

Value Added Tax (VAT)
Office of Protocol/OFM relationship
Abuses of immunity
Brazilian embassy case
Congressional interest in diplomatic immunities
Belgium embassy case
Vienna Convention
Nepal embassy case
Diplomats with multiple wives
Visiting Heads of States and entourages
Mistreatment of domestic servants
Official State Visits
Chief of Protocol and the President
Working Visits
Blair House
Private Visits
Medical Treatment Visits
Chronology for Official Visits
Duration and content of Official Visits
US Presidential Travels
US commercial participation on Visits
International Organization meetings in US
NATO meeting in Washington
Security issues
Presidential visits abroad
Accompanying President to Quebec
Hugo Chavez
Duties as Chief of Protocol
Presidential Funerals
Washington Cathedral protocol cadre
Expansion of Diplomatic Mission in Washington
US citizens as foreign Ambassadors
Public Relations firms
Foreign Embassy reliance on Protocol Office
US Public Relations Firms
Lobbyists
Meridian International Center for Ambassador's Spouses
Establishing and breaking relations
Iranian Embassy buildings
Chinese
Agrément process

INTERVIEW

Q: Today is July 6, 2007. This is an interview with Lawrence Dunham. This is being done on behalf of the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, and I am Charles Stuart Kennedy. Do you go by Larry?

DUNHAM: Larry.

Q: Ok we will start off with when and where were you born?

DUNHAM: I was born on Nantucket Island on June 4, 1949.

Q: OK, let's go to your father's side. What do you know about your father's side of the family?

DUNHAM: My father's side had been on Nantucket for many years. They date back to about 1800 on the island itself. My dad worked in the post office there. He had fought in the navy during WWII. After he came home, he started working for the government, and he made his career in the Nantucket post office.

Q: What do you know about the earlier Dunhams in the family? What were they up to?

DUNHAM: My father's father worked for a company on Nantucket called the Island Service Company, which provided coal in the winter and ice in the summer to people. The company itself did a number of other things. But my grandfather delivered coal and ice. He died in the 1930's, when my father was very young. My father died in the 1970's. He died when he was relatively young.

Q: Now your father, how far did he get in school?

DUNHAM: He graduated from Nantucket High School. He attended the Merchant Marine Academy, but decided that he did not want to make a career in the Merchant marine. The war had broken out. He had naval skills, so he joined the navy.

Q: Your mother, where did she come from and what was her maiden name?

DUNHAM: Her maiden name was Lundrigen. She was born in Newfoundland, Canada. She moved to the United States shortly after the war. She had family who lived in Nantucket, and decided to move there. That is where she met my father, and they got married and had a family, five children.

Q: What schooling did she have?

DUNHAM: She had gone to high school in Canada.

Q: So you grew up on Nantucket did you?

DUNHAM: Correct.

Q: OK let's talk about when you kind of remember, what was Nantucket like?

DUNHAM: Oh it is a very friendly place. I have a lot of childhood memories of riding a bicycle around town and playing in wooded areas near our home. One memory that I have that probably goes back to when I was eight or nine years old, so that is close to 50 years ago. I remember distinctly that it was a very nice day, probably in late spring day. We rode our bicycles out to the local airport and we actually rode down to the end of the runway. We parked our bicycles and we lay down on the runway and watched the planes as they took off, which is something you couldn't do today, not even on Nantucket. It was a great place to grow up because it was very secure and very safe, but it was a bit quiet in the winter. In the summer that changed because it was a resort island. People would come from all over the country and vacation there. Some people had homes. Some people would come for just a limited amount of time. So you would have this influx of people which meant that there was a lot of activity. There were ships, restaurants, movie theatres, and a host of other businesses which would open for the summer to accommodate the summer visitors.

Q: Were these all off islanders?

DUNHAM: Yes, we called them off islanders. Summer people. This was a fun time because of course we were out of school. You could go to the beach. As I said, there was a lot going on. Every year there would be a summer carnival that we would go to. On Sunday nights there were band concerts on the main street. So summer was always a very exciting time.

Q: Where were you in rank order in your family?

DUNHAM: I was the first child.

Q: The first child, this mean that you had more responsibility. You had a sister following you?

DUNHAM: Yes, one sister and three brothers.

Q: I guess she got stuck with most of the family shepherding or something.

DUNHAM: Well eventually.

Q: Well how about the sea part of your upbringing.

DUNHAM: Not to a large extent. Nobody in the family was a boater, so I can't say that I learned to sail at an early age, although I do a little bit now. But certainly we were always conscious of the influence of the sea upon our lives. My mother's uncle was a fisherman and owned a fishing boat. He had a crew of five or six people, and would go out for a week or two at a time, so we were always aware of Uncle Jack being out or being around.

The fathers of some of the children that I grew up with were fishermen. In fact we had one boy who lost his father at sea in a tragic storm. So you were always conscious of the effects of the sea. Many people on the island derived their livelihoods from the sea. Of course, most of the staples on which we relied – food, clothing, oil and gas, had to be transported to the island across the ocean. So we also were aware of the effects of nature on the sea.

Q: Where did your family fit religiously?

DUNHAM: We were Roman Catholic.

Q: Now how Catholic were you?

DUNHAM: Both my parents were Roman Catholic and I grew up in the Catholic church.

Q: How would you put yourself in the spectrum of following the religion and all that?

DUNHAM: I as a child was brought up very strictly in the Catholic Church.

Q: Altar boy and all that stuff?

DUNHAM: No, I wasn't an altar boy. I thought about it. However, I learned that my older cousins who serves as altar boys would have to get up at 6:00 on weekday mornings to serve 7:00 mass. I thought, well I don't want to get up that early in the morning, so I never became an altar boy.

Q: Politically how stood your family?

DUNHAM: I think they were independent. They didn't seem to be people of strong political views one way or the other. During the time that my father was working at the post office, the raises for postal workers all had to be approved by the Congress. You didn't get an automatic raise like you do today. Maybe it applied to other government employees as well, but I remember it specifically affected people working for the post office. The Democrats in Congress were more likely to approve pay raises than the Republicans. That may have had some bearing on the way my parents voted. Also my uncle, who was married to my father's sister, was chairman of the town Democratic committee, so I would hear a lot about Democratic politics from him. However, the local Democrats were a small organization. It was a Republican town.

Q: Well then, so we had this large family, brothers and sister and all. What was the family dynamic, sit around the dining room table and talk about things or sort of go eat and then take off.

DUNHAM: Being the oldest, you became independent early on. Of course, we would have dinner as a family. My parents would spend time with me doing homework as well. I spent a lot of time playing with friends. I lived in a neighborhood where there were a lot

of children. Growing up right after WWII, I was part of that baby boomer generation, so there were lots of kids the same age. As I mentioned we lived near a wooded area, so there were a lot of opportunities to go out and tramp through the woods, chop on trees and things like that.

Q: Were you much of a reader?

DUNHAM: Yes, voracious. As a matter of fact that is something my mother instilled in me at an early age. I can remember maybe it was for one year, maybe it was for two, I forget the length of time, but just about every night just before I went to bed, she would read to me from one of those little Golden Books, each was probably about 10 or 15 pages long with big pictures in it. So just about every night before bed I had a story and was read to. It was a ritual that I enjoyed.

Q: When you got into reading do you remember some of the earlier types of books that sort of left an impression on you?

DUNHAM: It is funny. I don't remember many of the stories really well now, but recall once my aunt gave me a book about Ferdinand the Bull. I remember another aunt gave me a three book collection. I guess it was the Mother Goose stories, but they had beautiful illustrations. I remember the illustrations even now. I believe they were done by Maxfield Parrish, who was a well known illustrator. Then as I got a little older, I became interested in the lives of people. They had biographies which were written especially for children at the local library, and I used to like to read them.

Q: Was it sort of a Carnegie Library type of thing?

DUNHAM: There were two libraries on the island. There was the Nantucket Atheneum which was quite an historic place.

Q: Good New England...

DUNHAM: Yes very much so. It was imposing, a big white building with great columns in the front. Before my time, much before my time really, it had been a center of community activities. They would have very famous lecturers come to the island to speak. Fredrick Douglass spoke there, William Lloyd Garrison and a number of others. So the Atheneum was the main library. But then there was another library called the Maria Mitchell Library, which was named for Maria Mitchell who was a very famous Nantucket woman. She was an astronomer. That library tended to house a more scientific collection, however they had a special biography section. I remember the books had orange covers. So that is where I got the biographies.

Q: Well now what about school. I assume you went to school on the island. What was the elementary school like?

DUNHAM: It was a typical New England sort of an arrangement. The school itself was relatively new when I got there. I think it probably had been built for children of my generation. It was a fairly large school with a central auditorium and all the classrooms were off on either side. The auditorium had a stage but it was also the gym. Actually, when I was growing up we had a great experience, because was once or twice a year we were let out of school so the town could use the auditorium for the district court, or superior court. They would have trials there. So they would turn the auditorium into a court room. So for the first three or four years I was in school, they had the local trials there. I should back up to say I started school in kindergarten. There was no public kindergarten in Nantucket, but my parents sent me to a school called Planned Playtime. I went there for one year when I guess I was about five years old. We would have a session with reading, and then we would have drawing. Then we would go outside and play. It was a half day. That was great fun.

Q: Was there, you went to public schools as opposed to parochial schools.

DUNHAM: Correct. The only schools on the island were public schools. So if you wanted to go elsewhere, you had to go to a boarding school.

Q: Did you go to middle school?

DUNHAM: The school I attended initially after kindergarten went through the 6th grade. When I first started, it was a very typical New England School with elderly women who taught. Many of them were single women. They were strict as all get out. I remember my first grade teacher was a real taskmaster. It was a thorough indoctrination for a lot of children. Through probably the fourth or fifth grade, all of my teachers had taught my older cousins, who were about ten years older than me. I don't think any of them taught my father or my aunts. Although there were a few substitute teachers, women who had retired but came back occasionally. I think a couple of them may have had taught my father. So you can see, there was very much of a small town atmosphere.

Q: How about that time up through 6th grade, any teachers particularly stand out?

DUNHAM: Yes, three or four. The first grade teacher particularly because she was so strict. She was the toughest disciplinarian. I can remember one day she just grabbed a kid who was talking by the ear and yanked him. I think she grabbed another kid by the head, or the hair on his head. And I remember once she knocked me on the hands. So I remember her very well. The second grade teacher I remember because it was her first teaching job. She was young and this was quite a change. She was a very good teacher. My third grade teacher I adored. She was one of the older teachers. She had been in the school system for a long time. In fact at one point I think her father had been the superintendent of schools on the island. She had a wonderful sense of humor. I think it was the first time in the classroom I can recall the teacher actually came in and telling funny stories. Sometimes she told stories that you wouldn't expect. I remember one day in particular. I don't know how she got onto the subject. But, she was talking about her uncle who had a parrot. The parrot apparently had been on a ship at one time. The uncle

was a very pious man and never swore. One day he dropped a flat iron on his foot and the parrot saw it happen and said, "God Dammit." The man looked at the parrot and said, "Thank you, Polly." I hope I remember as much about my arithmetic and my reading as I do about some of those stories. Then in 6th grade we had a very good teacher too. He had a very good sense of humor. He was also very encouraging to all of us. He got us involved in public speaking and things like that.

Q: Well then you went to middle school.

DUNHAM: On the island after there were two elementary schools. Actually there were three. There was another school in a little village on the other end of the island. It was only seven miles from the center of town, but that was considered a great distance. They had a one room schoolhouse there. Children would go to school there for three years and then in the fourth grade they would come by bus to one of the two main elementary schools. When you got to seventh grade you were sent to middle school, which was actually just on the top floor of one of the other elementary schools, but it was sort of a world apart. That was in the center of town. So depending on where you lived, you either made your own way there or you took a bus. We took the bus. We were a certain distance away. So anyway yes, in seventh and eighth grade you moved into the middle school.

Q: By that time did you find you had any academic strengths, weaknesses, likes, dislikes?

DUNHAM: Yes definitely. I did not like math and science. They were not strong suits for me. I liked history. I liked geography. I liked social sciences. That is truly where I started to focus my attention.

Q: Did you start to get much feeling for Nantucket and New England and history?

DUNHAM: Very much so. As I said it was a small town. The average size of the class back then would have been about 25. Of course, maybe when we got to middle school it was larger because you had the two schools together. So they were small classes to begin with. Everybody knew everybody. The school committee met once a month and anybody who wanted to go to the meetings could, in the same manner that the selectmen met. Once a week the selectmen met, and anybody could go to the meeting. The chairman of the school committee at one time was our family doctor. My older cousin's mother-in-law was on the school committee. So it was a very, I don't want to say small environment, but certainly very familiar. And, the people on the school committee actually monitored what was going on in school. There was a feeling when I was getting into junior high school that the local children didn't know enough about the community. So the school committee made a decision which I think was a very good one. One year we were required to take a course in Nantucket history. We learned about the founding of the island. We learned about the early settlers and their families. We learned about the whaling industry. We learned about some of the more famous Nantucketers who came after the whaling industry. So, yes there was a sense of local pride. There were museums that we would visit. There were always old people around town who would love to sit and talk and tell stories. Of course we had family friends in that category. So you got a

great appreciation for the history of the island. One other thing I will say about this insularity and the community. Every now and then if members of the school committee saw too many school aged kids hanging out on the main street at night or if there was a little rash of vandalism (which didn't amount to much, never serious, but it was annoying I suppose), the word would go out that the teachers needed to give the kids more homework. I don't know if the people who were out creating a nuisance would be deterred by a little more homework, but the theory was to give these children more homework to keep them off the streets.

Q: Well you had the feeling that whatever you did, there were adult eyes on you knowing what you were doing, so you had to kind of mind yourself.

DUNHAM: Yes. Long before the age of big brother. There was a feeling that you were a part of the community and people knew your parents.

Q: Well I remember as a kid, people on the street as a kid messing around would tell me to cut it out, and I'd cut it out.

DUNHAM: You were always respectful to authority. And of course I was in the Boy Scouts growing up. So we had scout training as well as the sense that you were part of this small community.

Q: Was Boston where you went, or did you go there much?

DUNHAM: The very first time I went away, I think it was five years old. We flew to Boston. It was a wonderful experience. Back then Northeast Airlines flew to Nantucket. We flew on a DC-3. I remember getting on the plane and walking from the back to the front. It was like climbing a mountain. There was the little wheel in the back. You walked up to the front of the plane. I recall that I flew with my mother and my father. We were going to a circus I think it was. The plane was very noisy, but it was fascinating to look out over the wings and see the island disappear and how small it was, and then getting to Boston and seeing the city and how vibrant it was and those huge buildings, riding up on elevators and escalators. It was like an amusement park.

Q: Well then you went to high school on the island.

DUNHAM: Yes. After the eighth grade. It is interesting again thinking about how much of a community this was. In our final year in middle school we would take a day and we would walk about a mile or so, I think we walked. As students we often walked as a group. Just as an aside we did so on a number of occasions. I can remember as a child in the lower grades when there was a Memorial Day service at one of the churches, and we all walked from the school down to the church. We used to walk in parades on Memorial Day, even if you weren't in the Boy Scouts or Cub Scouts, local children would walk. So at any rate, when we got to be eighth graders one of the things we did was to walk from the middle school over to the high school which was about a mile away. We had a day of

orientation over there. We met with some of the teachers and learned about some of the classes we would be taking.

Q: You went to high school from when to when?

DUNHAM: '63 to '67. Back then they had an actual orientation. When you were a freshman in high school. You can't quite call it a hazing, but for the first week of school I think you had to wear little dinks on our heads. Something to demonstrate to us that we were newcomers and we had to gain our acceptance. I think one day we had to dress up. Then at the end of the week there was an assembly where we were sort of admitted into the high school. I forget some of the things we had to do that first week. But after that, it was business as usual. Interestingly, back then, but back in those days, there were prescribed curricula. So if you wanted to go to college there was a certain course of study known as college preparatory that you were required to take. If you weren't sure, there was a course called general studies. Just for the girls, there was a course of study called the commercial course. If you thought that you wanted to be a secretary, they taught you typing and shorthand and the things you would need. They had also courses for people, one for girls, one for boys, who would not be furthering their educations. If you thought you were going to be a housewife you could take home-ec. They taught you how to cook and sew. For the boys they taught you mechanical things, carpentry and plumbing and skills like that. Actually that is how the school was maintained in many cases by guys in the vocational school. You had to decide at the beginning of high school what you thought you would do. I was in the college prep course.

Q: Was your family pushing this?

DUNHAM: Certainly they encouraged me to do what I wanted to do. My parents were very understanding in that respect, and when I talked to them about what I wanted to do, they said, "You know you really should do what you feel you would enjoy."

Q: How much did the outside world intrude, the cold war, Kennedy was assassinated. How did these things impact on you all?

DUNHAM: Well even though we got most of our news through television and radio and newspapers, it wasn't like living here, where you could learn about something and actually go and participate in it, as you could go to a presidential inauguration. So you got your news from a variety of sources. And news magazines, my dad always subscribed to Newsweek, so we always had Newsweek. We always had the daily paper, the Boston Globe and there might have been some other magazines. I think he read U.S. News and World Report as well. Then in school you would talk about what was happening, but we got our information from the television. Now in terms of the impact it had: One thing I will say, because you are on an island (and you even get that feeling today if you are there for any length of time) you see what is happening on television, and it does seem to be very far removed. Again, it is not like here, where you would watch TV and see something happening and think like that could affect me, like September 11 did to so many of us. Watching news while growing up on Nantucket, you have the sense that it

could be happening in another world. So you always felt very protected in that regard. You got the feeling that you were informed, but for the most part it didn't have a great impact on you. On the other hand when I was growing up, there was a boat strike. I think there was no boat service for about three weeks or a month. Certainly you could understand that and appreciate it first hand because it had a direct impact on the island.

Q: Did you get involved in any extra curricular things?

DUNHAM: I was not athletic, so I did not get into sports. In the lower grades in school I wrote a couple of plays. I was a little playwright and we produced them for the school. I remember writing a newspaper column for the local boys club. I did that for about a year. Then I was involved with a couple of things in high school. I forget exactly what they were. I also had a paper route. So I did a lot of the typical small town stuff.

Q: Was there much feeling about the global war and all that?

DUNHAM: Again we were aware of what was going on. But, I don't recall any anxiety about the world.

Q: No feeling that Soviet submarines were cruising off the coast or something like that?

DUNHAM: No. The one thing we did have were some Russian fishing boats off the coast of Massachusetts. Of course they were out in international waters. But that caused some concern for the local fishermen because the Russian trawlers if you know them, were very large ships. They actually had processing plants onboard. So these ships would go out into the Atlantic and stay there for extended periods of time, not only harvesting fish but processing them as well. The fishermen from Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard and the Cape would go out and fill their holds and then they would have to come back and sell the fish at market for processing. So it was more of an economic concern than a political concern.

Q: Well getting up towards 1967, did you know where you were going or what you were going to do?

DUNHAM: I had a pretty clear idea. When I was in high school at one point I thought I might be a diplomat. So I wrote to the State Department and got all of the information about how you became a diplomat. I was probably a sophomore in high school. Then my thinking changed a little bit and I thought maybe I would go to law school. By the time I was a senior by the way, I made sure that I didn't have to take any math or science. The subjects that I was taking at that point had to do with French, Spanish, problems in democracy, history and economics course, and English of course. By the time I was a senior, I had an idea of what I wanted to do. The question was where to go. My parents really encouraged me to go to college in Boston. They thought it would be nice if I went to school close to home. I felt I wanted to go to school further away, and that I wanted to come to Washington. That is what I did. I attended the Catholic University.

Q: What were the dating patterns in high school or were there dating patterns?

DUNHAM: Well again it was a small town. There were some couples in high school. Some kids were dating. More often than not the guys hung out with the guys and the girls hung out with the girls. In both junior high and high school, it was common that there would be a dance that would be sponsored by either one of the churches or by the school, and that all the girls would show up together and sit on one side of the room, and all the boys would show up on the other side of the room. Then they would go home separately except, for those few couples who were dating. The big social event in high school was the junior prom. For the junior prom we would decorate the gym in the high school, crank up the basketball hoops and string crepe paper around the gym. It was common for guys to wear a white dinner jacket with a black bow tie, and black pants. The girls would get long dresses. So everybody would get a date for the prom, no matter whether you were dating or not. That created some unusual arrangements, usually just for the night, but everybody went to the prom.

Q: Well then you are off to Catholic University in '67 to '71. What was Catholic University like at the time?

DUNHAM: Well it was very interesting. Catholic U. then, as it is now, is a relatively conservative school. For me it was a good choice because it was a small school, I think 2,000 undergraduates. Double that in terms of graduate students. The feeling was of a small community. It was in northeast Washington which is also like a small community. So coming from a small town to Catholic U, I think for me in retrospect was a good arrangement. I had friends who went to very large schools. Some went to the University of Massachusetts, which had tens of thousands of students. They managed, but I think they got lost in the shuffle there. Interestingly enough just before I arrived in the spring of '67 the school actually closed down. There was a student strike, and even though the Vietnam War was going on at the time, the strike was not related to the war as these things were in so many other schools. The strike was related to the fact that the school had fired a priest because the school leadership disagreed with what he was teaching. The school actually was closed down for about a week, which was unusual. This was the first time, and I think the only time it ever happened. So I came with that little bit of background. It was an easy school for me to fit into. I made friends immediately and was there for four years. I decided to major in international relations, so my courses had an emphasis on international relations and international history.

Q: Was there an order that taught at the school for the most part or was it sort of a mixed?

DUNHAM: It was a mixture. The school is not run by any particular order.

Q: As the Jesuits ran Georgetown and stuff like that.

DUNHAM: Exactly. Or the Dominicans run Providence. But, Catholic U. was the National Pontifical Coeducational Catholic University of America. It had been chartered

by the Pope at the time I was there. I think that may have changed now. It was run by religious people in the sense that the bishop who was the Rector and the hierarchy of the school were all religious, not all, but for the most part were religious, and many of the instructors were religious, particularly in philosophy and religion. But there were large numbers of lay instructors as well. There was no one order that dominated.

Q: Either on the island or when you got to Catholic U., did you feel that being a Catholic set you apart from parts of the United States or not or was that true or coming?

DUNHAM: No, certainly not on the island. On Nantucket, I think because of its smallness, you encountered everybody. So for example, I grew up with the son of the Episcopal minister. He was a friend. We had a few black students in the class. Everybody mingled. I think it was too small of a place to have a distinction.

Q: This is, in my reading of this, this is about the time this whole thing no longer became an issue but I know in New England before, I am not a Catholic, but I remember going to Boston University in '54 and '55 and with the name Kennedy, I realized girls were chalking me up for what I was in religion. To me this was just not an issue, but I was surprised. I think that was dying.

DUNHAM: You didn't have a sense of that at all growing up. Again I think it was because the island was just too small for that. I mean you have to interact with everybody. You saw everybody. So to maintain distinctions like that it just wouldn't work.

Q: But in New England prior to this, there really had been in some places.

DUNHAM: If I could add something since you mentioned Kennedy. My grandmother, my father's mother, was an Irish immigrant. I never sensed from others or from her that she had ever been discriminated against, which if you talk to Boston Irish, you get a real sense that there were folks that would not give them opportunities.

Q: Oh absolutely, no Irish need apply.

DUNHAM: So again on that front I never had a sense. My decision to go to Catholic U. was not based on religion. It was based on the fact that I wanted to go to college in Washington, and that was the school that I applied to and where I was accepted.

Q: Well while you were there, this was both Vietnam and civil rights were major issues that were sweeping, particularly student bodies. How did these impact on you?

DUNHAM: At Catholic U., the student body wasn't as politicized or as energized as they were at some of the other schools in the district. People used to say we were complacent. So there wasn't a strong anti-war movement there. I don't think there was a strong movement towards civil rights. Perhaps towards the end of my time there some of the newer students coming in might have been a little more politically active. But the first

couple of years while I was there people were cognisant, I am sure people had opinions, but they weren't really vocal.

Q: Well now you were taking international relations. Did you find yourself concentrating on any particular field?

DUNHAM: Well for the first couple of years it was very general. You know, you have to get a background. That was very true of the whole curriculum at school. As with my high school training, you found there were certain core courses that you had to take if you wanted to graduate in this program, and Catholic U. was the same. After I left that changed, and you were given much more latitude. But my first couple of years particularly I was required to take either Latin, Greek or math. So I took Latin. There were a certain number of history credits. You had to take a philosophy course. You had to take a religion course, and then you got to take a couple of courses in your major. As time goes by, I can't say that I really specialized in anything. One thing that had an impact on my studies was that after my first year, they changed so that you no longer had an international relations major.

They folded the international relations department into the politics department, and so you became a politics major. You actually had to start taking courses in politics. I would say my background was more general than specific.

Q: How did Washington, being in the heart of let's say politics, particularly coming from an island and all of a sudden you are in the middle of the political center of the states. Did that affect you much?

DUNHAM: Well it was very exhilarating. First of all just to get out and see the city and take in some of the sights. I had been here before, when I was in high school. Traditionally our high school senior class would come here for a trip, so I had traveled here for that. Probably, initially it was just getting out and seeing things and taking in the public buildings and all of that. Catholic University was a little removed from downtown. Back then, there was no subway system, so you had to take the bus downtown which was a bit of a journey. So to come down on a daily basis would have been a little difficult. But certainly on the weekend you could do things. Then I did some volunteer work for Hubert Humphrey when he was vice president. A friend and I volunteered in his Capitol Hill office. They just had us stuffing envelopes and doing mail and all, but it was fun, and it was interesting to be on the hill and to see the various senators and congressmen as they were walking around. I stuck mostly to my studies while I was here.

Q: How about race relations. How did that hit you?

DUNHAM: The city, let me ask you in what respect?

Q: Washington and the area you were in is a large black community and also it is the time that the civil rights movement was really cranked up. You were a college student, and how did this...

DUNHAM: Well it was interesting in terms of the set up of the city and how various neighborhoods were either all white or all black. The area that Catholic U. was in traditionally had been pretty much of a mixed neighborhood. The Brookland community had had a large number of Irish. But while I was in school, there was a very large Italian community in Brookland. There was even an Italian store not far from the university. So I think there was a little bit more of a mixture in that part of the city than there may have been in others. Obviously for somebody like me coming from a place like Nantucket you sense the difference. But it wasn't threatening, we didn't feel threatened. There were times you had to be careful. There were occasional stories about people being mugged or attempted muggings. Although personally I never had any trouble in the four years that I was at Catholic U. We routinely would go from the school down to the Brookland neighborhood which is about five blocks away. There was a pub and a sandwich shop where we would go. We would go at night, and during the day there was a grocery store, drug store, dry cleaners, all of that. So it was just a matter of watching yourself as you would in any other major city. But I didn't really feel strong racial elements.

Q: Well by the time you were getting up to 1971 or so, did you have any idea what you were up to?

DUNHAM: I felt that I wanted to go to law school. I started applying around. My grades at Catholic hadn't been the best. I did enjoy my four years there. After my second year I joined a fraternity and I became very involved with the fraternity and became president my last year. So a lot of my activities were focused on my responsibilities there. By the time I was graduating I applied to a few law schools. That was the time also when everybody wanted to go to law school. So it was a little more difficult than it had been previously. I wasn't accepted right away, so I went back to Nantucket. I worked one winter up there. My father had passed away by that point, so it was probably a good time for me to be home. I worked in the post office, which is what I had done for the summers while I was going to college. I spent a year there, and then I decided I wanted to get away, so I took a job on the mainland in a bank and spent a year renting a house with some friends of mine who were going to U-Mass. Then after that I attended law school here in Washington. I started at the International School of Law, an appropriate name. That eventually became the George Mason University School of Law.

Q: What attracted you towards law?

DUNHAM: A couple of things. We had a neighbor who was a lawyer. We knew him pretty well. I thought at one point I might like to get into politics. I thought that might be a good preparation for it. I also liked law. It seemed very logical to me. I just liked the idea that there were absolutes and you applied these rules and things and came up with solutions. One of the courses that I enjoyed most in high school was geometry, and another in college was logic, because you had certain principles and you extrapolated from there. I think it was that, that really drew me to it.

Q: How did you find law school?

DUNHAM: It was challenging. I had to work very hard. I had to study very hard. I enjoyed it; I found it interesting and had a number of very good teachers. So it was a broadening experience. After my first year I started to work, and I worked at the Justice Department in the anti-trust division, which I did until I was ready to take the bar.

Q: Was the draft a problem?

DUNHAM: No, I grew up with asthma. That was one reason why I was never involved in sports in school. So when it came time for me, I was called for a physical and was declared 4-F. So that really was not an issue.

Q: The law school was three years?

DUNHAM: Actually I went days for two years and then when the opportunity to work at the Justice Department came up they told me that I would have to work pretty much full-time there. So I thought it would be a good opportunity, I will learn something along the way and there will be some résumé value in this, so I made the decision to continue to go to school at night.

Q: That is pretty rough isn't it?

DUNHAM: At the time it seemed manageable and it was, although I wouldn't want to do it again. But I do recall very vividly going to work and going to school and then coming home at night and transcribing my notes. Making them legible and briefer so I could use them to study for exams. So it was a bit of a challenge. You know I spent weekends studying too, which was a new thing for me.

Q: The anti-trust, what was your impression of the Department of Justice at the time?

DUNHAM: Oh the department at the time, this was back during the Ford administration. I was very impressed with the people with whom I worked. The lawyers there were very bright, very good people. They were excellent. The section that I worked in didn't handle specific cases. We were the section that kept all the pleadings for the various other branches. We were sort of the resource center for the anti-trust division. So I didn't get involved in any case specifically. But I was very impressed with the people who worked there.

Q: Well, did you pick up is there sort of an attitude of oh we are out to get these people or we are out to see the law is done fairly, aggressive. Did you get any feeling for what the soldiers were out there doing in the law field.

DUNHAM: I didn't sense zealousness. Maybe it was because I was just dealing with them in a particular capacity. The sense that I had, and it has been true of other places that I have worked in government, is that these are people who were very bright, who were very hard-working, and who were folks who wanted to do a good job on behalf of

the government. I don't know what drew them to the job originally. Maybe the reason they joined the anti-trust division was to go and break up big companies, but the sense that I got from working with them on a day-to-day basis was very much the one I got working with foreign service officers. That is that certainly they wanted to uphold the law. They wanted to see the law was followed, but they were professionals.

Q: How long did you work there?

DUNHAM: About 2 ½ or 3 years.

Q: When did you get your law degree?

DUNHAM: '77. I took the bar in Virginia.

Q: Well what was this pointing you towards?

DUNHAM: When I finished, after I got my degree and passed the bar, I felt that I would like to get involved in international trade. I started looking around for a job in that area. So I sent a résumé over to the Customs Service and was interviewed and hired. I began in the Office of Regulations and Rulings. That office is distinct from the general counsel's office which is relatively small. Regulations and Rulings was responsible for a number of different things. The tariff classification of all imported merchandise, the valuation of that merchandise, writing regulations. There also were some esoteric aspects of customs law that we administered. Essentially the office handled administrative law related to customs work. You may know that customs back then was part of the Treasury Department, so our main boss was the Secretary of the Treasury. The Commissioner of Customs ran the agency, but everything that we did was vetted through Treasury.

Q: At that time, I know things change, were tariffs designed, customs regulations, was this designed to raise money or to limit stuff coming in.

DUNHAM: It was really designed to protect the domestic industry. By the time I arrived, tariffs were a very small source of income for the United States, and I don't think the focus was on money raising, although when we wanted to spend money, we would always point out that we were a revenue raising agency. Tariffs were based on how the import would affect the domestic economy. To give you a couple of examples. If you were importing in raw materials and they were going to be manufactured or refined in the United States, there was virtually no tariff on them. But if you were bringing in finished goods, the tariff could be much higher, particularly depending on what the goods were. Textiles were heavily taxed or the tariffs were particularly high because there was a big domestic industry. Certain electronic equipment as well was heavily taxed because there was still a domestic industry.

Q: Nixon was particularly focused on textiles because this is where he was building his base in the south which had been Democratic before and he was turning it into a Republican stronghold. Textiles were a major item, and he responded to that.

DUNHAM: In textiles, clothing was the major area where you had issues. I didn't deal in that area. I dealt with miscellaneous items, certain types of equipment, things like that. I did that for a year, and then I spent a couple of years writing regulations which was not the most desirable job in the customs service. People thought it was boring and routine and didn't offer the challenges that some of the other jobs did. But I learned a great deal about writing during that time. We wrote for the Federal Register. Every agency that publishes in the Federal Register pays to have its items published. You pay by the word, so there was a real incentive to be concise and succinct. I worked for two people who were very cognoscente of that fact. So as a result, I perfected my writing skills under their supervision.

Q: Were you aware of sort of political trends or somebody would come running in and say, "Oh my gosh, the rabbit farmers of Texas are being affected by something or other, that sort of thing?"

DUNHAM: You were. When I was a junior attorney, I had one case in particular which involved imported automobiles, and their re-classification. They weren't actually automobiles; they were little trucks. They were having quite an impact on the domestic market. So a decision was made much above my level that these needed to be reclassified under the tariff schedules, and that was done and I wrote the conforming regulations.

Q: Well after doing this, then what?

DUNHAM: I was there for six years. I had done a couple of rotations within the unit which was the custom.

Q: This is all within the treasury.

DUNHAM: This was all within the customs service, all within that one office of Regulations and Rules, but there were probably 100-150 attorneys divided up into six or eight different sections. The practice was that you would work a year at a time in a number of these sections and gain some expertise. Then as the more senior jobs came up, you could move up and specialize more. I had done three rotations. I had done classification. I had written regulations, and I was in the process of doing valuation work, which was related to the classification part, again having to do with tariffs. I had been there for six years, and I began to feel that I wasn't being challenged. I also felt that opportunities for advancement were limited opportunities. So I made a decision to look around for other work. At that point I had to decide whether I would stay with the government or leave. That was critical because I had reached a certain point on the government pay scale where I need to leave for the private sector or commit to a career in government. I thought about going with a law firm. I thought about a couple of other opportunities. Then out of the blue, the opportunity to work in the protocol office came up. I had a friend who worked over there, and she mentioned that there was a fellow who was going to be leaving just for a year on a temporary assignment. He was going to take a detail to the Sinai to work with the peace keeping observers who were there at the time.

This was in 1983 I believe. At that point they were looking for somebody to come just for a year and work with the protocol office. They were looking for somebody with a legal background. So I applied for the position. I interviewed with Selwa Roosevelt who was chief of protocol at the time, and I was selected. With her assistance I was able to secure a detail for a year from the Customs Service to the State Department protocol office. I started working in the section known as Diplomatic and Consular Liaison in '83, on a one year detail. After the year was up – I think I started in May—they extended me for a couple of months. And, in the course a colleague retired, and they hired me into his position. I became a full time State Department employee. That was in 1984.

Q: I would think that there would be a real problem in a place like the customs office as an attorney where after awhile the challenges I would think have all been solved. I mean this is true in a lot of jobs. The challenge is just not there. Was this prevalent, I mean were people peeling off?

DUNHAM: I think you are right in the sense that at a certain point people started to leave. I would attribute that to the fact that when I started, I was part of a group of 50 or 60 young lawyers who were hired by the Customs Service to work in this area. For one reason or another they were increasing the staff, so there were a lot of us who were recently out of law school who were joining the office. For many of us it was our first job out of law school. So it was very exciting and interesting time with a lot of young and enthusiastic people. As I said, we would rotate around so you got some experience, but the work did start to become a bit repetitive after awhile, and that wasn't going to change after a certain point. You weren't going to do much that you hadn't already done. In addition to that in any organization there is a pyramid, so you reach a point on pay scale which is a nice point, but it becomes harder and harder to rise. So you have to start looking for other opportunities, and a number of people reached that point. I would say that probably 30 or 40 people left, around or at the same time I did.

Q: Did you feel any change in the political tides of who is the commissioner for customs or not? Did this make much of a difference or not?

DUNHAM: No, not really. The difference you felt was more the difference in personality. When I started, the commissioner was a man named Chasson. He had been a Carter appointee. Then there was a new commissioner appointed, and his name was William von Robb. Chasson was not a high profile person. Von Robb on the other hand had a higher profile. He was quoted very often in the newspapers. He particularly seemed to emphasize the law enforcement aspect of customs work, drug interdiction and things like that, so certainly I guess his presence was felt a little more than some of the others. But politics, no.

Q: Well how did you find protocol? This had to be quite a change wasn't it?

DUNHAM: There were a couple of things, one subtle. I went from working at a sub agency, or a part of a larger organization, to the main agency, the headquarters. So that was different in terms of the way things were done. Even though the State Department

had a clearance process, I was dealing much more directly with the principals than I had been at Customs. It was a different mission. You were dealing with people of a different focus. Even though in my area at customs I was dealing primarily with lawyers, the mission of the agency really was law enforcement. So that was the kind of support you were providing. In protocol, the mission was diplomacy. The other thing that was different for me was that at the customs service my work was mostly internal. I did occasionally have dealings with lawyers from outside, but most of my work involved research and writing; that sort of thing. I might have had contact with people by phone or exchanged letters, but I didn't have the kind of personal interaction that you had at the State Department. Also, working in the customs service we were not allowed, for conflict of interest reasons, to accept gifts from any source. Not even lunch. Whereas, at the State Department if you are dealing with foreign embassies, part of doing business was to socialize with people, and sometimes it involved a lunch. Sometimes an embassy would want to make you a gift of a bottle of wine from their country. So that was different. I will never forget. Early on at State I got to know a diplomat, and he said, "Oh I would like to send you over a bottle of wine." I said, "Well thank you very much, but I don't know if I can accept." He said, "Oh I am sure you can." I said, "I will look into it," and sure enough I could. It was that kind of thing, so there was to some extent a cultural difference.

Q: Well your first boss was Selwa Roosevelt.

DUNHAM: She was the chief of protocol at the time I was hired. I worked directly for Richard Gookin, who was the associate chief of protocol and headed up the section where I was working.

Q: How was he?

DUNHAM: Richard? Just an exemplary person. Richard had a reputation in the diplomatic community and throughout the State Department as being one of the best, so it was a great experience for me to have the opportunity to work with him.

Q: Well what were your responsibilities?

DUNHAM: Initially I was hired temporarily to sit in for the person who was responsible for dealing with diplomatic incidents. That included criminal cases, abuses of diplomatic immunity, non payment of bills, landlord tenant disputes, things like that.

Q: Parking?

DUNHAM: No, not parking because the Office of Foreign Missions was responsible for that. I should point out, I came to Protocol in '83. In '82 the Office of Foreign Missions had been established to handle the privileges that were extended to embassy personnel. When I arrived at State, OFM was just starting to gin up its operations. But that included issuing motor vehicle license plates, titling the cars, issuing tax exemption cards, and dealing with parking violations.

Q: Diplomatic immunity too.

DUNHAM: We dealt with diplomatic immunity in protocol. We continued to handle that function.

Q: Was Hampton Davis there when you were?

DUNHAM: He had retired. Hampton had been Richard's predecessor, and had retired by that time, although I got to know him very well.

Q: Hampton worked with me in Athens, I think it was.

DUNHAM: I didn't realize he had served overseas.

Q: He had.

DUNHAM: We brought Hampton out of retirement to work on a special project.

Q: Well let's start with your first job, what sort of things were you dealing with?

DUNHAM: Generally as I said, the issues related to immunity. It is hard to remember specific cases, but I will tell you of one, which for some reason always stood out in my mind, and it happened early on when I got there. Of course it took me a little while to read in and to learn certain things, so I started with some pretty mundane stuff. But at one point, Dick Gookin gave me a note which had come in from the Embassy of Austria, where the son of the ambassador had received a notice to register for the selective service. Although there was no draft in effect, they still had a process where young men had to be registered. Of course this is inconsistent with the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. So it was my job to research the convention and find the appropriate provision, and to prepare a letter for the Selective Service Administration advising that sons of diplomats can't be required to register for the draft, and also prepare a note to the embassy informing them that the matter had been taken care of. The reason that it stands out in my mind is because subsequently that ambassador eventually became the president of Austria. It is one of those little things that sticks with you, probably because it was one of my first diplomatic cases. After that, I became involved with occasional landlord tenant disputes, mediating matters between the parties; cases involving immunity, where a diplomat or family member breaks the law. The State Department has a well established procedure for dealing with those cases. They are not swept under the rug by any means. I also got involved with some of the representation work of the office, meetings, greetings and escorting ambassadors to the White House when they presented their credentials. Occasionally greeting high level visitors at C Street, helping out at receptions or dinners or things like that. So very early on I was engaged in the overall operations of the office.

Q: Well I would think that some of the things that would come up would be on some of the countries which were really pretty new to the sort of diplomatic game coming in, and there would be almost a training element wouldn't there?

DUNHAM: We did not provide training per se. However, occasionally might do some counseling. You might have a case where something happened and you would have to explain to the ambassador or the DCM that in the future if they were to do something this way as opposed to another way, it might work a little better. I remember when I first arrived in the office, there were cases of people who just didn't quite understand how to take care of property, particularly appliances. Maybe they weren't used to working with modern appliances so the dishwasher wasn't used properly, or the stove wasn't used properly. Maybe the property wasn't maintained properly or the yard wasn't cared for. In the scheme of things a lot of it was petty, but it was important to the homeowner. Sometimes there were misunderstandings as to the obligation of the tenant. So to some extent there were some cultural differences that had to be bridged and some counseling was required. One of our greatest assets then and now, is an organization that operates out of the Meridian International Center known as THIS. It was founded in the 60's to help newly independent countries and their diplomats become acclimated to life in the United States. But, they have always been very good at working with spouses particularly. They have been helpful in establishing personal relationships with people where you can offer suggestions and guidance.

Q: I am looking at the time. I think this would be a good place to stop. We will pick this up the next time and I will be asking you about some of your earlier experiences. You know one often hears the horror stories from our diplomatic colleagues, Foreign Service ones who rented to diplomats and found that their property was badly damaged or at least claimed to be. Could somebody refuse to rent to diplomats because of reputation and that sort of thing? And then we will move into other State business and things of that nature.

OK, today is Friday the 13th. Larry, do you want to address the thing the problem, how much did you get involved in the problem of people who rented to diplomats and how often these diplomats, what they did to property and all that.

DUNHAM: In the diplomatic and consular affairs division of protocol, which is where I worked throughout my whole career, we handled a range of issues including abuses of immunity, both civil and criminal. Over the years we were responsible for mediating disputes between landlords and tenants. It came up occasionally with unpaid rent, damaged property, things of that nature. We also handled unpaid bills and other civil-type cases, where because of the individual's immunity, the claimant was precluded from seeking redress in court. In terms of the real estate issues, we had a few over the years, various types. I remember one of the earliest cases involved a woman wanted to curtail a lease on a house for personal reasons. She had rented a house to a European diplomat. The lease was for a three year period and she wanted to terminate it after the second year. She apparently had become ill, needed some money, and wanted to sell the house. She had tried to negotiate with the diplomat to leave the premises, and he was adamant that he

wouldn't, so she came to the State Department to see if there was anything we could do to help. I think eventually the diplomat did agree to curtail the lease. However, I don't think he was very happy that the State Department got involved in the process.

Q: Well did you get involved, one always thinks of the poorer countries that come here, and you know their employees and officers were not always, at least it would appear they would not be as disciplined as ours. If you are an American Foreign Service officer and you do something abroad, you bloody well better be responsible for paying up or something. But did you run across problems with particular countries or sometimes their people not paying their debts.

DUNHAM: We handled a number of different kinds of cases. We were talking about the real estate cases. We did have a few over the years where there was damaged property. I think I alluded last time to the fact that in some cases, and these were fairly new countries, the particular problem seemed to be that they might not have been familiar with some of the kitchen appliances which were not used according to directions and were damaged. There were a couple of cases where there was damage to the property. It might have been because families had children or a number of children. Doors for example, pulled off the hinges. There was one case of cigarette burns in the carpets of a home. It appeared that people had parties and folks just dropped their cigarettes on the floor. Sometimes there were cases of improper maintenance. We had one case which involved a diplomat who was required to maintain the heat in a house at a certain level during the winter to make sure the pipes didn't freeze. He went off for a two month period, the heat wasn't properly regulated, and the pipes froze. We had another case where the yard was supposed to be maintained. There were trees and shrubs that needed to be cared for, and they weren't and became diseased and died. So there were cases like that. Then there were occasional cases where people left without paying all of the rent, or they left with property damage that exceeded the security deposit.

Q: Well how were things resolved?

DUNHAM: Through a process of negotiation for the most part. In most cases if the diplomat was still there, we would call the diplomat in and bring the landlord together with the diplomat to see if they could come to some sort of mutually agreeable solution. Generally it was just a process of just trying to push the two sides to an agreement. As we say, offer our good offices to both sides and see if we could nudge them along to an agreement. In cases where the diplomat wasn't there, we would call in the ambassador or the DCM, depending on the size of the embassy, to see if we could get some sort of arrangement with them. Sometimes the embassy was the cosigner on the lease. In those cases the embassy would have a liability. Other times it was an individual's liability and we would have to ask the embassy to contact them and point out these debts were outstanding. We would remind the embassy that non-payment could have an impact on the person's ability to come back to the United States at a later date.

Q: If I were say a Foreign Service officer in a foreign country, and I didn't pay my rent, and I left. If the embassy was not a co-signer, the embassy would have, could just shrug it off and say OK that person may not be able to come back, but that is that.

DUNHAM: In some cases the embassy would say, "You know, this is a personal responsibility, and we will inform the person and the foreign ministry," and that would be the extent of it.

Q: Now, I am an American living in Washington DC and I have a house. I put it up for rent. If a foreign diplomat comes I would be very leery to rent to a foreign diplomat. I wouldn't want to quite frankly. Particularly a country that I knew, maybe to a British or a French diplomat because I knew the embassy would stand behind, you know it is a disciplined Foreign Service. But let's say it was an African Foreign Service officer, and I had been around the block and I knew that these were not, I mean one, they are poor countries and two, their Foreign Service were maybe not as disciplined, where ever it was. So if I turned it down it would look like I am saying oh I don't want a black person to get it, when actually it was because I didn't trust the native from Senegal say. What happened there?

DUNHAM: A few points: First of all we had problems with a variety of embassies. We didn't have a large number of them. But you would be surprised every now and again at which embassy would present a troublesome case. For example I said one of the cases involved a European embassy. Another one involved an English speaking country where we had a difficult landlord tenant problem which took a long time to resolve. Finally the landlord ended up trying to sue the tenant in his home country. Secondly, there are steps that a prudent man could take. First, you could always ask for a written waiver of the diplomat's immunity, which can be placed in the lease. Of course if it is waived they can't resort to that protection. Secondly, you can always ask that the embassy co-sign the lease, which makes the embassy liable as well. Then the embassy would be subject to suit under the Foreign Sovereignty Immunities Act. Another thing that people often do would be to call the Protocol office in advance. While we couldn't predict the future, we would advise if we had a number of civil cases pertaining to a certain country. Another thing that I would advise landlords to do was to ask for a higher security deposit if they had any concerns about renting to a diplomat. So that they would have two months or three months rent in escrow in case there were a problem.

Q: I would think this would cause a problem if somebody wanted to raise the case on civil rights or discrimination. It could be a Norwegian or something. But if you are saying this is a foreigner and I am demanding this, that and I wouldn't do this as an American.

DUNHAM: Well the reason is if you rent to an American, you have recourse. If there is a problem you can sue them. Whereas, if you rent to a diplomat, you can't do that. So you know, I think it is equitable.

Q: I am just saying there wasn't a problem under the law that if you demanded this, there are all sorts of laws that landlords can't discriminate against one section.

DUNHAM: It is not discrimination based on race. It is an honest transaction. The landlord in a case like that is just trying to insure his investment.

Q: Well I call up and say this man is a diplomat from country X, and you look through your files and find there have been a significant number of problems with country X. Were you under any constraint about divulging this, and what happens if I hear that and I don't want to rent to that person?

DUNHAM: That is your prerogative.

Q: You can say no.

DUNHAM: Sure.

Q: I am just wondering because we have got so many laws trying to avoid landlords...

DUNHAM: Again you are not talking about racial discrimination or gender discrimination. You are looking at this and saying that it doesn't appear to be a good business transaction.

Q: So that was so that despite the fact that it was a middle eastern or African or Oriental country, all these could be a lawyer could say we are talking about racial problems, but this wasn't something that could be used.

DUNHAM: I think you would look at it, at least I would, more in terms of checking somebody's credit rating to determine whether you are taking a risk by renting to them.

Q: I got you. Ok, I am not sure if it was in your time or not but there was a horrendous case of somebody from, was it Ukraine or one of the former Soviet countries of an automobile accident. Did that come up in your time?

DUNHAM: It did.

Q: Could you explain what it was.

DUNHAM: Definitely. I wasn't primarily involved in this case. Matters involving motor vehicles were and still are handled by the Office of Foreign Missions. Since the Foreign Missions Act was passed in '82 (OFM was up and running in about 1984-'85), they have handled responsibility of registering motor vehicles, issuing the license plates and issuing driver's licenses. As a result, they also had responsibility for dealing with motor vehicle related infractions which included parking tickets, moving violations and in this case, incidents involving allegations of driving under the influence of alcohol. Now in this particular case, the diplomat involved was the deputy chief of mission from Georgia.

Apparently the accident occurred late one evening or early in the morning, I think it might have been in the spring or early summer. The diplomat was driving down Connecticut Avenue. Just as you get to DuPont Circle, you can either go under the circle on Connecticut Avenue, or to your right where there is a short exit ramp which brings you right up into the circle area. He was apparently going very fast. They estimated that he was traveling at about 80 miles an hour. He had been drinking; there is no question. He was intoxicated. He mistakenly got into a lane that took him up into city traffic. When he came up off Connecticut Avenue into the intersection, there were three or four cars backed up at a stop light. He came up and smashed into the back of that lane of cars with such great impact that he pushed one car forward and actually pushed another one into the air. That car came down upon another car and killed one of the occupants and injured another. There may have been people in other vehicles who were injured as well. So that was the case you are talking about. Now in that instance the diplomat actually had to be brought to the hospital to be treated as well. The incident was highly publicized. I am sure there were reporters on the scene because it was just so horrific and so graphic. They were taking photos of it. It was reported on the news the next day. The State Department asked the local police to conduct a thorough investigation of the incident and gather all the information and to provide a report to the State Department. That report was transmitted by the State Department to the prosecutor in the jurisdiction with a request, but for immunity would you bring an action in this case? If the prosecutor comes back with an affirmative decision, as happened in this case, the State Department requests a waiver of the individual's immunity so that he or she can be prosecuted locally. Now in this case, as I said I was involved tangentially, but I was aware of what was going on. So a waiver was made to the ambassador, a written waiver was presented to him. The Government of Georgia took it under advisement. In addition to the formal request which was presented to the ambassador, Secretary Christopher called President Shevardnadze and made the request orally to him. Around that time as well, Congress was considering a financial aid package to Georgia. There was some discussion on the Hill as to whether or not this would be approved if the waiver weren't granted. Eventually the Georgians to waive Makharadze's immunity. He went to court and pled guilty to charges. He was sentenced to something like seven to 21 years in jail. I don't know whether he was fined also. He started to serve his sentence in the United States. Subsequently, the Georgians acceded to a treaty, or established a treaty, with the U.S. allowing for the exchange of prisoners in U.S. jails to serve their time in their home country. He was transferred to Georgia and was serving time in jail there. I don't know whether he is out or not. In that case a waiver of immunity was granted and justice was served. In addition, in accordance with the Foreign Missions Act, all diplomats are required to have to have motor vehicle insurance, and he had motor vehicle insurance. I am not certain what happened on the civil side, but I am sure that an arrangement was made with the family of the girl who was killed, and perhaps with others who were injured.

Q: Well now, you have a consular side. I am an old consular officer. That is my background. I remember back in '76 I was with the senior seminar and we used to travel around the country. We each were supposed to have a project. I made my project early on, I interviewed foreign consuls about their experiences in the United States, because nobody had ever done this before. I wrote an article on this. But did you find sort of the

problem of consular cases? I can see a citizen of Sierra Leone say getting into trouble in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Police there all of a sudden they get a foreigner, and they are supposed to inform the embassy. I can imagine the sheriff of Tulsa has never heard of an embassy. I don't mean to denigrate a smaller town or something but anyway what was our impression of this?

DUNHAM: Now you are not talking about consular immunity in this case.

Q: We are not talking about consular immunity. We are talking about a citizen of a foreign country gets into trouble, and as an American consul abroad, I expect to be informed about any American who gets into trouble.

DUNHAM: So you are talking about consular notification and access.

Q: Yeah.

DUNHAM: Protocol was not involved to a great extent with that issue. It was actually something that the Bureau of Consular Affairs managed. However, because we had a certain degree of liaison responsibility with local police, when we went out to meet with them or to educate them in regard to diplomatic immunity, we also would point out the requirement under the Vienna Consular Convention to provide notification and access to foreign consular officers in the area. This came to a head in the late 90's or 2000 when there were a couple of very high profile cases involving foreign nationals who were sentenced to the death penalty in the United States and whose governments challenged the fact that their consular personnel in the U.S. weren't notified early in the course of the proceedings. In one case, and I forget which government it involved, the United States had to appear before the International Court of Justice in The Hague. There was an issue, and it also involved the Supreme Court, on the appropriateness of the death penalty in the case. There was a question of whether failure to notify a foreign consul officer could be considered the same as failing to advise someone of their Miranda rights. The U.S. was sued in the International Court of Justice for failure to make the appropriate notification.

Either as a result of these cases or just before, a decision was made in the Department that an outreach officer would be appointed to liaise with the local police officials, and make sure that they were aware of this requirement. The outreach officer was assigned to the Bureau of Consular Affairs. We tended to work very closely with that person in our own diplomatic immunity outreach program, because protocol and OFM already had a program for going out and educating local police authorities. The consular affairs person was brought into our outreach program and subsequently the Department published a booklet regarding consular notification and access, and produced a video tape which was given to police officers throughout the country explaining consular notification and access. These were very similar to a publication and a video which had already been produced on the subject of diplomatic immunity.

Q: I remember talking to the Mexican consulate in Chicago or something. They have a huge Mexican population in Chicago. I wouldn't have thought it but they do. This is back

in the 70's of course, but saying that they weren't being informed an awful lot of their citizens who were sort of in a very marginal position. Maybe they weren't here legally or something, and in a way didn't want to get to the attention of the diplomatic establishment, or just that the police picked them up and treated them as they treat just anybody in the United States.

DUNHAM: The issue became much more serious after your time. By the 90's of course, the Mexican population in the United States had grown, as did the foreign population generally. There were many more visitors coming to the United States then there had been back in the 70's. So this was a very serious problem. Among other things, the Department provided a number of standard waivers or standard statements in about 30 or 40 different languages which the local police could just hand to a person they thought might be a foreign national, and say this is information regarding your right to have your consulate notified of your arrest. They would ask the individual to sign it indicating that they had seen it. There was also a standard form that they were given to fax to either the local consulate or the embassy advising of the detention. In the pamphlet the State Department put out, we have a listing of all the consular offices throughout the U.S., as well as a listing for embassy addresses, with phone numbers and fax numbers. In connection with consular notification and access, there are two different procedures. In one case there are a number of countries where the United States is required to notify the nearest consulate or the embassy when one of its nationals is arrested. There is no discretion. We have to do it. In the other case it is discretionary with the foreign national. He or she must be advised that his or her consulate may be notified of the detention, and they have the option of requesting notification or not.

Q: Why would there be a division?

DUNHAM: Because the United States chose to negotiate special agreements with certain countries. The Vienna Convention requirement is a discretionary requirement. The Vienna Convention says that law enforcement authorities must advise a foreign national who is detained in a foreign country, that they have the right to have their consulate notified. That is the blanket notification language. The United States chose to negotiate agreements with certain other countries where the notification would be mandatory. I don't recall the list of countries with which we negotiated such agreements, but I suspect that requirement had to do with the cold war and wanting to make sure that we were notified if our nationals were detained in any of the Soviet Bloc countries. At any rate, there are two different procedures, mandatory and discretionary. So to cover both, the Department put together this book to insure that the authorities A. were informed, B. they knew the distinction, and C. they were in a position to comply.

Q: I imagine you had to work very closely with both Consular Affairs and the Office of Foreign Missions. During your time, how did you find relations with those ones and was there a change because of administrations and personnel?

DUNHAM: I came to protocol in 1983, that coincided with the establishment and the staffing of the Office of Foreign Missions. That was an interesting time.

Q: Let's talk about the establishment, as you see it, because from the outside who looked at this, it seemed to be sort of a product of in a way the cold war. You know a tit for tat type of thing. Would you talk about this?

DUNHAM: Sure. First of all I should say the Office of Foreign Missions was established by legislation which was enacted in 1982. I was not in the Office of Protocol at the time. I was working at the Customs Service. I didn't have any first hand knowledge of what went into the decision to establish the office. But my understanding, from conversations after the fact, was that there had been Congressional concern that we weren't strictly applying reciprocity in our dealings with the Soviets. And this was brought to a head by the fact that the Russians were given a choice piece of property in Washington upon which to construct their embassy. It was a very strategic location on a fairly high point in the city.

Q: Near the National Cathedral.

DUNHAM: Exactly.

Q: It is the highest point in Washington.

DUNHAM: There was concern that we needed to be stricter in the application of reciprocity in dealing with the Russians and Soviet satellites. So, the Foreign Missions Act was passed. I am not the authority on this, and when you get around to it you should interview some of the people who were working in the Office of Foreign Missions at the beginning. But the act itself was designed to do two things. One, to insure reciprocity in our dealings with all countries, not just with the Soviet bloc. And two, to enhance national security. Among other things after the Office of Foreign Missions was established, and of course the legislation is general, there were regulations that were written and after internal directives which were prepared. As a result of the act, the Office of Foreign Missions assumed certain functions that had been performed by the Office of Protocol up until that point. They were generally divided between privileges and immunity. The immunity aspect of protocol stayed with the Office of Protocol. The privileges aspect was transferred to the Office of Foreign Missions. As you can appreciate, at least initially, there was some friction between the two offices in coming to a determination as to what would go and what would stay. But in general terms, the privileges ended up involving review of foreign government requests to locate and build facilities in the United States, also embassies, residences and consular offices. The Office of Foreign Missions also took over the issuance of tax exemption cards, the registering of motor vehicles and issuing of license plates, the processing of duty free entry requests by foreign diplomats. There was also some friction between the Office of Foreign Missions and the embassies at this time because the procedures that the U.S. government started to follow in these cases changed. For example, tax exemption became very contentious. A lot of European countries have a VAT tax.

Q: That is a value added tax.

DUNHAM: Exactly. A determination was made that we would reciprocate. This became very contentious, because the Europeans claimed that they could not eliminate the VAT tax at the point of sale, which is what we were doing in the United States. Here, you would buy something and you hand the merchant a tax exemption card. They can very easily deduct the tax from the purchase. The problem with the Europeans was that because the value added tax was incremental, and is added at various stages of the process, it couldn't be eliminated or deducted at the point of sale. As a result, the U.S. Government determined that as these countries were not going to find an easy way for us to avoid paying VAT tax in their country, they were going to pay sales taxes here. That became very contentious.

Also, instead of diplomats receiving local license plates, either in Virginia, Maryland, or the District, based on the location of their residence, the Office of Foreign Missions started issuing a very distinctive U.S. government license plate. In the process it began to enforce restrictions relating to the operation of motor vehicles, which were imposed in various countries. For example, in some countries if you were a diplomat, you could only register two vehicles in the country. So that rule was enforced reciprocally in the U.S. There were some countries where it was impossible to buy a U.S. made vehicle for either safety reasons or environmental reasons. Rules of that nature started to be enforced in the United States. As you can appreciate, this was a contentious time with the diplomatic community because a procedure that had been in effect for many years changed and there was a certain level of discomfort along the way. OFM also began to define benefits or privileges which were going to be regulated under the Foreign Missions Act. Driving was deemed to be a benefit, not a right. So OFM started promulgated regulations relating to the operation of the motor vehicle that hadn't been in existence before. It also began finding ways to enforce the payment of particular moving violations by diplomats because they couldn't be required to appear in court to address a citation for a moving violation. The Office of Foreign Missions also took over the function of issuing driver's licenses to diplomats and others.

The legislation governing the Office of Foreign Missions didn't address specifically the division of authority between the two offices. There was an inspection of both the Office of Foreign Missions and the Office of Protocol in 1984 which settled the division of responsibility. In 1984 both offices were inspected simultaneously. One of the preliminary recommendations of the inspectors was that all of the Protocol functions related to privileges and immunities be turned over to the Office of Foreign Missions. But through a process of negotiation with the inspector general and the undersecretary for management, a decision was made that protocol would retain the immunities aspect of its work, which included the accreditation of diplomats and consular officers and the handling of cases involving abuses of immunity, such as the cases that we talked about, both civil and criminal. However the Office of Foreign Missions would be given a general role in the accreditation process. That involved participation in a panel that we established called the Accreditation Review Panel which set broad policy for accreditation. It also was agreed that they would have a role in some of the civil cases that we were dealing with, and with the criminal cases. They were asked to clear on some

of the work that we did. In that way, the Office of Foreign Missions was bought into the process.

Q: OK you were both government workers and one of the things I am trying to document are these impressions of thoroughly informed governments in the ___ but also governments working in a bureaucracy. It strikes me that the Office of Foreign Missions was established. This was basically the Congress getting mad at what had been done to us by other governments. I understand because I have served in other countries. I understand exactly where they are coming from.

DUNHAM: The legislation was intended to deal with that precise issue, that is the U.S. government needed to place greater emphasis on reciprocity in its dealings with foreign countries. I think another important point about the Foreign Missions Act is that it gave the State Department tools to use in enforcing reciprocity, which it didn't have before the passage of the act. That is a very important point, because up until that time, when Protocol was handling these issues, they were trying to act reciprocally, but they didn't have the same degree of leverage that the Department had after the passage of the act. Once the act was passed, the Department was given additional tools to use in this area. This signaled a change in attitude on the part of the U.S. government. Also, in accordance with the foreign missions legislation, a determination was made that there would be somebody from the law enforcement community working in the Office of Foreign Missions. Either the director or the deputy director of the office had to be a member of the law enforcement community. Although the first director was a Foreign Service officer, he was on the job for about a year or so. Subsequently the next director was brought in from the FBI. He had been a counter intelligence officer. So there was a much stronger law enforcement orientation after that. In handling the privileges and the reciprocal aspects of the privileges, there was a much tougher attitude taken by the Office of Foreign Missions. On the other hand, the argument related to Protocol maintaining the immunities was that the extension of immunities is not reciprocal at all. It is a blanket grant, and it is something that you don't want to bring into the realm of reciprocity because you don't want to have foreign governments dealing with immunity in a selective way. The feeling was that Protocol was well able to handle this, not only because you didn't want to give that function to the office that was doing tit for tat as they say. But also because Protocol had a reputation for handling things in a non-confrontational, smooth, very diplomatic manner. That is the approach that you want to take in dealing with cases involving abuses of immunity. Not that Protocol wasn't effective. It was very effective in those cases. In dealing with them, you didn't want to create issues where they otherwise wouldn't exist.

Q: When you came in, did you find that as part of your work, or maybe the work of your office in Protocol. You were having to smooth sensitivities and say wait and let's work on this and all. In other words, there is no point in riling up people over maybe almost non issues, but just an attitude on the part of the Foreign Missions Office or something. Was this in the equation at all?

DUNHAM: To some extent yes. Not so much myself personally, although when I was with members of the diplomatic community I would hear grouching about what the Foreign Missions Office was doing. But I do know that there were ambassadors who came in to see the Chief of Protocol on this issue, and ultimately the dean of the corps came in to present a demarche, the EU ambassador came in separately. I know they also came in to speak to the Under Secretary for Management, under whose responsibility the Office of Foreign Missions operated. So, there certainly was a sense of discomfort in the diplomatic community, not only because things that hadn't been reciprocal or hadn't been handled on a strictly reciprocal basis in the past now were being handled reciprocally, but also because there appeared to be a lack of tact in the way that this was being done, and maybe the Office of Foreign Missions was being overzealous in carrying out their responsibilities. Also in their communications with the embassies they were less than diplomatic. In fact one of the outcomes of these demarches by embassies was that a decision was made by the Under Secretary for Management that Protocol should clear on all of OFM's outgoing notes to make sure they were not offensive in their presentation.

Q: I can just see. One can support the idea of this tit for tat stuff because basically we had been made the patsy in a lot of cases. OK, fellows, if you are going to do this to us, we are going to do it to you. Which is fine but you had to make sure we didn't over offend our friends and all that.

DUNHAM: Yes, and that was an argument that many of the embassies made. They would say, "Wait a minute guys, we are your friends." The OFM did take a very hard line in interpreting, for example, how to deal with some of these tax issues. There didn't appear to be much room for negotiation. In some cases these countries did end up relinquishing their tax cards, because they couldn't deal with the VAT issue.

Q: Well I know a really major issue. About this time or a little earlier I was consul general in Naples, and in Italy for years, we are talking about decades now, consular employees, the Italians weren't declaring their income. We weren't informing the tax authorities. Of course when, I am not sure if this is part of this procedure, but all of a sudden it was said, "Well you have got to tell the Italian government how much you are paying your people." I mean we had people, we lost a lot of very significant employees because they quit before the word came out because they owed hundreds of thousands of dollars. This is not just in Italy but elsewhere, because all of a sudden the embassies had to tell how much we were paying.

DUNHAM: I think this was true in many cases. Because of the U.S. Government's new emphasis on reciprocity, I suspect there were instances where foreign governments which had been turning a blind eye or winking and nodding, or whatever, went back and said wait a minute, now you are doing this to us. You can't cut us any slack in this area, so we are going to have to look at the arrangement we had here, even though they weren't exactly reciprocal. I think it did inspire some of these governments to become creative.

Q: Well I suppose that over time, you were there at the beginning of this thing. This was when the rough edges were there and sort of the new people on the block were coming in,

and by God we are going to stick it to these guys. The first ten years or something, it takes a while for these things to work their way out. I suppose you have got people where today it is not quite that issue.

DUNHAM: It is interesting. You are right. So many of the people coming in initially were zealous. It is great to see it as it progresses. The dust has settled now. I think part of the difficulty was there were foreign diplomats serving here who had been experiencing a certain type of treatment. That was changed, and they were subject to a certain amount of pain. Now diplomats coming in know up front that this is the way it is going to be, that this is the routine now, and it is accepted.

Q: Had somebody been keeping track in protocol before in certain countries. I think there were a couple of Latin American countries that were named that had an inordinate amount of liquor being bought without tax. It was quite obvious that this was being sold to supplement the income of the ambassador or the admin officer or somebody like that. Was this apparent?

DUNHAM: Not to me, but again this probably preceded my coming to in the Office of Protocol. But I think generally today you can say the issue is a factor. Today the questions being raised have more to do with productivity. Why does it take three weeks to get a tax card? Why can't I have it the next day? That sort of thing. And the relationship between the Office of Protocol and OFM became very close. After we got through the growing pains in the Office of Foreign Missions, after it was settled they would have their responsibilities; we would have ours, and we established procedures, we started working very closely with the office, and our staffs started working very closely. By the time I retired which was probably a good 20 years after the birth of OFM, we had an excellent working relationship.

Q: It is sort of a bureaucratic thing. You could see the clash and then the thesis, the antithesis and then the synthesis is in operation. OK, let's talk about state visits and that type of thing. That is where your real work was, wasn't it?

DUNHAM: Well actually my work was dealing with privileges and immunities. Just to summarize, I was responsible for agrément for foreign ambassadors, which involved some interesting cases, and maybe we could talk about those at a certain point; accrediting diplomats and consul officers throughout the country; opening embassies; opening consulates; establishing relations with countries; breaking relations with countries; closing down embassies. Those were my primary responsibilities. I would like to talk about at some point, some of the cases we had involving abuses of immunity because some of them are interesting.

Q: Well, why don't we talk about that now, and then move on to state visits, opening and closing embassies and that sort of thing.

DUNHAM: Just to finalize this thought, I was involved with state visits and official visits, and with some of the ceremonial aspects of Protocol's work. This happened as I

became more senior in the office. From January to June of 2001, I served as acting chief of protocol, so I had responsibility for the overall supervision of the office. But over the years, I experienced a steady increase in responsibilities for areas outside of my primary duties.

Going to abuses of immunity, I think there were probably three or four interesting cases. Until I arrived there, there was an informal procedure for dealing with abuses of immunity, both civil and criminal cases. On the civil side as we discussed, matters would be brought to our attention. On the criminal side, something similar happened we would rely on the police to bring matters to our attention. We would receive a report and call the ambassador or a senior official from the embassy in and deal with it. In about 1984, or so, there were a couple of very highly publicized cases involving abuses of immunity. Actually, the one I am thinking of occurred before I got there.

Q: Well anyway,

DUNHAM: This is significant. You might have heard about it. The son, in fact, it was the grandson, of the Brazilian ambassador at the time was involved in the shooting at a nightclub, a sort of gentleman's nightclub, in DC. He shot the bouncer at the nightclub and hit him in the shoulder. The victim's name was Kenny Skeen. That case became highly publicized because the police brought the son to the police station and booked him. Then they found out that he was a diplomatic dependent and that he had diplomatic immunity. They blacked out the record. This made the press because the bouncer went to the media and complained about it. Before the State Department could intervene, the dependent was removed from the country and sent back to Brazil. Through a process of negotiation, the State Department was able to secure an ex gratia payment, a certain amount of money for the bouncer, where the government of Brazil or the family made a payment to the victim to cover medical expenses, lost earnings and pain and suffering. He received a payment in connection with this incident. Because the dependent was never prosecuted because of his immunity, and perhaps partly because of the way the case was handled, there was a tremendous hue and cry about "diplomatic immunity." This case was featured on "60 Minutes," by the way. About the same time, there was a book which was not terribly accurate, called Diplomatic Crime, written by an investigative reporter. As a result, by the time I got to Protocol there was a lot of public sentiment against diplomatic immunity. This was reflected on the Hill as well. Senator Helms on the Senate side, and others on the House side, I think Steven Solarz, sponsored legislation which would have a tremendous impact on diplomatic immunity. The original legislation would have limited the number of people in the United States who would be entitled to diplomatic immunity. It would have placed a cap on eligible diplomats. There were other elements in the legislation which the State Department thought would have a highly negative impact on our ability to do business overseas. So the Department took a position against this legislation, even though there was public support for it. Chief of Protocol Roosevelt testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in connection with the legislation. She testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in connection with a companion bill. There was a lot of activity in our office during that time. We were commenting on the legislation. We were preparing op ed pieces for the newspaper. We

were writing letters to the editor to rebut erroneous articles that had been printed. We wrote a lengthy article for the Foreign Service Journal. We were involved with others in the Department who had concerns about the bills. I think AFSA testified against the legislation, as did the Foreign Service spouses association. So we were very much involved with this. We thought it was going to be devastating. Nevertheless, it passed both the House and the Senate. So George Shultz went up and met with Tom Foley who was then the Democratic majority leader, (he was yet to become Speaker of the House) to try to reconcile the matter. As a result of their meetings, a determination was made that the offensive provisions would be pulled out of a larger bill. It was part of a huge bill, one of these omnibus bills that covers all kinds of things. This was done with the understanding and agreement that the State Department would prepare very specific regulations for dealing with abuses of immunity. As I said at the outset, there were no State Department regulations governing how we handled incidents involving diplomatic immunity. We had an informal procedure which we followed. Subsequently we came up with regulations which essentially codified existing procedures. But we did have to agree to do certain things, and these were worked out with members of the House and particularly the Senate foreign relations committee staff. There was a woman in L (Bureau of Legal Affairs) who was our legal advisor at the time. She worked with the staff members on the Hill and with Protocol and OFM to devise the regulations which eventually were published in the FAM and are followed today.

Q: FAM is the Foreign Affairs Manual.

DUNHAM: Correct.

Q: It is basically a list of our regulations and procedures on how to deal with issues.

DUNHAM: Correct. But because of this there were certain procedures that we had to follow. Subsequently there were a couple of big cases that came up which were handled in accordance with the FAM guidelines. We had one case where a fellow who was staff level member at a European embassy, entitled to criminal immunity, took a gun from the embassy. He went down to Florida by bus. He got down there, and he went to gay bars,

Q: Let's say homosexual because terminology my change.

DUNHAM: These were bars where homosexuals hung out. On two successive evenings he went to a bar and he picked up somebody, and he went to the beach with them and shot them.

Q: Good God!

DUNHAM: Yeah. It was quite frightening. The Florida police (I think this was in Fort Lauderdale) were very concerned because they thought they had a serial killer on their hands.

Q: Where was he from?

DUNHAM: Which country? It was Belgium. (This was publicized at the time.) He went to these bars and he picked up men on two successive nights. He murdered them on the beach. So the authorities were very concerned. Of course the police were on the lookout for this person. Within the gay community in the area there were warnings. Then out of the blue, early one morning this fellow approached two police officers in a patrol car. It was about 1:00 in the morning. He approached the officers who were just sitting in a parked police car and he said, "You know I am the guy you are looking for. I want to turn myself in." The officers took him to the station, and started to book him. As identification, he showed them an ID card issued by the State Department that said he had diplomatic immunity. At that point, they called our duty officer (protocol has a 24 our duty officer who is available to handle inquiries from the police in cases like this). The duty officer called me at home and got me out of bed, saying, "Larry, the police in Florida have a man who has just confessed to committing two murders. He has diplomatic immunity. What do we do?"

The Vienna Convention is quite clear that even though people may have immunity, if they appear to be a threat to themselves or others, or there is a chance that they might commit the crime again, they can be held pending a determination as to how to handle the matter. In this case the man actually had told police he was prepared to go out and kill others, I had no problem telling them they could hold him until we could determine what to do with him. I went to work early the next day and called the embassy as soon as it opened.

Q: The Belgian embassy.

DUNHAM: Yes. I spoke with my counterpart, explained what happened, and said, "You know we really need a waiver of his immunity so that the police can continue to hold him." Within a very short period of time (we did have to prepare a written request), the Belgian government waived his immunity. It was done before COB that day.

Q: COB is close of business.

DUNHAM: Correct, that day. The police were able to hold him temporarily. Over the next day or so we were able to negotiate a complete waiver of his immunity so that he could be prosecuted in Florida. The sticking point for the Belgians was the fact that Florida still applied the death penalty in some cases. They had recently executed people. The Belgians didn't enforce the death penalty any longer. Their concern was if immunity were waived, that he would be put to death. So the lawyers at the State Department got in touch with the prosecutors in Florida. After the prosecutor determined that he wouldn't ask for the death penalty, the Belgians waived immunity. The fellow was prosecuted and convicted and he is in jail now.

Q: You know it sounds like a case that this man was mentally unstable. I mean what you said, it doesn't sound like a rational person.

DUNHAM: You may be right, and quite honestly, once the decision to waive was made, I no longer was involved with the case.

Q: You washed your hands of it.

DUNHAM: It no longer was a matter for the Protocol Office. I went on to other things. But that was one of the more notable cases that occurred during my tenure.

Q: This must have been quite a shock to the Belgian embassy wasn't it.

DUNHAM: It was, but they were very responsive and very cooperative as well. There is another case that stands out in my mind, and if I wrack my brain there will be others, but this was one involving an ambassador. This also was publicized. A number of years ago there was a fine man who was ambassador of Nepal. One morning I got up and put the news on and there was a report on television about him being picked up for shoplifting. The incident hit the news before we even learned about it at the State Department. In that case the ambassador had gone to a book store. Allegedly, he had taken a book off the shelf and brought it out to his car. He claimed that he had taken the book from the store to his car because he had a letter in the car which had been sent to him from his daughter. She was in medical school in another country. She apparently had written to him asking if he could buy a book in the United States which wasn't available where she was. Something like Gray's Anatomy. He said that he had left the letter in the car and wanted to bring the book out to the car so that he could check the title against his daughter's letter. The store clerks felt that he was shoplifting. They went out to the car and brought him back and called the police. I understand a call went out over the police scanner, which was monitored by one of the local television stations. They sent a reporter to the store and he interviewed the clerk subsequently. The clerk gave him the information related to the story and the incident. Before we could get a police report and process it according to our procedures, the incident was reported on the news. It was also publicized in the newspaper and, of course, the Nepalese foreign ministry found out about it. They recalled the ambassador and fired him. He never got a chance to present his side of the story.

Q: I would think though that dealing with this sort of thing, it could end up with real problems because actually diplomats are people and we all have the same thing. Wives of diplomats getting mad at their husbands or husbands getting mad at their wives and all of a sudden something which is essentially a family matter gets into the realm of protocol. Did this happen?

DUNHAM: Oh yes. We had one very interesting case where a diplomat had two wives. The wives got into a fight and came to blows. The police were called to the house to separate the two of them. Nothing more ever came of it.

Q: What happens, you know in some countries you are allowed to have how many wives you want or something. Has this entered your procedures?

DUNHAM: It did. It was an accreditation issue. Over the years we had a few diplomats with more than one wife. I think the most was three. In those cases, the embassy would provide documentation that these women (we never had a female diplomat with more than one husband, but we had male diplomats with more than one wife) were legitimate wives. We would accept all of them. However, we would have the embassy designate one spouse who would be listed in the Diplomatic List. That spouse was given privileges and immunities as a wife. The other spouses would be accepted as dependent members of the family forming part of the household. They would also be given privileges and immunities.

Q: While we are on that subject did you hear about the king of Lesotho or one of those African countries who had 20 wives or something on visits? Was this ever I mean would you sort of treat it the same way?

DUNHAM: It was not an issue for Protocol because the procedure for extending immunity to heads of state is not spelled out in the Vienna Convention. It is not an accreditation issue. When a head of state visits the United States, under generally accepted principles of international law, heads of state, members of their families, and members of their traveling delegations are extended immunity from prosecution while in the host country. They don't have to be formally accredited to us in the way diplomats are.

Q: Well I wonder here, on state visits and other things, I think this might be a good place to stop, and we can pick this up the next time, sort of make notes to yourself of state visits and any other cases of immunity that come to your mind, and then let's talk about the opening and closing of embassies when they come in because this can be quite a procedure and then changes of residence. I had an interview with somebody sort of on the minister side, but Mike Boorstein, the Chinese embassy. I am sure there are other ones as well. Another thing, we certainly in the early days relations like the cold war with the Soviets. Say we caught a Soviet diplomat's wife shoplifting or something like that. The Soviets would tit for tat us with maybe a trumped up charge. Did you run across this sort of thing happening, more hard line things and how are these dealt with.

Today is 20 July 2007. A famous date, the attempt to kill Hitler. Well we have got a number of things. One thing this came before we move on. Did you run into any problems I use "slave" type situations. You know what I am talking about don't you?

DUNHAM: We had allegations over the years of mistreatment of domestic servants. In each and every case that came to our attention we would investigate the allegations. Generally they weren't allegations of slave labor, so to speak, but there were allegations over the years of situations where domestics were brought into the country and they weren't paid according to the employment agreement or perhaps the living conditions were not appropriate or consistent with the proper standard. In these cases, we would call in an official from the embassy to inform the government and resolve the matter. In many of these cases by the time a complaint was filed, the domestic had left the employment of the individual. In some cases we were able to secure financial arrangements for them. In

other cases, they were happy just to be out of the employment arrangement and did want to pursue things. One of the greatest problems we encountered in these cases was when the domestic was no longer in the employment of the alleged offender, they weren't inclined to cooperate with us.

Q: OK, well let's go on to state visits. Can you talk about some notable state visits and how you might say various administrations you were with dealt with these.

DUNHAM: Certainly. First of all, as you may know a state visit is the highest level visit the United States government can offer.

Q: You might sort of go through the ranking of visits.

DUNHAM: The designations vary sometimes from administration to administration, but generally there are State and Official visits. The State visit is accorded the head of state. An Official visit is accorded the head of government. They are really very similar except for a few minor details. The level below that would be what we would call an official working visit. Then below that there might be what we would call a working visit. Below that there is a private visit. Generally speaking there are four categories of visits. State visit being the highest level of visit we can offer to a foreign leader. That would include a welcoming ceremony on the lawn of the White House. People have seen those on television - where the president and the visitor get together on the lawn of the White House. The president actually meets the visitor and spouse upon their arrival at the White House. Thereafter there is a review of the troops, playing of national anthems, and both leaders make remarks. Then they go into the White House for tea or coffee and maybe a 20 minute chat. Later in the day there is a luncheon at the State Department which is known as the State Luncheon, hosted by either the Secretary of State or the Vice President. That evening there is a State Dinner at the White House, which of course is a black tie event hosted by the president and the first lady. That includes entertainment following the meal. Other events may be included. Sometimes the leader will address a joint session of Congress, he or she may lay a wreath at the tomb of the unknown soldier at Arlington. The embassy will organize other events related to the visit. In addition, there may be a reciprocal event hosted by the leader at the embassy or at some other location, but that is not always the case. An Official visit as I said is very similar. The routine is the same. The only difference is it is extended to a prime minister or a chancellor.

The State visit usually will include an invitation to the visitor to stay at Blair House, which is the president's guest house, for a certain number of days and nights. Of course they are hosted by the U.S. government so all their needs are looked after. They also can use the building to host events of their own if they choose.

Q: Was there any problem between State Department protocol and White House protocol? I mean how did you all work together?

DUNHAM: We are one in the same. The chief of protocol is the chief of protocol for the United States.

Q: Ah, well that makes it very handy.

DUNHAM: Both as the president's chief of protocol and as the chief of protocol for the State Department. He or she is the chief of protocol for the United States. Our offices are in the State Department. We work very closely with the social office in the White House, which of course, arranges all of the events that take place at the White House, and generally has a hand in anything the president or the first lady would do outside of the White House as well, so our interaction would be with organizations like the social office at the White House, or if the president is traveling overseas with the White House advance office.

Going back to visits though, an official working visit would be a visit where the leader would come at the invitation of the president and be invited to stay at Blair House. Generally the stay isn't as long as it would be for a State visit or Official visit. An official working visit generally doesn't involve the pomp and ceremony of a state or an official visit but it may include a small working dinner with the president or a small working luncheon. Then we have working visits which are similar to the official working visit. The leader might be invited to stay at Blair House or might choose to stay at a hotel or his or her ambassador's residence. A private visit is when a leader makes to the United States for private purposes. They may come here for medical treatment. They may come here to accept a degree at a college or university. They may come for a special exhibition at a museum. This would not include a visit with the president. They come purely for private reasons and for one reason or another no meeting with the president is scheduled. In general no meetings with other senior government officials are scheduled. So this is something they do for their own reasons. The protocol office tends not to get too involved in private visits.

Q: I understand the Queen of England comes over from time to time for the Kentucky Derby and the horses, things like this.

DUNHAM: Generally, private visits are not uncommon. We also have leaders who come for medical treatment. We recently had a leader who came to Baltimore for treatment at Johns Hopkins. We have many leaders who come for college commencements and events like that.

Q: Well just for somebody who is unfamiliar with this, who kicks off a state visit for the prime minister or the King of Norway or something like that? How does that work in the system?

DUNHAM: The invitation comes from the President because the leader is going to be a guest of the United States government. So the invitation is always officially extended by the White House. There is a process, and I think it is done either quarterly or semi annually where the State Department will send to the NSC recommendations for leaders

who would come on State visits or on working visits. A memo would go to the White House two or four times a year with recommendations as to who would be invited and why they should be invited for a particular type of visit. Then that works its way through the NSC and ultimately a decision would be made as to who would be invited for what type of a visit.

You asked how these visits are handled from administration to administration: I started working at the protocol office during the Reagan administration, and during that time there were generally perhaps 10 or 12 state visits a year. It seemed like we would have one a month except during the dead of the summer, when everyone went on vacation. Then we would have two or three official working visits during the same month. So you could have an average of four visitors coming in to see the President during the course of a month. Back then, maintaining a tradition which had been established much before that, a State visitor would not only have the State day I described at the White House and the State Department, but also travel around the country for maybe as long as a week or ten days at U.S. government expense. I can remember when I first came to State, we had the State visit of the President of Austria which had been the first time in our history that an Austrian president paid a State visit to the United States. In addition to being received by the President and the first lady as I had described the U.S. provided him a plane and he and his delegation traveled throughout the United States for another week. They went to New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and San Francisco before returning home to Austria. So during the Reagan administration we would have a visit like that every month. When President Bush became president, the first President Bush, "Bush 41", a determination was made that a State visit would not include the travel throughout the United States, so thereafter a visitor who was invited for a State visit would be received by the President and first lady in Washington and accorded the treatment that I have described, but if he or she wanted to travel throughout the United States, that would be done at their own expense. We would not coordinate the visit. We had a number of visits during the Bush administration as well. They were very active. The Clinton administration took a different approach, and initially the visitors were all at the official working level. So we didn't have a State visit until I think a year into the Clinton administration. Then we had them, but they weren't quite as frequent as they had been previously. During the next Bush administration, "Bush 43", the president did invite the president of Mexico fairly early on for a State visit to Washington. However, there have been very few State visits since then. I believe that there have only been four or five in the term of this administration. That reflects the style of this President. He receives a great many visitors. They have a lot of working visitors, so he sees many leaders generally hosting them for a small luncheon or dinner. But he prefers not to host leaders for the Black Tie events. The type of visit that we extend to a leader very often reflects the style of the president and the first lady.

Q: Well I would think that maybe things have changed so much with people traveling and all, but there would be real benefits for some leaders who aren't familiar with the United States to get out and see things. To see the breadth of the country and the complexity of the country and all that. For some who have not traveled much, I am talking about foreign leaders, I think not doing this would sort of remove an arrow from our quiver, not just impressing but educating foreign leaders.

DUNHAM: Well certainly they can do it on their own. The State Department would provide guidance and suggestions, but I think the determination was made that when the President travels, generally, he goes only to the capital when he is paying a State visit to a country. The feeling was that in reciprocating, a State visit to Washington was appropriate.

Q: Well there is a cost factor. Let's say that the president of Bulgaria comes on an official working whatever it is, and has never seen the United States, would you get together with the Bulgarian embassy or did somebody get there and say you know it might be a good idea to do this. I can call Joe so and so. In other words arrange for the Bulgarian president or what have you to get out and see some places that could be significant.

DUNHAM: There are a number of ways this would work. Once the invitation has been extended and the leader knows what type of visit he or she has been invited for, they probably would want to talk to the American ambassador. The embassy here probably would want to talk to the country desk officer and to protocol to formulate an itinerary given their goals for the visit. When a leader comes here, they want to accomplish certain things. The next thing to do would be consider what resources might be available. They may have a major American company which is investing or interested in investing in the country which could perhaps help sponsor some events. They may have a community in a certain part of the United States which would invite the leader to come there. They might be able to help underwrite the expenses, I suppose there are certain other organizations that may be helpful.

Q: We are talking about State visits. Most of them I am sure go off very well, but in an oral history thing you say okay well that is how a regular State visit works. Were there any State visits from hell that you had to deal with?

DUNHAM: Not really. First of all there is so much planning and so much coordination that goes into it, and you touch so many bases, and retouch them in the process, that things tend to work pretty well. There was one event, it wasn't a state visit, but one event I would like to tell you about that is historic: it went well, but it was the biggest single event we had hosted in Washington and that was the 50th anniversary NATO summit in 1999. that included both the leaders of the NATO countries, the North Atlantic Council member states, as well as a group from the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council which is called the EAPC. Partner states who were somewhat participants in NATO. It was the largest gathering of foreign leaders in Washington at once up until that time. There were over 50 of them, which was an incredible feat. It was organized over a one year period. The military was actually brought in to assist with the planning. There was a retired general who was the coordinator, and then there was a State Department retired ambassador who was the associate coordinator. I can remember the months and months of planning that went into that and the many meetings that we had to put it together. We housed people at about 10 or 15 different hotels. Each of us who were participants, I was a junior participant, but I was given three countries with which to coordinate, Turkey,

Finland, and Sweden, and was responsible for organizing all of their activities. It was a huge undertaking, and shut down the city for that weekend. Employees were given the day off from work. The streets were closed. Everything slowed down so that they could put this together. However, around that time things flared up in Yugoslavia, and a decision was made that instead of having a ceremonial meeting with black tie events, it became a working event. There was to have been a parade, which was cancelled. Business type events were substituted for the black tie events. The focus was on the business meetings. I would underscore the degree of planning that went into it.

Q: How did you deal with okay, the president of Turkey is coming in. You know there is going to be an Armenian protest. Very well organized. I am talking generic. No matter what country comes, some one is going to protest. Armenians are particularly well endowed in this ability. How do you deal with that?

DUNHAM: That primarily is a security issue. Of course every leader who comes into the United States is protected by the Secret Service. Each leader has a Secret Service detail leader who coordinates the visit. The Secret Service is very well organized. They are prepared for every contingency. They have their own playbook which they put together for each leader. So they would work with the local police to make sure if it was going to be a demonstration, the demonstrators would be held at a certain distance, and they would be monitored. During that visit I was with the Turks most of the time. If there were protesters, I didn't see them. Of course there were a lot of venues the protesters couldn't get to. For that particular visit, the summit meetings were held in the old Departmental Auditorium, which is on Constitution Avenue, which was closed to traffic so you couldn't get within a couple of blocks of the building. The social events were held at the White House. Even though Pennsylvania Avenue was open at that time (this was before September 11), people couldn't get close to the White House. So there were very limited occasions where the president was actually in an area where the public might get to him. We did have one case many years ago. I think it was the Ethiopian president who was visiting. One of my colleagues, a protocol officer, was walking with the Ethiopian delegation accompanying the president into I believe the National Press Club, where he was going to give a speech. My colleague got pelted with stones by some Ethiopian demonstrators. So protocol can have its hazards. I think the leader was fine, but my colleague got hit in the head with a rock.

Q: Speaking of difficulties, of course one always picks out the other team. I remember talking to somebody who was involved in protocol way back when. You had leaders like Sukarno and Nkrumah and all. Sukarno was notorious for sort of devouring a young blond stewardess a night. I asked, "Well what does protocol do. Sukarno was a very iffy person and we were trying to warm him up." The answer was, "Well there is somebody in the police department who could sort of act as supply officer." Did this ever come up, not necessarily with you our recruiting, but covering up or dealing with these problems?

DUNHAM: It never came up in my work in the office, no.

Q: What about the problem though of you had delegations coming and some of the, either a member or the wife of some dignitary comes in and sees something that he or she can't resist and tries shoplifting and things, or getting drunk, inappropriate behavior. Did you have to work to smooth things out of this nature, or did it happen?

DUNHAM: It didn't happen in my experience. When a leader and a spouse come to the United States they are more in a bubble. Their movements are almost all programmed according to a schedule. When they travel, they generally travel with an entourage. They have security people with them; they have their own people. Generally they are going to very well organized events. They are there for a limited amount of time. So it is an in and out, do your thing, sort of affair.

Q: You never had the mise, Mr. and Mrs. Ceausescu of Romania? Apparently you almost had to count the silverware, not only in the United States but other places they were.

DUNHAM: I didn't have that experience. I had experiences where leaders from certain third world countries would go on shopping sprees here. I heard stories about them bringing an extra airplane so that they could carry back the things that they bought. But it was a situation where they actually paid for the merchandise and took it home with them. I did have a colleague who referred to Imelda Marcos as the "patron saint of Bloomingdales".

Q: To be objective about this I think it was early on in the Reagan administration I have heard stories about when they would send advance teams out to prepare for him to go to Germany or something, our embassy were quite, I mean these guys and women too were a little bit extravagant in buying cars and trying to have them sent back. You know, all sorts of going wild at the BX.

DUNHAM: I never traveled on one of those trips. However, because I mentioned the special cases aspect of our work last week. That involved making sure that the embassy's bills got paid. Very often before a foreign leader was coming to the U.S., if we knew the embassy had outstanding bills in Washington, we would call the embassy and say, "You know, before your leader comes to Washington, you might want to take care of these bills." That always seemed to be a very opportune time to make that suggestion because there seemed to be a lot of money in the pipeline coming from a the country at that time. I didn't see it personally, but a Secret Service agent told me, on one occasion he was traveling with a third world country on a visit. When it was time to check out of the hotel, a member of the traveling party went to the front desk and as the clerk was adding up the bill, he opened a suitcase full of money and paid him in cash.

Q: Well did you go on any protocol trips?

DUNHAM: I traveled once with the president when I was acting chief of protocol.

Q: Who was president?

DUNHAM: President Bush 43 -- to the Summit of the Americas in Quebec. Then I traveled on a number of occasions with what we called presidential delegations. They were groups going overseas to represent the president. I traveled to Madagascar to celebrate the 25th anniversary of their independence. I traveled to El Salvador with a group that was monitoring elections there. I traveled to Turkey for the funeral of President Ozal. I may have done one or two others.

Q: How did you find that? What was your role in these?

DUNHAM: When the president traveled to Quebec, I was the acting chief of protocol, so I handled the responsibilities that the chief of protocol normally would handle on a trip like that. In Quebec, the president had a number of bilateral meetings with foreign leaders, so it was my responsibility to help organize those meetings. Now they had been set up in advance of course. In that case the foreign leaders came to the hotel where we were staying. The U.S. delegation took over the Lowe's Hotel in Quebec. We had the whole building. Leaders were invited to the hotel to meet with the president. It was all done on one afternoon. I think it was the Friday afternoon when we arrived in Quebec. So it was my job to greet them at the hotel entrance, bring them to the meeting with the president, make introductions and then escort them out at the end, dealing with anything that came up in the way of protocol issues. In that case the president had a series of three group meetings with various leaders. We did have a little problem that day because, of course, all of these things movements were being choreographed. There were leaders coming and going throughout the city to get there. As is very common with summit meetings now, a whole area in a city was cordoned off. Within the secure area, only people who had credentials for the meetings could move about. Anybody else was kept out of the secured area. In Quebec there were a lot of protesters who had gathered for the event. Some of them were able to breach the security area. So we had a situation where President Bush was in meetings with one group, and the leaders for the second meeting had arrived and were holding in a big room before their meeting with President Bush. Canadian security stopped all traffic and closed down the whole area because these protestors had breached the secured area. The police told us there would be no travel within the secured area until they could get the protesters out. So the participants for the second meeting were ushered in to see the president; that was not a problem. That meeting continued. But the leaders who were coming out of the first meeting couldn't leave the hotel, so we had to hold them there. I think we had to hold them for an extra 20 or 30 minutes so the Canadian police could deal with the disturbance. As it happened, Hugo Chavez was in the group of leaders we had to hold. We didn't have a very large holding room, so we quickly had to find another space in the hotel. We were able to arrange for a larger room and able to arrange for refreshments for the leaders while they waited. But I had to make an announcement that they would be delayed leaving the building. I did it through an interpreter. I spoke in English and she interpreted into Spanish. At that point Hugo Chavez decided he'd like to banter with me and he piped up and said, "You are telling me we can't leave the building?" "Yes, I am very sorry but we are advised by the Canadian police that this won't be possible for a little while." I explained the situation. He said, "You mean you are holding us hostage here?" I said, "Well no, Mr. President, I am not doing anything of the sort. We have been advised by

the police that for your own safety we have to ask you to stay here because it is not a good idea for you to leave right now.” He went on in this manner for about five minutes. He seemed to be having a very good time with me. Then at the very end, he just threw his hands up and started to laugh, very loudly -- a big belly laugh. Then, he walked up to me and put his arms around me and give a big bear hug and shifted me form one side to the other and patted me on the back and had a good laugh. Then he went off and had a Coke or a Pepsi or something. Then when it was time to go, we let everybody go, so that was my most memorable experience in Canada.

Q: Well, you have got a new era of these summit meetings where the heads of the European Union and then NATO and the Economic 8 and Latin America. For protocol did you have any of those taking place on American soil?

DUNHAM: The only one that I actually was involved with was the NATO summit. Every few years we host the G-8. That happened in Williamsburg on one occasion, during the Reagan Administration but I wasn't involved. Then during Bush 41, there was one G-8 meeting in Houston. Clinton hosted one in Denver I believe. Then President Bush 43 hosted one in Sea Island, Georgia. But I was not involved in any of those. Actually I was acting chief of protocol in Washington during the Sea Island, Georgia economic summit, G-8 summit, and President Reagan died while that was going on, so I was involved in helping organize his funeral arrangements here in Washington, DC.

Q: Well what does the chief of protocol do when you have the president die? I mean you sort of have to muster all forces don't you?

DUNHAM: The Military District of Washington (MDW) is responsible for coordinating the arrangements for state funerals. They handle all of the ceremonial events that occur in Washington. I had been involved with the funeral of former President Nixon, which was technically not a state funeral. It didn't have all of the attributes of a state funeral, which involved a ceremony in Washington, lying in state in the capitol and so forth. After that funeral, which was I guess you would call it an official funeral, a decision was made by the then chief of protocol, that protocol should maintain liaison responsibility with the military district of Washington in connection with state funerals. When President Nixon passed away, which was during the Clinton Administration, it had been 20 years since we had had a former president die. The previous state funeral had been President Johnson which occurred in Washington in 1973.

When Nixon died, we really hadn't been preparing for a state funeral. He died fairly suddenly. We were able to work out all of the details, but we didn't have a game plan. After that funeral the decision was made that we would liaise more frequently with the MDW generally on how a state funeral would be conducted. The understanding was that any former president who died subsequently would have a service in Washington. At this time, I was the senior career person in the office, so I was designated to handle the liaison responsibilities. When the Bush administration came in, the new chief of protocol asked me to continue in that role. Before former President Reagan passed away, we had been having periodic meetings the Military District of Washington, to review in a general

manner what would happen in the event that any former president died. We knew that there would be certain key events which would occur. The body would be brought to Washington. It would be transported from Andrews Air Force Base to the Rotunda of the Capitol to lie in state. There would be a certain amount of time for people to pass in review and pay their respects. There would be a procession to a church in Washington, where there would be a funeral service. So, we had a general idea of what would occur. We were able to prepare draft documents which would be distributed to the embassies when a former president dies. When former President Reagan died, I was able to go into the office with another person, and very quickly put together an announcement of the death, which is perhaps a bit of a formality considering people already knew. But we did that. Then within a day or so we were able to distribute another document which announced the lying in state at the capitol. As you know there is a ceremony which precedes the lying in state. In this case, the Vice president conducted the ceremony, and leaders of the House and Senate spoke. The foreign ambassadors are invited to attend as representatives of their governments. We invited them to do that. We also made the arrangements to invite them to the State Department beforehand and transport them up to the capitol by bus -- it is easier to do it that way rather than having them drive individually -- and because security is so tight, it is much more efficient. So we transported them by bus, and organized them in the rotunda of the capitol. Subsequently we issued an announcement inviting the ambassadors to represent their governments at the funeral, and also to invite delegations from abroad to participate if they chose. I think there were delegations at various levels from over 90 countries. We were responsible for facilitating attendance at the funeral service for all of these individuals, which meant again for the ambassadors, transporting them by busses. For leaders with Secret Service delegations, we coordinated their arrival at the National Cathedral. That, of course, had to be choreographed because there were so many of them. We had one liaison officer who worked with the Secret Service to choreograph the arrivals. After the service the secretary of state hosted a reception at the State Department for the foreign ambassadors and for the delegations who attended. As you can appreciate, we were working constantly from the time we found out that former President Reagan passed away until the funeral service and reception concluded on Friday afternoon.

Q: Well the National Cathedral is sort of your designated church isn't it essentially. For one it is big enough.

DUNHAM: Each president determines the type of service he would like to have and where he would like to hold it. At least in this case, and with former President Ford which I wasn't involved with at the time, that was the choice. Former President Johnson's funeral actually was at another location.

Q: Yeah, I know the church.

Well moving, oh, does the National Cathedral have a professional protocol cadre there too that you go in with?

DUNHAM: They do. The people with whom we dealt organizing former President Reagan's funeral were highly skilled and very professional. As you can imagine MDW had a seating graph prepared, probably worked out with the cathedral, so we knew well in advance how many seats we had for our group and where they would be. We went to the Cathedral the night before the funeral service to put place cards on the seats that were allocated to us. The foreign leaders all were seated according to their protocol rank, then we had a section for other heads of foreign delegations, after that, the ambassadors were seated with the dean of the corps given a seat of honor and maybe one row seated by precedence and then everybody else filled in behind, because there were just too many people to be seated in precedence.

Q: You mentioned the setting up of missions of new countries and changes and all of that. What sort of things?

DUNHAM: That was a very interesting part of the work. When I first came to protocol, I think we had ambassadors from about 140 countries in Washington. That remained constant for a long time. I guess it was in about 1898 1990, we had the breakup of the Soviet Union, and almost overnight we had 15 or 20 new countries to do business with. It was very interesting because the United States government made a decision that we were going to open embassies in all of those countries. That was a priority of Secretary Baker. So we went to great lengths to make sure we were able to establish a presence in all of the former Soviet Union countries. Many of them immediately reciprocated. So it was a matter of trying to cope with an increased workload. Of course there were new country desk officers being formed in the State Department to cover these countries. There was a lot of activity. We worked with the Office of Foreign Missions to help representatives from these countries find space to house their embassies and for residential purposes. Most of them came with just an ambassador and maybe one other person. We worked to get them accredited as soon as possible. We had a couple of rather interesting cases in which people showed up claiming to be representatives of certain governments and yet we had no idea whether they were bona fide or not.

Initially most of the newly independent countries rented space. That made it a little bit easier. I think there was one building downtown that OFM found which was very happy to rent to the former republics. I think five or six of them located right in that spot. It was a good downtown location, and they were able to find space and do business very quickly.

The Soviet bloc countries, the Eastern European countries already had a presence here because they had embassies. Of course once the wall fell and these countries were able to act independently, they wanted to put different people into their diplomatic positions. We had a number of cases where countries didn't want to have anything to do with the Soviet era diplomats and looked outside the existing diplomatic service for their ambassadors. A number of people who were presented to us to become ambassadors and diplomats had U.S. citizenship. It was very interesting. They chose people they felt they could trust but who had U.S. citizenship. So we went through a situation where a number had to renounce their U.S. citizenship in order to take up diplomatic postings. That took a bit of

time and it took a little bit of counseling because for many of these people this was a big step. They were representing new governments. They didn't have careers in the foreign service, and they weren't quite sure what would happen to their careers once they gave up their ambassadorial posts here. We did have one case which was unfortunate, where a man gave up his U.S. citizenship and within about six or eight months, the government changed. The new leader decided not to continue him as ambassador, so he had given up his citizenship to be ambassador for six months. I don't know what happened to him actually, whether he went back home to live or whether he applied for a green card here.

Q: Did you find yourself at all involved with lobbyists, countries that promote wine or promote their country's status or something hire PR firms here in Washington. Did they impact on you?

DUNHAM: In the course of my work, all of the transactions between my part of the office and the government were conducted through the embassy. People who were all notified officially through the embassy. Sometimes they would hire a law firm to advise them in certain areas. We would give the law firm advice, although I always felt it was an unnecessary expense because we could tell the embassy the same thing directly. But we would provide the information always with the understanding that anything officially related to the matter had to be directed through the embassy. One area where protocol did have some interaction with PR firms were with visits. Very often a small embassy would hire a PR firm to help them arrange a visit for their leaders. Again, anything officially related to the visit had to come through the embassy. I know these PR firms often would help them arrange meetings on Capitol Hill and maybe meetings in other places. But for the official U.S. government meetings, those were always handled through the embassy.

Q: Was there anything, it might not have been in your province but when an embassy is established for a new country or there has been a revolution or something, and a really brand new team appears in Washington. Washington for foreigners is an extremely complex place. I mean if you want to be effective, you don't go to the State Department and go to the desk officer or the assistant secretary and accomplish your stuff like you might think. I mean basically you have got to get Congress; you have got to get the media; you have got to if you can establish connections to the National Security Council, maybe the Pentagon. It is a complex world. Is there anybody cluing these people in?

DUNHAM: It is a process of learning on the job for most of them. I agree with what you have said. Every now and again you get an ambassador from perhaps a small country, or one who had never had experience in the United States, and they would call the protocol office asking us to make appointments for them with various offices in the U.S. government. We would have to explain to them that is not the way the U.S. government works. Unfortunately, there are a few ambassadors who never really realized that. I suspect they weren't very effective. Within the diplomatic community there is a lot of interaction, so they could learn from their colleagues what they needed to do. If they had a good desk officer, the desk officer might explain what needed to be done. I remember on one occasion going to the airport to greet a newly arriving ambassador from Africa. The desk officer and I drove out together in my car. The desk officer brought with him a

book that had been written by Hendrick Smith, the New York Times reporter. I think the title is, "How Washington Works." The desk officer gave it to the ambassador as a welcome gift. He said, "You might want to read this. It will help you do your job here in Washington." That is the only time I was aware that happened, and I thought good for him. That was a very helpful thing for him to do. For the rest of them, if they had embassies that weren't attuned to this sort of thing, they had to learn on their own.

Q: Well sort of a classic case, I mean this goes back, it no longer pertains, but you have the Indians and Pakistanis with their long standing conflict. A Pakistani ambassador I think was from the military, retired or something, was around and knew everybody. Really well connected and doing a fine job for Pakistan. Whereas, the Indian ambassador was a high class Brahman or something. But anyway wanted to do everything by the book, do it through the State Department. You didn't talk to people below your rank and all. It meant he cut himself off from the pulse of the community.

DUNHAM: I agree. I know that some embassies would hire lobbyists to help them. The Pakistanis for years had a former congressman, Charlie Wilson from Texas who worked for them as a lobbyist or a consultant. I also remember very well, and this is ironic given what happened subsequently, but the Iraqi ambassador to the United States during the Reagan years, and I think into the Bush years, was a man named Nizar Hamdoon. He was very close to Saddam Hussein. Before he left Washington he wrote an op-ed piece for the post or the Washington Times explaining what it took to be an effective ambassador. He outlined many of the points that you have mentioned. At the time I referred it to a couple of ambassadors because I thought it was very useful. I believe he recommended hiring professionals to help navigate the system here.

Q: Washington again is a complex thing. This is where I think of this interview. At some point people would say go through the internet and call things up can use this as a guide to how things work. In the foreign service we think of ourselves as being able to come into a foreign culture and try to figure it out and how to be effective in it. Well, somebody coming to Washington, even if they are an American coming here, has to figure out the culture. Whom do you see, what do you do and how do you do it.

DUNHAM: It is true. In the course of my work, I participated in briefings at the Meridian International Center for Ambassador's spouses. I did about six or eight of them before I retired. The briefings were for the spouses of newly arrived ambassadors. They organized a panel, and I would talk about protocol. But they always would invite the spouses of two ambassadors who had been here for a while. I will never forget, there was one, the spouse of the Finnish ambassador who spoke on a couple of occasions. They were on their second tour as ambassador to the U.S. by the time she made these presentations. She was very perceptive in explaining to the spouses what their role should be. She told them, "Washington is a very diverse city. You are going to have to learn to deal with many different groups. You need to make sure you read the papers every day, and know what is going on. You need to know which groups are important for your husband. You need to know members of congress, the legislative branch, and members of the executive branch. There are business people you need to know. There are people working at non

governmental organizations you need to get to know. She also said you need to get involved with a couple of charities because this is how you are going to make your mark; hosting events for certain well known groups will bring people into the embassy who are important for you to know. So not only does it extend to the diplomats but it extends to the spouses also.

Q: Well Larry I can't think of anything else to ask. Do you have anything else on your list?

DUNHAM: I want to talk just briefly about one or two things if you don't mind. Going back to establishing relations: I had mentioned that during my years in Protocol, the U.S. Government established relations with a number of the former Soviet republics as well as the Yugoslav republics. But we also broke relations with some countries, which was a very interesting part of the job. Of course it didn't happen very often, but I remember one or two cases in particular. In one case, it wasn't a highly publicized case at the time, but in Rwanda after the president of Rwanda was assassinated at the beginning of the Clinton Administration. Warren Christopher was Secretary of State at the time I remember, a decision was made that we would break relations with the government of Rwanda. As you know, it was a terrible situation, with genocide and mass killings in the country. So protocol was responsible for working with the desk in breaking relations. Of course the decision to do so was made by the White House. It is a decision that is always made at the political level, but it was our responsibility to work with the desk to implement it. Once the decision was made, we were tasked with preparing a diplomatic note to the government explaining the steps we were taking and gave them a time table for winding down business. We invited the ambassador in. The chief of protocol gave him the note. I will never forget, he was totally stunned. He apparently had no idea that this might happen. The chief of protocol at the time explained the situation to him, presented him with a note, and told him that he would be required to leave the country. See explained that the government could leave a diplomat here to wind down relations. The Ambassador had - I think - two weeks to move his family, but the embassy would be given a little bit longer to wind down business. I will never forget. At the end of the meeting he just looked at the chief of protocol and said, "You mean I have got to leave?" She said, "Yes, I am afraid so." I don't know how he did it, but he ended up getting a green card and stayed long after the embassy was closed. It was a very interesting process to see how the department works vis a vis the embassy, and to see how well that is coordinated. The ambassador had been informed that he had been give a short time with which to advise his country. I think it might have been 24 hours. Then, the U.S. made a public announcement that we were breaking relations. We also broke relations with the Yugoslavs at one point. Actually they broke relations with us. That also was during the Clinton administration, and was a result of NATO action that was taken in Yugoslavia. After military action was taken against it, the Yugoslav government made a decision to break relations with the United States. Over a period of several days, we worked out the process of closing down the embassy. In that case of course, they were given the option of finding a protecting power to manage things. I forget whether they designated somebody or not. That was a more complicated process because they had a much larger embassy than the Rwandans had. Of course we had a larger embassy in Belgrade then we

had in Rwanda. The situation on the ground was different too. We had to evacuate many of our people out of Rwanda right away because they weren't safe. It was very interesting. With the Yugoslavs there was really a process of negotiation. We exchanged a couple of diplomatic notes with them going over the points that needed to be considered. They came back and asked questions about things. They actually asked for some modifications. I remember one female diplomat was going to have a baby, or the spouse of a diplomat was going to have a baby. I forget which it was. Nevertheless, it just wasn't possible for her to leave the country, so arrangements were made for him or her to be posted to their mission to the UN, which of course would not be affected by our action in the case. They also had to make determinations as to who would take care of the embassy property.

Q: We broke relations with the assumption that this is essentially a temporary thing, so they hold the property in abeyance.

DUNHAM: Some things have to be done immediately. I don't know if it was stated that this was thought to be temporary. I think in the back of everybody's minds it probably was felt that at some point in the future we are going to re-open in Belgrade and they probably were going to want to re-open in Washington. Certainly you go about it with the idea that they need to start making arrangements for their property. I think in the Yugoslav case, the property initially was turned over to the Office of Foreign Missions. I don't recall that they named a protecting power. OFM took over for all the property and took care of it. Over time some of the property was transferred to the successor states to Yugoslavia. I remember the Yugoslav diplomat we dealt with in this case. After a week or two of meetings, we had worked out all of the details and he came in for his last meeting. At the end, I walked him to the front door of the State Department. Ironically the process was not contentious; it was very businesslike. We had some issues we had to deal with, but those were resolved relatively easily under the circumstances. I was walking the diplomat out at the end of all of our meetings. I left him at the C Street entrance and shook hands with him. He said, "You know it has been nice doing business with you." Of course eventually once things were resolved, it did take some time, but we established complete relations with the Serbians. I just attended their first national day celebration back in February. They hosted a very large event to celebrate their national day. The assistant secretary for European affairs spoke.

Q: Who is taking care of the Iranian embassy building?

DUNHAM: The building itself is still being managed by the Office of Foreign Missions. I don't know what it is being used for but it is a place on Massachusetts Avenue.

Q: I went in there one time. There were some offices.

DUNHAM: When OFM was established, they used it for office space. Actually I think another embassy rented that space to use for swing space while their building was being renovated. However, I think it is empty now. The residences the Iranians owned are being rented. One embassy rents a house for its ambassador's residence. One building was used

a few years ago as the decorator show house to raise funds for the Washington Symphony. The Iranians do have an interest section here in Washington which is in rented spaces, but it is manned by people who are either U.S. citizens or are green card holders, so they have no diplomatic privileges.

Q: One last question. Did you get involved in the Chinese embassy which was put up in a big apartment building on Connecticut Avenue? They were building over by Van Ness and that area. Did that hit you at all, or did the Chinese get involved?

DUNHAM: I was not involved. The Office of Foreign Missions and the Office of Overseas Buildings were the lead offices in that case. The reason was that the U.S. government had to negotiate with the Chinese government as to where we would locate our embassy in Beijing. In the process of negotiation we needed to be able to offer space to the Chinese here in Washington. The only involvement I had, was when the negotiations were complete there was a treaty signing arrangement at the State Department between the State Department and the Chinese government. I was involved in that. By the way, the building is going up. They have made a lot of progress. I think they plan to be in there within the year.

Q: Speaking of the Chinese, the Chinese are renowned for their protocol and all that. Did you find in dealing with them you had to be on your toes protocolwise?

DUNHAM: Yes, although I didn't get too involved in visits with them. My other colleagues were responsible for that. I do recall a couple of occasions where they were really rather formal about something. I will tell you about one because it was rather interesting. I won't go into detail about what happened, but there was something that occurred involving a Chinese diplomat. Because of it the Chinese decided to come in and make a presentation to us at the State Department. I agreed to receive the embassy representative. She was probably a counselor. She came in and spoke at length. She actually read a document to me. So I took notes. Then we concluded the meeting. As she was leaving, I said, "I wonder if it would be possible for you to leave me with a copy of the document that you read. It would be very helpful," and it was in English. She said to me, "I don't know if I can leave it with you because I was only told to come in and read it to you." So I asked, "Could you inquire?" She said, "Yes, I will inquire and I will call you back." Later in the day she called me back. She said, "I have been told I can't give you the document, but I will be happy to read it to you again."

There is one other thing I wanted to talk to you about. It is a relatively esoteric area, but it is interesting. Most of the time is routine but in a couple of cases it did become an issue. One of the areas for which the Diplomatic Liaison Division of Protocol had responsibility was handling the Agrément requests for foreign ambassadors coming to the United States.

Q: You might explain what an Agrément is.

DUNHAM: The Agrément process is described in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. There is a specific provision in the Vienna Convention that addresses it. But it has been a practice in international relations generally since time immemorial. Essentially it involves seeking the advance approval of the receiving state before a foreign ambassador is sent there. In cases where a foreign diplomat is sent to a country to represent it, he or she gets a visa and they travel there and are registered with the host country once they arrive. But in the case of ambassadors, the host country is queried in advance as to whether or not they would accept a particular individual as ambassador. The formal term for the process is Agrément, which is the French word for Agreement. In 99.9% of the cases this is a routine procedure. The sending state would send a written request, although it doesn't have to be written. It can be oral. But they send a request stating that so and so is being appointed to be our ambassador to your country. Is he or she acceptable to you? With the request they attach a biography (a CV of the individual). In the U.S., the paperwork is received in the State Department and generally it is reviewed by the desk. It might be vetted elsewhere in the U.S. government just to make sure nobody has any reason to disapprove the request. Once everything appears to be in order, the office of protocol will respond to the foreign government either with a diplomatic note or a cable indicating the person is acceptable to the U.S. government and saying we should be advised when they are preparing to travel to the U.S. because we have a procedure for greeting new ambassadors on their arrival in the U.S. In most cases this is done routinely within a few weeks of the Agrément request. However there were a couple of cases over the years where we weren't able to do that. I remember in one case there was a person who was proposed to be an ambassador. In the process of reviewing the Agrément it turned out the individual had been accused of some very serious human rights violations in his country. We made a determination that we would not accept him, and we did contact the government and advise that this person was not acceptable. These requests are handled confidentially. We don't want to embarrass the government and we don't want to embarrass the individual. Only a few people are involved in the process. All of the paperwork involved is treated as confidential. In one case, however, the matter did become public. This was a very interesting case.

During the Reagan years, the government of Nicaragua sent us the name of a person to be their ambassador. It was Nora Astorga. She was a prominent Sandinista. She was a relatively young woman. As we were going through the process, we found that she had been involved in the assassination of a senior general in the Somoza government. This was rather an interesting scenario. She was a very attractive young woman. Apparently after the Sandinistas had taken over, or maybe during the process. She invited this general to her house for dinner with the promise of certain favors. At one point during the course of the evening she lured him into her bedroom where some armed men burst out of a closet and assassinated this general. When she was proposed to be their new ambassador to the United States, we made a decision that somebody who had been involved in this kind of activity was not acceptable to the U.S. government. We turned down the request for Agrément. I am not sure how it became public, but it did. Of course a situation like that is titillating. It got published in the press and newsmagazines and so forth. As it turned out the Nicaraguans did appoint her as their ambassador to the United Nations. The U.S. Government had no control over ambassadorial appointments to the UN

because there is no Agrément procedure for that. So she became their ambassador to the UN.

There was another interesting case that we had, although it didn't affect the person's appointment. We accepted him as ambassador. He was from a certain Latin American country which will remain nameless. In the process, the U.S. embassy gave a report on him. Everything was very positive, but as an aside they did mention that in his own country he was known as a "skirt chaser". That didn't affect his acceptability and we did agree that he could become ambassador to the United States. As far as I know there were no incidents here involving skirt chasing.

Q: Well Larry, I think this is probably a good place to stop. As I mentioned before if there is anything you want to flesh out on this when you get it, please do.

DUNHAM: I will be happy to.

Q: Thank you very much.

End of interview