerda."

And I said, "Well, Mr. President, I'm very sorry to disappoint you. Your ambassador in Washington is free to see the opposition party in the United States as much as he wants, not the terrorists. And I'm not going to see the terrorists in Brazil. I have to maintain my own freedom to see people in Brazil, whether or not they agree with the government."

Well, then the papers started to have headlines saying, "Will Tuthill Be Persona Non Grata?" And at one stage, Frank Carlucci said to me, "Jack, I know you don't give a damn whether you're a persona non grata or not, but I've been PNGed twice already." [Laughter] "Once in Tanzania and then some other place in Africa." And he said, "If I have three PNGs against me, people start to think Carlucci doesn't get along with anybody." [Laughter]

Q: On the Lacerda episode, were you getting any particular pressure from Washington on this one way or the other?

TUTHILL: No. Washington was fully supportive.

Q: Lincoln Gordon was Assistant Secretary for American Affairs.

TUTHILL: That's right. No, the Department and the press at home, because then it got into the press, you know. I remember one editorial in The New York Times or the Washington Post that said "The silly season in Brazil," having to do with the Costa e Silva position. So no, Washington and the press position was fully supportive.

Q: Did you feel that it behooved you, as the American representative, to try to work to relieve the repression within Brazil?

TUTHILL: Well, there was only so much you could do. When I came down there, the first staff meeting, one of the guys on the staff said, "You must be clear that the president

of Brazil is the most important man in this country, but the American ambassador is the second most important."

And I said, "I want to correct you right away. We are not running Brazil. Brazil is for Brazilians. We can play a role. We can see that our aid program helps the progressive people in Brazil, but we are not in charge of Brazil." This was the background of the whole Topsy operation.

Q: Yes, I'd like to get to this.

TUTHILL: Yes. Because at that time, we had aid people all over Brazil. If somebody was after you for not paying your taxes, there was an American always there. The government was unpopular, and all the unpopular aspects of the government was attributed to the Americans. This was because a lot of our people had the view that the "natives" really couldn't run their own country. But we can't run it either. So that sure, we did what we could for the universities, we did what we could for youth, we did what we could for youth and the trade unions.

Q: When you say, "We did what we could," what do you mean?

TUTHILL: Well, in the first place, we met with them on substantive issues. When I made my visits all around Brazil, I always went to see the cardinal or the bishop and the general and the governor and--the trade union people. The Brazilian government didn't like it worth a damn. I remember one time in Sao Paulo, a highly developed industrial area with trade unions, and when I first sat down with the trade unions, they said, "Mr. Ambassador, will you show us the road to Monticello?"

And I said, "I can tell you about our experience, and I can tell you that I think in any country moving towards democracy, that there has to be free trade unions. I'll tell the government this. We can't force it, though. We can argue for you, we can help the trade unions," which we did to a certain extent. As a matter of fact, the labor man in Brazil was a fellow named Herb Baker, who is now here in Washington. He was in Germany for a long time as a labor attaché, Baker would find ways, you know, especially at his house, he would frequently have informal meetings, with beer and sandwiches, with trade union people, because the embassy residence was a little too heavy for them. So indirectly, we showed--and I'm sure Linc Gordon did, too--interest and appreciation. Of course, all that time we were cutting back on our aid. What was going on was with the aid people and the IMF, they'd have all these lists of things that the Brazilians had to do with commercial policy and fiscal policy and military policy, and the Brazilians would sign all sorts of things and then do whatever they damn well pleased. So we tried to use our aid to encourage labor and other people. We also supported the idea of opening up the center of Brazil, in roads and transportation and big agricultural areas.

And when I was back here, I was going around as a Woodrow Wilson Visiting Fellow about once or twice a year, and I went to a university in Iowa, in Orange County, Iowa, Northwestern University. That was an area that used to be in corn. Now it's about two-

thirds in soybeans. So I told them that one of the things we did in Brazil was to get the Brazilians to produce soybeans. The Brazilians used to be the largest importer of American soybeans. Now they're the second largest producer of soybeans in the world and also a major exporter of soybeans. So during my week at this little college right in the middle of the U.S. soybean area, we talked in classes on international affairs and ethics and philosophy and politics, about this whole thing. I put it up to them, "Do you think that I spent your taxpayer dollars and mine in a sensible way?"

This is a place that was started by the Dutch Reform Church. At the end, one fellow sort of summarized the whole thing. He said, "Look, at the moment, the price of soybeans is going down, and we have competition from Brazil. It does create a problem." But he said, "You know, it's a world in which there's hunger." And he said, "As Christians, we can't oppose the United States Government encouraging other countries to produce this food which has such nutritional value." And he said, "Therefore we don't criticize it. We would hope however that the United States Government would also try to see that food gets into the mouths of people who need it worldwide."

And I said, "Well, I wish we were doing more in the second part of that, but I think a lot of people are trying to do that."

Q: You mentioned before Operation Topsy. Could you describe this, please?

TUTHILL: I've written that up, you know, in Foreign Policy. There's an article which does describe it, and I've just written another article for the Atlantic Community Quarterly on "Foreign Policy, the State Department, and the Foreign Service" and mentioned this. But very briefly, the business of Topsy came about not as a budgetary matter, although there were beneficial budgetary effects. Of over 900 employees, we send about 300 back home. Some of those were contract employees in AID, so we just let some of the contracts expire. But it was basically a political decision, and a political decision based upon the fact that many of our people thought they were running Brazil, and we were getting all the backfire from unpopular Brazilian government policies. So that I felt we just had to retrench and concentrate on areas where we could be influential without helping to get the Brazilians to collect taxes and change their fiscal policy and do this and that and everything else.

Q: What sort of opposition did you have within the American Government?

TUTHILL: Well, I drafted a telegram for Washington which I popped on the country team and gave them 24 hours to look at it, didn't change a word, actually, and saying that I wanted to tell every--every American agency in Brazil to tell me what they would have to stop doing if they had a 50% cut in personnel. As soon as I did that, showed that to my country team, both especially Defense and CIA came to me and said, "This can't possibly cover us."

And I said, "It sure as hell does cover you." As a matter of fact, Defense, in particular, was overstaffed. As a matter of fact, CIA was doing some things that I thought were kind of silly and detrimental. So I sent this message back to Washington and asked for approval.

The next day I got a report back from Rusk, saying he fully approved. Then subsequently in Washington, Rusk said to me, "Look, I want you to know that you have the support not only of me, the whole State Department, but all the rest of the Cabinet and the President of the United States. So you have a free hand to do what's necessary." Frank Carlucci was my deputy on this whole thing. I asked for a small working team to come from Washington with representatives of various agencies, and departments, to find out just how we could do this. I didn't cut by 50%; I cut about one-third. I never had said I was going to cut by 50%.

Q: Give them the bottom line to work with.

TUTHILL: That's right. I think the key thing--and I have spelled this out in this article which I've just sent in to the publisher--the key thing, I think, was the support of the President of the United States. My guess is that when this was started both Defense and CIA tried that out in the White House, saying, "Does Tuthill really have this authority or doesn't it just mean State, Agriculture, and AID?"

Q: This brings up two things: your relation with a figure who sort of runs through the post-war and part of the war history, Vernon Walters. One, you were cutting down on the military side, and two, what was his role there, particularly vis-a-vis a military government?

TUTHILL: Well, first, let me explain that a big cut in the military was in the military aid program, which was not under General Walters. There was a major general whose name I've been happy to forget. He's the one that had offices in the Defense Department and all the rest, and that was where the major cut came. With the military attachés, there was very little cut.

Dick Walters was extremely helpful to me, although his political orientation is quite different from mine. He shared the skepticism about trade unions and universities that the President of Brazil had, and he had served with the President of Brazil in Italy with a Brazilian contingent during World War II. To give you an example of how Walters worked, I would every so often come in the morning, and my secretary would say, "General Walters wants urgently to see you." And I knew that probably meant he had been called in about midnight by the President of Brazil to have a little chat. Dick is one of the great linguists, you know, and Dick would have this chat, frequently going for about an hour with the President, and would go back to his apartment and type out the whole thing--"he said, I said." The next morning he'd have all the raw material, bring it in to me, put it on my desk. And after I had read it, he'd say, "How do you want to handle this?"

And I said, "Dick, about 90% or 95% of it is political, so we'll report it through State Department channels. We'll head it that "military attaché called in by President Castelo Branco last night," and I'll say, "pass Defense" of course, although that's automatic, so that Washington will know and will give credit to you for the whole thing. And the rest of it you can send through military channels." So therefore, the reporting, I'm sure, was accurate, highly reliable, and extremely valuable.

On our political conclusions, that's something different. Dick and I disagreed time and time again, but with Dick--and we had quite explicit and noisy disagreements from time to time, and I had no doubt with Walters that once I told him what the position was of the United States Embassy, that in his conversations with the Brazilian military, many of whom were very old friends, that he followed my line. He didn't say, "Well, the ambassador thinks . . ." you know, in effect, to discount it. I think some of the military will say to their opposites, "Well, the ambassador says such and such," but will imply that this is not to be taken too seriously.

Now, when Operation Topsy came along, as a matter of fact, Walters was just about to be transferred back to Washington. He was in Vietnam for a while, then in Paris as military attaché there. But the Operation Topsy, I found Walters' operation so responsible and so valuable that if there was any change, it was minuscule.

Q: Was he useful to try to bring across the concern the American Government had with the repression by the Brazilian Government?

TUTHILL: No, I think that was my job. I didn't go so far as to insist that he be a proponent of what I felt should be done. In the first place, they all knew him well enough to know what a conservative fellow he was. No, I made representation to the President or the Foreign Minister or parliamentarians, because they were still important on those subjects.

Q: Did you have any real effect--I'm not talking about you, but the American Government--on the military government as far as its rule on the people? Or really did we not have that much of a role to play?

TUTHILL: I think we had very little effect. As I say, I tried to demonstrate with the trade unions and universities and that part of the church which was liberal that we were sympathetic with their position. We wanted to see them, but to have any direct effect, I think, very little.

Q: Were you having problems with or pressure from the American press, the media, Congress and all, to do more than you felt you could do?

TUTHILL: Not really.

Q: Brazil was just not at the front of people's attention.

TUTHILL: That's right. It was during the Vietnam War, and the Brazilians, as I say, were trying to be as helpful as they could in terms of supporting the American position in Vietnam. No, the only thing that really developed in the press was the questions to whether I would be declared persona non grata because I was seeing the opposition. And then the U.S. and Brazilian press was completely supportive.

Q: Not too long thereafter, they threw all the people, including other people in the press and Lacerda into jail for a while. That was shortly before you departed.

TUTHILL: Oh, no. It was rather interesting. Take for example Kubitschek, the former President of Brazil. He had been deprived of his political rights, and he was out of the country most of the time. When I came in, he did come back to Brazil. It was very interesting, because he knew that the embassy would be in trouble with the government if we were too close. I would see him occasionally at parties or big receptions. He was a very sensitive man on this, and he said quite explicitly, "I'm not going to embarrass your relationship with the government. The fact that we don't see much of each other, I think, under the present circumstances, is the only way to do it." Now, as to Lacerda, I don't remember that they ever put him in jail. As a matter of fact, I used to see more of Lacerda when I was in Bologna and then in Paris, because he used to spend a lot of time in Europe. I don't remember that he was put in jail subsequently.

Q: I thought he was.

TUTHILL: He may have been. Hard to put him in jail because of political opinion.

Q: Brazil had a small contingent in the Gaza Strip before the '67 war. Did that have any effect on us, our policy toward Israel and the fact that Brazil was there made us more favorable towards the Brazilians or not?

TUTHILL: I don't really know. Worldwide, on U.N., on the Far East, Middle East, Brazil tried to be supportive. For example, at one stage when all the little islands in the Mediterranean were becoming nations, you know . . .

Q: Malta and Cyprus.

TUTHILL: Oh, no, I don't mean the Mediterranean. I mean the Caribbean.

Q: The Caribbean. Oh, yes.

TUTHILL: At one stage--I forget which one--we had instruction to go to the foreign office. I went to the secretary general and I said, "I hope that Brazil will support this nation, this new nation, for U.N. membership."

And he said, "Well, of course we will." He said, "You know, you can take the entire population and put them in our stadium for football, and the stadium wouldn't be filled." He said, "Furthermore, they have better toilet facilities in that stadium than they have in the whole damn country." [Laughter] So they didn't take any of this very seriously, except Vietnam. And as I say, this one, at least in terms of the United States Government, in terms of the Lyndon Johnson government, they did what they could to support United States policy.

Q: How did you see the growth of terrorism at the time? I noted an American officer was killed, Charles Chandler, I believe, in Sao Paulo, and also there were increasing student riots. How did you view that?

TUTHILL: Well, I've forgotten his name. The one in Sao Paulo had come from Vietnam, and he, rather foolishly . . .

Q: Charles Chandler.

TUTHILL: Was that it? He, rather foolishly, I think, got into a lot of public debates in Sao Paulo, in which he implied that he was very close to General Westmoreland and the intelligence operations. Of course, he was Army intelligence or they wouldn't have been sending him to Sao Paulo to learn Portuguese and all the rest, which is perfectly all right. But in any event, he was murdered in cold blood in front of his wife and children, a terrible thing. Incidentally, the CIA was absolutely right on this, because the Brazilians kept saying, "Oh, well, it's just Intelligence Services fighting one another within our country." It wasn't that at all; it was a left-wing extreme terrorist group that gunned him down.

After that, we started to get threats at the embassy saying that, "We're going to kill the ambassador next." And the Brazilians were very worried about it. They wanted to put troops around the embassy, the chancellory, and we finally agreed to let a few be in down in the cellar where they weren't visible, so if something serious happened, they were right there. And then they said they wanted to give me an armed jeep behind a car, a bodyguard in the car, and I said, "No, we've got the Marines here, and I'll have a Marine with a driver." I did that for a while, and then I started thinking these Marines were all back from Vietnam, they were all young kids, nice boys, but in Brazil, driving is crazy, and sooner or later some Brazilian was going to drive in front of my car, and this Marine's going to shoot him dead, and the Brazilian will be totally innocent. So I changed that and said, "Okay, you can let me have a plainclothesman in the car. And secondly, between the residence and the chancellory, you can give him instructions and give instructions to my driver the route to follow." There were three or four different routes you could take. So we did that and nothing ever happened.

Now, Burke Elbrick succeeded me, and Burke was a very experienced, splendid Foreign Service officer. But he thought that was excessive. So he said he didn't want that bodyguard in the car. He said, "Furthermore, I can save several minutes if I take the direct

route every day." And after only a few weeks, they picked him up. I know the street very well, 100 yards or so from the residence. They just blocked both ends of that street, stopped the car, and he was a hostage for a month or so. He got hit on the head with the barrel of a gun, and his career was ended. He came back, but he was never well again, and then he had several operations. That was the start of the terrorism in Brazil of ambassadors.

Then a little later, they got the German ambassador and then the Swiss ambassador. They released about a dozen political prisoners in order to free Elbrick. It was a bloodier thing with the German ambassador, because I think the driver or the bodyguard was killed. The case went on for some time, and they released about 20 or 30 political prisoners in order to free him. Then the Swiss, they raised the ante to, I don't know, 60 or 70, and the Swiss ambassador was held for a long time. The military were furious about it, about this giving up political prisoners, plus the fact that it was thought in Rio that the Swiss ambassador was a homosexual, and they said, "We're going to give up 60 political prisoners for this homosexual Swiss ambassador?" Actually, the ambassador, apparently, behaved very well, very courageously in captivity. He was finally released, but then the Brazilian Government said, "No more. No matter who is taken hostage from now on, we're not going to release any more political prisoners." And it stopped. But part of the reason was that this gang, in which I say the CIA was right about the killing of the captain in Sao Paulo, it was a left-wing terrorist gang, and they killed the leader of that gang in a shoot-out someplace or other in Brazil.

Q: This brings up a question. I don't want to move into sensitive information, but how well were you served by the CIA, do you feel, that you could talk about, in Brazil?

TUTHILL: Well, the CIA contingent was too large and too obvious. The very top floor of the chancellery was CIA, full of equipment, equipment on the roof and everything. And everybody knew it was CIA. You know, a cleaning woman would know, you know. Anybody would know. And secondly, it's the easiest thing in the world to identify the people in the embassy, or most of them who were CIA. Then Fulbright didn't help any, because in my hearings, he asked, "Why are you being sent to Brazil?" and I said, "You've got to ask somebody else; don't ask me." And he said, finally, "Well, Ambassador Tuthill, I know that this committee and the Senate will give its consent to your nomination because of your record, but you don't know anything about Brazil, and you go down there, and you will find a deputy who's a CIA man, and he'll just show you around and explain everything to you." Well, I did have a deputy; he wasn't a CIA man at all--Phil Raine, who was a USIA man, who was, in fact, very familiar with Brazil. But Fulbright did a disservice, because, of course, the Brazilian papers picked that up immediately and said, "Fulbright says CIA will guide Tuthill," which was not true.

The first CIA man there when I came, their station chief, was quite helpful, but the CIA was engaged in what they refer to as "recruiting" agents, and I raised with CIA in Washington what the hell they thought they were achieving with the recruiting, because everybody that was approached and refused (about nine out of ten refused), would go out

and tell their friends, "Hey, guess what's happened to me?" So the word got around, that the CIA was doing this. I felt that the marginal benefits to be obtained from this were so small in a country where practically everything is open anyway, while the risk of having some prominent person identified as being a CIA agent was so grave that I felt that the CIA operation was excessive and potentially very embarrassing. On the other hand, on some of the things such as who was killing people, they were absolutely right. When they stuck to something like that, they were very good. When they were engaged in recruiting agents, I thought that the risk far outweighed any advantages.

Q: Coming to your leaving Brazil, were you ready to leave and leave the Foreign Service at that time? There was a change in administration, I believe, at that time.

TUTHILL: Well, no. That was the election in 1968. This is the only election in my life, and undoubtedly the only election in the future, in which I knew the two contenders very well. I knew Hubert Humphrey very well, and Nixon came down for a week in between when he was just a New York based lawyer and was our guest at the residence. So I knew both of them. I told them both that regardless of who won the election, I was going to leave at the end of '68. So I did not leave because of Nixon's election. As I mentioned earlier, I had planned to join Johns Hopkins' faculty. So, I was ready to leave. I felt I had done my duty. I'm glad I went, because I think that somebody with basically European experience can have a different outlook on things in Brazil, and I think the idea of moving Foreign Service officers from time to time away from the special area is a good thing.

Q: To summarize, a question I've been asking the various men and women I've interviewed, what do you think was your greatest achievement and your greatest disappointment in the Foreign Service? Do you have any thoughts on these?

TUTHILL: Well, I had so few disappointments that I really can't think of anything. I enjoyed it immensely. During the war, as I mentioned earlier, I was frustrated, because I felt my duty and my right was to join the military forces, but I was frozen in. But they took care of it by sending me over to Eisenhower's headquarters, so I have really no serious complaint there.

In terms of achievement, I don't know. I think perhaps the negotiation creating the OECD, because that reflected not American observer status as in the OECD, and it also reflected a feeling that Europe, combined Europe, within the OECD should try to negotiate with the United States on these basic economic and financial issues. It also led to Japanese participation. So I suppose it's that, and also the advocacy of European unity. When I last saw Monnet, just a few months before he died, he was kind of depressed about what was going on in terms of European unity, and he said, "Well, if nothing else, one thing we've accomplished is we have excluded the possibility of another Franco-Prussian War."

And I said, "My dear friend, that is quite an accomplishment."

Q: Just one final question and we're through. Looking both back on your career and also the way things are today, would you recommend the Foreign Service as a career to a member of the family or to other people? How do you feel about it now?

TUTHILL: Yes. I'm told that the quality of people taking exams is holding up, even though this is a particularly bad period we're going through right now in the Foreign Service. I think that yes, I would recommend it, but I would recommend it on the basis of somebody's comment years ago, "The only way to work for the United States Government is to be prepared to resign at any time." It doesn't mean that you wouldn't go in with a theory of a real career, but if any time either the government policy or your own treatment was such that you couldn't stand, that you would feel that you were prepared to leave. I have always recommended that young people do something else before joining the Foreign Service, either teaching or writing or being a banker or truck driver or a pugilist, or something, so that they have another alternative line of work. I think the real security of people in the Foreign Service is knowledge that they can support themselves some other way if necessary.

Q: I thank you very much.

TUTHILL: Thank you.

End of interview