

**Edwin R. Bayley, Oral History Interview – JFK#2, 12/19/1968**  
Administrative Information

**Creator:** Edwin R. Bayley  
**Interviewer:** Larry J. Hackman  
**Date of Interview:** December 19, 1968  
**Location:** New York, NY  
**Length:** 67 pages

**Biographical Note**

Bayley was press secretary to Governor Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin (1959-1961); Director of Public Information for the Peace Corps (1961); Special Assistant to the Office of the White House Press Secretary (1961-1962); and Director of the Information Staff for the Agency for International Development (U.S. AID) (1962-1964). In this interview, Bayley discusses U.S. AID and the Peace Corps, including the staffing of both organizations, controversies and scandals, the difficulties of getting Congress to allocate money for foreign aid, the Alliance for Progress, and R. Sargent Shriver, Jr.. He also discusses his involvement with the President's Panel on Mental Retardation, among other issues.

**Access**

Open.

**Usage Restrictions**

According to the deed of gift signed on January 30, 1969, copyright of these materials has passed to the United States Government upon the death of the donor. Users of these materials are advised to determine the copyright status of any document from which they wish to publish.

**Copyright**

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excesses of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law. The copyright law extends its protection to unpublished works from the moment of creation in a tangible form. Direct your questions concerning copyright to the reference staff.

**Transcript of Oral History Interview**

These electronic documents were created from transcripts available in the research room of the John F. Kennedy Library. The transcripts were scanned using optical character

recognition and the resulting text files were proofread against the original transcripts. Some formatting changes were made. Page numbers are noted where they would have occurred at the bottoms of the pages of the original transcripts. If researchers have any concerns about accuracy, they are encouraged to visit the Library and consult the transcripts and the interview recordings.

**Suggested Citation**

Edwin R. Bayley, recorded interview by Larry J. Hackman, December 19, 1968, (page number), John F. Kennedy Library Oral History Program.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION  
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

Gift of Personal Statement

By Edwin R. Bayley

to the

John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library

In accordance with Sec. 507 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (44 U. S. C. 397) and regulations issued thereunder (41 CFR 101-10), I, Edwin R. Bayley, hereinafter referred to as the donor, hereby give, donate, and convey to the United States of America for eventual deposit in the proposed John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library, and for administration therein by the authorities thereof, a tape and transcript of a personal statement approved by me and prepared for the purpose of deposit in the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library. The gift of this material is made subject to the following terms and conditions.

1. Title to the materials transferred hereunder will pass to the United States as of the date of the delivery of this material into the physical custody of the Archivist of the United States.
2. It is the donor's wish to make the material donated to the United States of America by the terms of the instrument available for research in the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library. At the same time, it is his wish to guard against the possibility of its contents being used to embarrass, damage, injure, or harass anyone. Therefore, in pursuance of this objective, and in accordance with the provisions of Sec. 507 (f) (3) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (44 USC 397) this material shall not, for a period of 20 years or until the donor's prior death, be made available for examination by anyone except persons who have received my express written authorization to examine it.
3. A revision of this stipulation governing access to the material for research may be entered into between the donor and the Archivist of the United States, or his designee, if it appears desirable.
4. The material donated to the United States pursuant to the foregoing shall be kept intact permanently in the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library.

5. This restriction shall not apply to employees and officers of the General Services Administration (including the National Archives and Records Service and the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library) engaged in performing normal archival work processes.

6. The donor retains to himself during his lifetime all literary property rights in the material donated to the United States of America by the terms of this instrument. After the death of the donor, the aforesaid literary property rights will pass to the United States of America.

Signed	<u>Edwin R. Bayley</u>
Date	<u>Jan. 28, 1969</u>
Accepted	<u>James B. Rhoads</u> Archivist of the United States
Date	<u>JAN 30 1969</u>

Table of Contents

<u>Page</u>	<u>Topic</u>
54	White House regional conferences
58	U.S. foreign aid
61, 70, 74	Staffing and organization of U.S. AID (Agency for International Development)
64	“Operation Tycoon” to recruit businesspeople to U.S. AID
66	Difficulty getting Congress to approve foreign aid expenditures
73	Institutionalized racism at the State Department
76, 83	Public relations and press relations at U.S. AID
80, 87	Alliance for Progress and Teodoro Moscoso
85	Communicating with John Kenneth Galbraith and other ambassadors
88	Working as Director of Public Information for the Peace Corps
89	Pressure to fire a Peace Corps volunteer who was accused of Communist sympathies
92	R. Sargent Shriver, Jr.
95	Trip that Bayley and other Peace Corps administrators took to 11 countries
97	Draft deferment for Peace Corps volunteers
97	Foreign Aid to British Guiana (Guyana)
99	CIA involvement in U.S. AID and the Peace Corps
103	1962 Clay Committee to examine U.S. foreign aid policies
105	David E. Bell’s 1963 appointment as Administrator of U.S. AID
108	Aid to India
109	U.S. aid money for population control
111	President’s Panel on Mental Retardation
113	Appointment of Ivan A. Nestingen as Undersecretary of Health, Education, and Welfare
114	Relationship between Wisconsin politician Gaylord Nelson and the Kennedy Administration
118	Allegations of sexual improprieties between women in Pierre E.G. Salinger’s office and members of the Kennedy Administration
119	Vietnam
120	Lyndon Baines Johnson’s personal vendetta against Frank M. Coffin
121	Ambassador Joseph S. Farland

Second of Two Oral History Interviews

with

Edwin R. Bayley

December 19, 1968  
New York, New York

By Larry J. Hackman

For the John F. Kennedy Library

HACKMAN: You were talking about the White House Press Office, and maybe you could follow up on that.

BAYLEY: Well, I wondered how much I'd covered of that because there's a couple of interesting things in there. I find there's some interesting things in the papers here about that.

HACKMAN: You talked about the reports that were written when you went over.

BAYLEY: Yes. They're in there.

HACKMAN: What about the White House Regional Conferences? You said you played a role in setting them up. I thought maybe I could find out where the idea originated from, and what kind of problems you ran into, and how successful.

BAYLEY: Well, the project was related to the basic problem of getting across to the American public the fact that something was being done in Washington. As to who actually thought it up, I'm not sure.

The project fell into the hands of Dick Maguire [Richard Maguire], George O'Gorman [George D. O'Gorman], and myself. We recruited ten information officers, partly as an offshoot of the earlier meeting in which all these information officers were asked to write papers, but, actually, taking in some other people, and mostly political people, people who may be in the second or third level in information, or not in information, but who had that kind of experience, who were sophisticated enough to understand this kind of a thing.

The White House Regional Conferences, when they'd had them in Washington, were quite effective, and there was some prestige value to being invited to such a thing. They thought highly of that as a device for getting information abroad. These were an extension of that. You couldn't invite large enough numbers of people to Washington to be effective on a mass basis, and the thought was if you took the same kind of people who would be at such a conference and toured the country with them, you could reach a lot more people. Of course, the prestige value was diminished because you're just inviting them to Philadelphia or Chicago or something, rather than Washington, and it wasn't actually in the White House.

We took these ten information officers and assigned a city to each one of them. And they went in and organized, and they tried to get free or low cost facilities from mayors or governors or other officials who might want to do something for a Democratic administration. They used government employees where they could to do the clerical work—the Department of Labor, the Department of Agriculture were two I remember being used—and volunteer help as well. The people that went out were some Cabinet members and many sub-Cabinet members, Under Secretaries and that level, Assistant Secretaries. Wilbur Cohen [Wilbur J. Cohen] was one of our best performers, and Ribicoff [Abraham Alexander Ribicoff] was very good, too. People that had, really, some political sense were the ones that did this, for the most part.

Then we wrote a big report and sent everybody who had attended a brochure. Wayne Phillips, who had been with the *New York Times* and eventually wound up with the Democratic National Committee, came in to help. He was in charge of the project of writing up the report, and they had a group of six or eight people who did that. On the whole it wasn't totally successful. It drew quite a bit of criti-

[-55-]

cism from newspapers and politicians who saw it for what it was, but it did some good, too. But it was an effort to get at the basic problem of the image.

HACKMAN:           What kinds of people were they particularly trying to convince in deciding who to invite to these things in these ten cities? Key critics? Key groups?

BAYLEY:            Key groups, yes, and leaders. It was an effort to get at leadership groups. There was nothing partisan about the invitations; in fact, it was quite the opposite. It was done on a nonpartisan, community basis, and you'd have officers of the Foreign Affairs Council, any civic groups or professional groups. It was heavily concentrated on domestic issues rather than foreign policy. So it drew a lot of

groups in the welfare, health, and educational fields. We had one in Madison that I sort of set up, knowing people there. That was concentrated on agriculture and conservation. It wasn't bad. It had a good crowd. And that's the place where I could judge the crowd. And the people that came were serious, intelligent, influential people.

The other one I attended—I only attended two—the other one was in Chicago, and that's when I felt a little cynicism because this was a Mayor Daley [Richard J. Daley] operation, and the crowds there were somewhat synthetic. I remember at one point a couple sessions were rather sparsely attended, and somebody called Mayor Daley. People came in running, panting, “Where do I go?” In about a half an hour there were a thousand people in those rooms. So after that, these recent happenings weren't a surprise.

HACKMAN: Did Freeman [Orville L. Freeman] show up at the one in Madison?

BAYLEY: Yes, he did, yeah. I don't like to be critical, but that was the low spot. I mean, Orville Freeman is a decent guy, but as a speaker he lacks a good deal. That almost killed it, but there were other people that came who made up for that, people of lesser rank, but more effective really.

[-56-]

HACKMAN: Can you remember any department or agencies that there were problems in getting cooperation from on this whole thing?

BAYLEY: There were some. Well, the State Department exempted itself. Dave Bell [David E. Bell] went out, but he was then with the Budget Bureau. I think more of the people that were effective... [Interruption] was Bill Batt [William L. Batt]—was he Small Business [Small Business Administration] then?

HACKMAN: No, he was ARA, Area Redevelopment Administration.

BAYLEY: ARA, yes, right. He was very good. Wilbur Cohen was excellent. Dave Bell was good when he went out; he didn't go out very much because he was busy, but he didn't object to this exercise, his spirit was good. Let's see, well, we didn't try to involve Defense. Joe Barr [Joseph W. Barr], was he with Treasury?

HACKMAN: Yes.

BAYLEY: He was good. He did this quite well.

HACKMAN: What about foreign aid, Labouisse [Henry Richardson Labouisse] who was at—I guess this was right in the period ICA [International Cooperation Administration] was becoming AID [Agency for International Development]?



BAYLEY: I don't think Labouisse was asked. I think he was considered a holdover from the Eisenhower [Dwight D. Eisenhower] Administration. And this was political. I know the whole effort was not to involve people who were unwilling. And I think all the people I've named, the ones I remember doing well in it, were Democrats and had come into the Administration and believed in what they were doing.

Let's see, there was some trouble with Social Security which was an important part of this because in some areas that became the big issue. Philadelphia was a Social Security meeting. There's some material in here about these

[-57-]

regional conferences, I don't know how much. I can't remember what the trouble was with Social Security. But I don't think Labouisse was asked.

I'm just running around departments of government in my mind. I can't remember Labor in this although Labor should have been a part of this. I think there were individuals who were reluctant to do it—people who were seriously interested in what they were doing—because of this kind of promotion, which it was. But most of them were politically sophisticated enough to know that you had to do some of this. And I think the way the request to participate went out from the White House that you'd have to be pretty bold to refuse.

HACKMAN: The letters went out over the President's [John F. Kennedy] signature, or how?

BAYLEY: That's my recollection, but I haven't got such a letter. But I think they did.

HACKMAN: You talked last time about the feeling on O'Donnell's [Kenneth P. O'Donnell] part and, I assumed, the President's part that things weren't going that well in the Administration's press operations.

BAYLEY: That's right.

HACKMAN: Can you just talk about some of the people that you could see that the White House was high on or down on at that point, as far as information officers and Cabinet people who weren't doing the job?

BAYLEY: I'm not sure that I was inside enough to—see, I wasn't over there at the time the dissatisfaction arose. I came in after that feeling was already abroad. It was obvious that foreign aid was one of the key areas in which they felt that the story wasn't getting across. When you get to foreign aid, that's a whole psychology in itself. Perhaps I might as well talk about it right now.

HACKMAN: Yeah, and how you went over then.

[-58-]

BAYLEY: Eisenhower had made a good thing of foreign aid in a way. Eisenhower had been very effective in enlisting the leaders of the Establishment to supporting foreign aid. I think he was in an ideal position to do that, having been commander-in-chief in World War II, and he was part of that group. He worked at it, too. They had formed a citizens, committee which he cultivated and which worked for him, important people who he entertained at the White House regularly, and that's how he kept them going. These people were quite effective. There are a lot of people that I'm associated with even now at NET [National Educational Television], members of our board, people like Phil Reed [Philip Dunham Reed], Amory Houghton. And Paul Hoffman, who was in the foreign agency then, was part of this same group.

Through this device, Eisenhower did pretty well with Congress and with the public. Foreign aid is a funny issue in Congress—it always has been and always will be, I guess, as long as it goes on—in that there's no immediate reward for the American people. Nobody sees anything happen that they can directly attribute to the aid program. And each president has to go up and fight Congress in order to get an aid bill through. This was rather boring in a way because you're just doing as well as your predecessor did, and, actually, as it's proved throughout the Johnson [Lyndon Baines Johnson] Administration, you do a little less well each year. And it was true of the Kennedy Administration, too, although we didn't go down as fast. The thing reached its peak right after the War, of course, and that impetus fades out. And it gets more difficult to explain when you get into the underdeveloped countries, and the results are less apparent.

I think that—well, this gets me into the AID thing and Fowler Hamilton. Fowler, of course, was the Kennedys' appointee to replace Labouisse as the agency's name was changed. There was always the story around that Dick Goodwin [Richard N. Goodwin] picked that name which made the AID thing—which not everyone was happy with. Fowler came in there, and he—Fowler had some experience in government. He was an international lawyer. He was originally asked to take CIA [Central Intelligence Agency], and he didn't want that. His connection with the Kennedys

[-59-]

was not very direct; he didn't know them personally beforehand. But he was a guy with a good civic record, and a good deal of ability, and an important position in New York. I think they saw a chance to make a creditable appointment, a man they thought might be effective. Again, he's part of the establishment—he's on the Democratic side; Fowler is definitely a Democrat, but he's part of this same establishment group. I was foisted upon him, really, because—I don't remember just where we left off there, but at the time that all those people were shifted over to State, there was a Sunday evening announcement at which Chester Bowles [Chester B. Bowles] was demoted at the State Department.

HACKMAN: We didn't talk about that at all.

BAYLEY: Didn't we get into that, no? Alright. I think we did talk about my relations with Pierre [Pierre E.G. Salinger], and this follows that, naturally. After that trip in which I was acting Press Secretary, a number of reporters told Pierre what a good job I'd done, and this cooked me with Pierre. The parts of the assignment at the White House that were the most interesting, really, were these sort of spot things, doing something for the President, writing a quick speech. I noticed in there that there's a memo which I composed in one hour, a real fast job of reporting, as to what he should say to the Minnesota publishers. Another time, Adam Yarmolinsky and I—and I think maybe we talked about this.

HACKMAN: You talked about the Margaret Chase Smith thing.

BAYLEY: The projects like that were exciting and interesting, and I liked them. I wasn't getting so many after Pierre started cooling off on this. Then came this Sunday evening announcement where there were about ten, I remember ten, it seems to me, shifts, people from the White House to the State Department or here and there, major shifts of people.

And one of those was Fred Dutton [Frederick G. Dutton] going from Cabinet secretary to Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Liaison. Fred and I were good friends. Fred came to me after that and asked me to come over there and

[-60-]

be his deputy making the argument that I wasn't going to get any good assignments around the White House as long as Pierre felt insecure and that I was a potential replacement. And I was rather inclined to go over there with Fred. However, Ralph Dungan [Ralph A. Dungan], who was directly responsible for State and AID and whom I'd gotten to know quite well, had been after me for some time to take the AID job. That vacancy had existed; they had a temporary arrangement, but it wasn't what they wanted.

Ralph heard that Fred was trying to recruit me for this, and he went to Kennedy and said, "If Ed Bayley is up for grabs, I want a chance to recruit him for AID." So he came to me and put it to me that this was a better use of my talents. And he finally got Kennedy into it, and Kennedy told me that he wished I would take the AID job. He said that he thought this was the hardest, most difficult information job in government, and one most vital to the country's welfare. And, naturally, I took it. What could you say?

Fowler Hamilton had been chosen about the same time as Administrator of AID. They more or less told him, "Here's your information director." They had the grace to let him interview me, and he decided that the President was right, that this was his information director. [Laughter] But we got along famously, and we remain good friends. Fowler conceived his job at AID to be to persuade Congress and the public, not to try to administer directly. He, again, was handed a Deputy Administrator, Frank Coffin [Frank M. Coffin], who's a very decent guy, but who wasn't really an administrator either. Frank was a lawyer and a politician, and sort of a thoughtful fellow, but he wasn't really the kind of administrator

that the agency needed. He's certainly not a trained government administrator. Frank had been director of a Defense Loan? No, not...

HACKMAN: DLF, Development Loan...

BAYLEY: DLF, Development Loan Fund.

HACKMAN: Wasn't Lingle [Walter L. Lingle, Jr.] over there for awhile before Coffin?

[-61-]

BAYLEY: No, no. Lingle came after. I'm leading up to Lingle. Coffin and Hamilton.... Coffin, in effect, was a political legacy, as Hamilton was not, you know. But Coffin, he and Hamilton really didn't hit it off very well. Fowler's extrovertive, did not really bother with details. Coffin's the opposite, quiet, thoughtful, terribly concerned with details, almost to the extent that he didn't do the big job. But very different personalities. Inasmuch as Hamilton thought that his job was the public relations, congressional relations job, at which he worked very hard, he wanted somebody to run the thing and not bother him with that, really, except at the very top policy issues. The guy that really suited him was Bill Gaud [William S. Gaud], who was his own choice in the Near East...

HACKMAN: Right. Near East and South Asia?

BAYLEY: Near East and South Asia. And Gaud was a damn good administrator. I guess probably he didn't have a choice, he'd have put Gaud in there as deputy in the beginning, and that would have worked a good deal better. There was Frank, and Frank was valuable, in a way, in congressional relations. He had a great many friends on the Hill from his own time in Congress. And he was there.

Well, it was in an effort to get around this and to get somebody who would be an efficient, cold blooded, bureaucratic administrator that he obtained Lingle. Lingle had been, I believe, international vice president for Proctor and Gamble. I'm not sure of that title exactly. He was in charge of international sales and reputedly making two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars a year.

HACKMAN: Right. I read that figure. Quite a cut.

BAYLEY: I also have heard that his position there was a little shaky, so it wasn't purely altruistic on his part. Well, he certainly wasn't what was needed either. I mean, that was a terrible period really. He didn't know government administration either. He

[-62-]

obviously knew business and industry, but it was quite different, and things didn't happen just because he said so. My memory would have to be jogged to remember the particular incidents. There were a lot of incidents that would make good anecdotes, but I just can't remember them at this time.

HACKMAN: Any of them involving...

BAYLEY: There was a crisis, though, and the crisis result.... I think Lingle was only there four months, three or four months? Yeah. Then they finally had to get him out. I wish I could remember exactly what that final crisis was. Well, you can get that from somebody else, I'm sure, or maybe you have.

HACKMAN: I'm trying to think, was it wrapped up with the White House meeting?

BAYLEY: That sounds right.

HACKMAN: Was Hamilton taking—he used to take his staff to the White House periodically, I believe, when he would go over.

BAYLEY: Yes.

HACKMAN: I know he took Lingle. I can't remember if there was a blowup at the White House?

BAYLEY: I think there was, Larry, I think there was. I knew it at the time, but that was it, I think.

HACKMAN: I know there was some trouble when he took Moscoso [Theodoro Moscoso] over.

BAYLEY: Yes, oh, yes. Moscoso blundered. Every time they took him over, it was a fiasco. Ted was a nice guy, but he had no real conception of the politics in these things. Was Bobby Kennedy [Robert F. Kennedy] involved somehow with the Lingle thing?

[-63-]

HACKMAN: I don't know that.

BAYLEY: I don't remember now. I don't think I can be helpful on that. But I know that they had to get him out. It got into a fight with Coffin, too. I mean, this bringing a fellow in to do the same job, in essence, didn't really work. There were some very strained relations in the office. But, anyway, they finally palmed him off to NASA [National Aeronautics and Space Administration] in not really a

very big job. It was sort of a public relations job, wasn't it? Sure. And of all the people not equipped to do public relations, Lingle was classic.

HACKMAN: There was something operating called operation Tycoon to bring in business people?

BAYLEY: Yes. Yes. I remember that quite well.

HACKMAN: Had Lingle come in as a part of this conception?

BAYLEY: No. No. No, he may have been reached somehow, but he was not one of those young tycoons that came in. That was another fiasco. They may have gotten a few good people through it. But they sent out a general invitation to industry.... Let's see, what was the fellow's name that came in to run that?

HACKMAN: Let me give you something that may jar your memory. I've got lists of—that's ICA. Then this picks up '62 AID people, and then '63.

BAYLEY: Right. That's good. Yeah, right. Well, this fellow was sort of a special assistant to Fowler. I don't think he would have been listed because he was temporary, unless he's down here as a special assistant or something. No, it isn't important anyway. But the idea of the thing was that there were many people in industry.... It's reminiscent of this thing of Nixon's [Richard Milhous Nixon] of asking members of *Who's Who* to recommend people. It was like that.

[-64-]

They sent out letters to all big industry in the country asking them to release promising young men for up to two years of service, I believe it was, and these were supposed to be trained as AID mission directors or assistant directors. And what we got, really, for the most part were, people they wanted to get rid of. I knew a couple of them personally. A couple of them came from Milwaukee, and I knew them by reputation. And they were that type. But I think we got that, for the most part—troublesome people or people who had reached an impasse in their careers and a good chance to slough them and be patriotic at the same time. It got to be an internal joke around AID.

HACKMAN: Where had that idea originated, do you know?

BAYLEY: Well, I rather think it was Ralph Dungan's idea.

HACKMAN: I'd wondered if.... It doesn't really sound that much like him but...

BAYLEY: I know it doesn't, that's why I hesitate a little bit, but he was active in the thing. No, I don't think Bill Dentzer [William T. Dentzer, Jr.] was

involved in it. Bill Dentzer came on the scene a little later, but I don't think he was involved in this exercise. I had the feeling there was somebody.... This was also partially political, I believe, this Operation Tycoon, in that it was an effort to get bipartisan support for the AID program. In that respect, maybe it was Ralph. You know, Ralph had had that kind of consideration. And most of these people were Republicans, and the guy that was sent as special assistant who was in running it was an open Republican. In a way, I always conceive the approach to foreign aid as necessarily being a bipartisan one. So it may have been Ralph. Somehow in my mind I connect Ralph with this exercise.

One of the principal things that Ralph talked to me about when I went in, he said this was a concern of Kennedy's, is the fact that most of the money that goes into foreign aid is spent in this country. People didn't realize, still don't realize it, although they do more than they did. The

[-65-]

common conception of it is taking money and giving it to people in foreign countries. The fact is that increasing amounts of it were tied to purchase in the United States. This is one of the first things that I did, set up a system whereby each contract for AID financed goods was made the subject of a release which went back to the local community and to the local congressmen. These were factual releases saying that such-and-such a company in such-and-such a place has received a million dollar AID contract to produce such-and-such to be sent to Yugoslavia or Brazil or wherever. They always got into the papers.

I set up a little department to handle all these things, of which there were thousands every month, in a routine way, and I think it was quite effective, that this gradually sank in. I notice they're still doing this, and they were quite pleased with that operation. Especially, it had a direct effect on congressmen because congressmen didn't realize this either, that all this money was going back into their districts. I think it blunted some of the congressional attackers. It was quite apparent. The AID program, of course, did run into difficulties in Congress, and this led to Fowler Hamilton's resignation. As I said before, Fowler had worked very hard in this area, but nevertheless, as was inevitable, the legislation got into trouble.

Well, this was very boring to O'Brien's [Lawrence F. O'Brien] guys. They were interested in the new programs—and everybody was—particularly aid to education, and their lobbying efforts, the bigger force was behind such programs. They resented the time and trouble it took to put through just the same old program. And this led to quite a bit of flak over there. I attended a few of those meetings over in O'Brien's office, and Fowler, I'm sure, attended a good many more. But they got quite impatient and dissatisfied with Fowler because they felt he wasn't pushing this thing through Congress fast enough and easily enough.

HACKMAN:           And he wanted help from them, more help?

BAYLEY:            No, no. Oh, yes, I take it back. He did, he did. He didn't feel that they were giving him the support that they should. Along at the same time

[-66-]

that year—and this goes back to what I said about Eisenhower—they wanted us.... Dungan talked to me about this and talked to John Salter, who was congressional liaison, and Craig Raupe, who was his deputy, about setting up another citizens' committee in the same manner that Eisenhower had.

The White House, however, was not willing to do what Eisenhower had done and entertain these people personally. Salter, I think, was the main one responsible for this, and he hired as a consultant somebody who had done this for Labouisse, not very effectively, whose name I can't remember, somebody from New York. This guy worked at it for awhile. Nobody was really coming in. It turned out, eventually, that the only basis on which they would do this, very important people, if they got a personal invitation from Kennedy accompanied by an invitation to a social function at the White House, they would do it. There was—I can't think who he was now—a key person in this who would only do this if he and his wife got invited to a dinner-dance at the White House, and his wife could dance with Jack Kennedy. Well, Kennedy had contempt for this idea, you know. He wasn't going to.... So the thing never came off, and the citizens' committee never was formed.

HACKMAN: Was the guy who was working under Salter working through this same formal group—I can't remember the name of it—that was under Eisenhower which gradually, then, died out, I believe?

BAYLEY: Well, there was an attempt to revive that. I think that they used that list as a starting point, and there was a lot of overlapping. And the attempt was to get in Republicans, independents, and a bipartisan group. It was a direct successor to that, but I'm not sure it was the same. I couldn't say there was really continuation of it. That was a source of dissatisfaction, however. The White House wanted us to do that without any support from the White House, really. And Fowler Hamilton couldn't rally that kind of support personally, nor could anyone else in that job. But gradually it

[-67-]

became apparent they were not satisfied with the Congressional relations job that Fowler was doing. There wasn't any particular, well, there wasn't any particular happiness, either, about the administration because they had the Lingle flare-up, and Frank Coffin, I think, was unhappy and that got back to them, too.

Anyway, what started happening was that little items started appearing in columns, and various reports were reported back from cocktail parties to the effect that Fowler Hamilton was thinking of resigning. Well, at that time, Fowler wasn't thinking of resigning. And I would routinely check these. I had contacts in the press, and I'd either call the person direct who printed this, or find out some other way as to where these leaks came from, if they were leaks, which is what we felt. Fowler felt that they were trying to give him a message by leaking this stuff. Well, the first two we tracked back to Arthur Schlesinger [Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.]. However, we were told, or further checking I think maybe would have found them, I'm not sure, that leaks from Schlesinger didn't really mean anything, weren't to be taken seriously. They kept popping up.



Marq Childs [Marquis W. Childs] had a big column about this. I called him direct. He's an old friend, and he told me where he got it. When I told Fowler where that came from, we knew it was an official leak. And it came from Ted Clifton [Chester V. Clifton, Jr.]. This was about the sixth leak. At that point Fowler decided that, well, he'd better resign, but he didn't want to do it being pushed, or visibly pushed. So he went off for a weekend with Felix Belair [Felix Belair, Jr.] of the *New York Times*, and told Felix his whole story, not that kind of inside stuff, but he gave him his whole rationale for resigning and what he'd tried to do. It turned out to be a very favorable story for Fowler personally, and favorable to foreign aid, not criticizing the Kennedys or anybody, but it enabled Fowler to escape with a whole skin.

And I never understood, either—neither Fowler nor I did. All they had to do if they wanted Fowler to resign was call him up. Fowler is a thorough lawyer. He thinks like a lawyer. He always talked to the President as the Client. He never did anything except work for the client. All they had to do was just tell him, “We don't think you're

[-68-]

doing an effective job. Why don't you resign?” And he'd have done it with good grace. But he resented this idea that he had to be sort of destroyed before he could leave. And I don't understand those tactics myself.

But, anyway, we beat them to the punch, and he resigned before they knew he was going to resign, actually, and in a context that was favorable. We've always been good friends as the result of this month or so when we were working together to do nothing more than extricate him with a good reputation. I felt that he was treated unjustly, first of all, in judging the job he had done because it was a terribly difficult job trying to sell that to Congress, to people like Passman [Otto Ernest Passman] and others; and secondly, in the method that they chose to get him to resign. But it all turned out with a happy enough ending, and nobody was hurt.

HACKMAN:               Where did Dungan fit into this? You haven't mentioned him as someone who might have leaked this to the press, but yet he had primary responsibility at the White House level. Was he seeing this the same way?

BAYLEY:                No, not really. I think Dungan was basically favorable to Hamilton. He was quite candid with me, and I told him about the stuff that was going on. And he had nothing to do with that, really. I mean, he would have been the person to do it directly, through whom to do it directly. He and Fowler were in almost daily, I'm sure, daily communication. Dungan made recommendations for personnel, which is why I think he must have been in Operation Tycoon, and kept in very close touch on all of this. But I think this came from O'Brien's staff, and I don't think Dungan had anything much to do with it. I can remember one.... I was out on the Hill doing a little work myself one day, and I had a run-in with Dick Donahue [Richard K. Donahue] of O'Brien's staff who had been working very hard and his temper was short. He delivered a big tirade in the halls of the gallery up there about how they're sick and tired of having to worry so damn much

about foreign aid, and why couldn't we take care of this ourselves, and on and on with this. I think it was from that staff that all this dissatisfaction came.

[-69-]

HACKMAN: You'd talked about when you came over there, you weren't really Hamilton's selection. Gaud was, Coffin wasn't. What about the other people, Seymour, is it Janow [Seymour J. Janow]?

BAYLEY: Janow.

HACKMAN: Janow, Hutchinson [Edmond C. Hutchinson] at Africa?

BAYLEY: I don't know. Well, Janow had been a contractor in Saigon. I don't know where Janow came from or why he was chosen. They were looking for people with Far Eastern experience. Hutchinson, I think, was already there. I think he was a Labouisse choice, but I'm not positive there. Hollis Chenery [Hollis Burnley Chenery] was a Hamilton choice. I don't think he knew him before, but I think he came up through the academic economics fraternity, and there was an advisory committee of international economists, and I think they probably recommended him. That was an Ivy League group. I don't really think Hamilton, I didn't know of Hamilton choosing anybody himself, except Gaud. I'm sure he made the decision on a lot of them, but they weren't his people. They were career people.

Looking at this list, I see a good many of them are career people. Oh, he brought in Sy Peyser [Seymour M. Peyser] from New York; I think he'd known him here. But they're not really his own people. Most of them are people who had some standing in that field already, professionals.

HACKMAN: You'd talked about Hamilton making the efforts on congressional relations. What about Salter and Raupe, did they provide much help to him? Or how did the White House look at these people? Salter was, what? Jackson's [Henry M. Jackson] old...

BAYLEY: Magnuson [Warren G. Magnuson], Magnuson.

HACKMAN: Magnuson.

BAYLEY: Magnuson. Salter had been Magnuson's administer-

[-70-]

ative assistant for many years—about twenty years, in fact—and a close personal friend. No, I think he was given to Hamilton, too. I think John worked hard at this, and I think did a creditable job. But he wasn't really Hamilton's kind of guy. Raupe was a Texan—that's R-a-u-p-e—and his backing was

Congressman Jim Wright [James C. Wright, Jr.], and he was a political appointment. He had been with the agency, with ICA, for about a year, I believe, or more. He was an economist, had taught at some school in Texas, and, I think, had been in the Indonesian mission for six months or so. But he wanted to get back to Washington, and, I think, through Congressman Wright he got in this job. And he was fairly effective. He's a good operator. He's still in that business now for Eastern Airlines. But, again, he wasn't Hamilton's choice either.

Hamilton didn't have anybody in that department who was his own choice. They all, really, were congressional recommendations, which is rather logical for that area. They knew the Hill; they'd all worked there.

HACKMAN: Were any of the people that he inherited or who were given to him anxious to get him out? How much trouble did he have getting support—particularly of career people, I guess, the old ICA people?

BAYLEY: No, I don't think there was any opposition from that end. He believed in delegating authority. He gave them responsibility in their areas and left them pretty well alone. He did that with me, too, which I liked. He was a nice guy to work for. And he took the same position that he did toward the President; he was my client, you know. And it's a nice relationship. It's not personal, it's just a businesslike relationship, and I think that's the relationship he had with all the other department heads, these other assistant administrators. I think they were quite satisfied with it. I don't remember any real internal opposition.

HACKMAN: You'd talked about setting up the office in your operation for getting these things out to congressmen in the cities, the areas. Were there other changes you made in staff organization?

[-71-]

BAYLEY: Many, yes. There's a bit of deception in this, not willful deception, but one of the inducements to get me to go over there was the fact I could recruit my own staff and set up an entirely new organization. And I'd been around government long enough to know that this is very attractive. Hamilton had been told the same thing. Dungan was the one that told me, and he believed it.

However, it turned out when I got over there that this function had been performed for the past five years by the State Department for AID on a reimbursable basis, and that four or five years ago the ICA information staff had been transferred to the State Department. These people had the right to come back to AID if and when the information function was taken over directly by the agency, and I had twenty-four people whom nobody wanted, on my hands.

Another difficult situation, Phil Stern [Philip M. Stern] had been the acting head of this operation within the State Department, within their public affairs section, and fully expected to head it when it went back into AID. Hamilton had interviewed Stern before I came into the picture and had decided against him, so there was a little hard feeling there. I'd

known Phil fairly well just around Washington before that. There's a letter from him about this in there.

But I had all this deadwood on my hands, so the first two or three months I was there was spent in trying to persuade some of these people to transfer. I refused to take some of them. All the time I was in government, not by plan or anything, but I operate on the basis that I didn't care if I got fired tomorrow, and I got in the habit of doing that and being bold that way, and I did things that, if you were thinking from a career standpoint, wouldn't have been wise perhaps. But I refused to take these people. I went over the list. I interviewed them all, went over their records, found out a little bit about them. And the ones I thought could be useful, I took, perhaps ten. Then, the rest I just refused to take, and I just let them sit over there at State. I wouldn't let them come over, wouldn't transfer them physically over to my office. Some of them got bored with that and found jobs other places, some of them just hung tough.

[-72-]

After about six months, the ones that were left, I had to take, and they're still there. There were a couple of them that had alcoholic problems, a couple of them that were just kind of screwballs. There were people there that had been working there twenty years and got to be grade 12, and they weren't really any good to anybody, but they had seniority and rights. I finally had to take the residue. I found a couple of them that had unfavorable reports on their Civil Service records, and I initially was unimpressed with them, but some turned out to be excellent, given the chance. They'd been held down. And this was particularly true of a couple of Negroes, and I could see, looking back, even at that time in 1961, that five years before attitudes were very different in this area. There was one marvelous worker, a guy that turned out to be terribly important to our operation named Arthur Thompson. He was a Negro about forty-five to fifty years, and he'd only gotten to be a grade 5 in all that time. He was in charge of distributing all the materials, which is a huge job, you know, hundreds of thousands of things being mailed out, the whole mail operation, the whole distribution operation and just effortlessly, smoothly, intelligently. And he had bad comments in his record, and he'd been just treated shabbily. The people for whom he had worked.... He'd worked for one man for five years, and he didn't know his name. He would be ordered to do the most menial things, you know, even though it wasn't his job. He had a very bad thing in his record for having spoken back to somebody who called him a nigger or something, or boy or something, you know, did something degrading. He objected to this. But it was a revelation to me, the changes that were going on in government at that time. This guy just turned out to be a great employee. Now, just this year, some of my old employees down there sent me a clipping, he'd been given a distinguished service award. I got him up to a grade 9 while I was there, which was proper for his function, and I think he's been promoted once since, and he's gotten this award.

So all these people weren't deadwood. It was an unpleasant period, unpleasant process to have to go through. Fowler didn't want a great big staff, but after he realized that we had to take these people—he didn't know about that either—the staff eventually got to thirty-five and forty,

and our original plan had been to keep it about twenty-five. But we had to get some new blood in there and had to absorb these people and let them do the little things they could do, but, yet, in order to make this a real live operation you had to get some new people. Well, that's the way I was able to do it, by increasing the number of the staff. And I did get some good people in, and it went very well. Let's see, I think the question you asked me was about organization.

HACKMAN: Right.

BAYLEY: Do you care about such details as how we organized it?

HACKMAN: Yes. Right.

BAYLEY: All right. I organized it into two divisions. Well, first of all, I hired as a deputy one of the fellows I'd uncovered in the regional White House conferences, a fellow named Joe Newman [Joseph Newman] who was an old hand in government information, and I wanted an old hand to handle the administrative and the relationships with the personnel office and the budget and all that sort of thing. Experience in government teaches you, and he was very good at this. He also had a good acquaintanceship in the press, and particularly, he was a personal friend of Felix Belair who was the *Times* man assigned to AID, and this is very important.

Then I organized it into two divisions: one called Public Affairs, for which I recruited a man named Jim McCrory, James T. McCrory, who is currently, my current replacement in the top job at AID, top information job, and Jerry Rosenthal, who had been Sunday editor of the *Milwaukee Sentinel*, the other, opposition paper in Milwaukee, who was an excellent editor and a good writer himself, great editorial skill. In Public Affairs, McCrory had a varied assignment. His area took in answering letters from the public, congressional mail, working with groups, citizens groups, civic groups that supported foreign aid, running the speakers bureau, such things. Rosenthal's responsibility in the News Division was getting out the press releases and

direct relationships with the press and the media. They were both good men, and this worked very well.

We developed a good staff of writers. McCrory's division varied a little more, we had some of the deadwood in there. We put them on such things as answering mail from the public, you know. If they couldn't do anything else, they could do that. And we tried to do that very conscientiously, not using form letters, but to really write, give responsive answers sooner or later. Actually, we were forced to take a few people, in addition to the deadwood, we were forced to take a few people we didn't want to that were political legacies.

HACKMAN: Who would they come from?

BAYLEY: Senators...

HACKMAN: I mean, would they come out of the Democratic National Committee operation, or Dan Fenn's [Dan H. Fenn, Jr.] operation, or Dungan, or directly?

BAYLEY: All those things, all those things. You've named three, there're probably some more. Oh, they'd come through John Salter. I know Senator Bartlett [E.L. "Bob" Bartlett] had a woman who'd worked in his campaign, and she had to have a job; John Seigenthaler placed one. Good women, there wasn't anything bad about either of these, but...

HACKMAN: What, Tennessee, or for Robert Kennedy or for...

BAYLEY: The Tennessee thing, yeah. But I think she'd been in the Kennedy campaign in Tennessee. There's a letter in there on that, too, a letter thanking me. Humphrey [Hubert H. Humphrey] was quite active in this area. He was always placing, giving us people. Lyndon Johnson gave us a few people, and he was very rough about this, or his people were. Clif Carter [Clifton C. Carter] was the one that did it for him. Well, we didn't take everybody. They weren't all on my staff, either, but then these congressional pressures were always there. And we were always more responsive to these pressures than a more established agency could be. We were always nip and tuck in Congress, and we couldn't,

[-75-]

really, slap anybody in the face. But you have to play these things. I'm not sure what—I've forgotten what our subject was.

HACKMAN: Okay, let me ask something else. What kinds of rules, if any, or arrangements did you set up for contacts with the press on the part of people in AID? How much of a problem was it to keep control of leaks and other, just contacts?

BAYLEY: Well, I'm a nut on that subject. Part of my career in journalism was involved with secrecy in government, and I'd been carried out of committee hearings and closed door sessions and such things, and hid in closets and things like that, but also serious—I won an award in this area from the American Society of Newspaper Editors and was nominated for a Pulitzer Prize on some of these stories. And I believe this is in here, too. I know it is, I saw it today. Fowler Hamilton agreed with me on this, a completely open door policy for the press in that anybody in the whole agency could receive a reporter, talk to a reporter freely without fear of any punishment or criticism or anything like that. I did ask that they report the contact after the

fact to our office just so we could follow up, or so we'd know where a story came from, and see if there was anything else we could do, but not with an idea of suppressing it.

There came a time when the Kennedy Administration was very concerned about leaks. You've probably got some other stuff on this. And I think Defense—well, of course, Art Sylvester [Arthur Sylvester] was in all that trouble. But the State Department issued an edict that nobody could talk to the press unless it was approved by their public affairs office. Without asking anybody, I made a public statement on this, issued a release, saying that this was not the policy for AID, that we had this open policy. And I did it so forcefully and so quickly that nobody ever tried to make me do anything else. I knew better than to mess with it. And that stuck. Dungan never tried to get me to comply with that State Department thing. I think it works much better. The kind of leaks that you get come when you try to suppress sources of information, try to close them up.

[-76-]

HACKMAN: Did you ever get any feedback from Manning [Robert J. Manning]? I guess he replaced Tubby [Roger W. Tubby] about the time you came over to AID.

BAYLEY: Yeah, Manning came about a month later. Right. No, no. Bob and I were pretty good friends. I think maybe we discussed this a little bit. I think I told him what I did, but he didn't object to it. I think he wished that he had been able to do that. It wasn't his idea.

HACKMAN: I'd wondered if problems came up, particularly in relation to projects that AID and State were not seeing eye-to-eye on? AID would maybe have opposed a project that State, for political reasons, would have wanted, and a leak would have occurred out of AID to the press opposing—not a leak, really, but a story.

BAYLEY: No, I don't think there was that kind of difference between State and AID. I don't recall any such incident. I don't think any of the leaks that the Administration was concerned with came out of AID, so I wasn't really under the gun there. I can't remember just what the subject was that the leaks concerned that upset them so. I always had a good relationship with Manning. We coordinated a lot of things. But that was always a much more closed operation than ours. My key people were all outsiders, they were not up from the State Department, or they were not government people primarily. They were newspaper people, media people, who look at things the way I do, that our job was not to maneuver things or fool anybody, but to serve the press, and felt that if we got the information out, reason would prevail. It was as simple as that.

HACKMAN: Who of the columnists—you talked about the *New York Times* man and the relationship with your assistant—but who of the columnists were particularly helpful and who were the rough ones?

BAYLEY: Starting with the rough ones, the person we had the most trouble with was Clark Mollenhoff [Clark R. Mollenhoff]. Mollenhoff has a great reputation as being an investigative reporter, and he is a bulldog on such things. However, many of the things that he investigated so thoroughly are picayune

[-77-]

matters that he blows up into becoming very important. They're scandal things that aren't really significant in the larger picture.

HACKMAN: You try to read one of his books, you get a book full of trivia, none of it fits together.

BAYLEY: Exactly, yeah. And he'd find some AID employee, usually from Minnesota or Iowa originally, who was out in Indonesia and maybe had stolen a phonograph player, you know. And then there was a great big story, you know, and this is where we had the test of our policy, though. When he came in to these things, we gave him the facts. And it surprised him a little bit because he didn't expect that treatment.

We had the same problem, the other one was Jack Anderson on Drew Pearson's staff. He had some similar things, although I will say for him that in one case where I gave him all the information, but I said, "I plead with you, think twice before you use this. I can't see it accomplishing anything. It will destroy this guy's own life, and it isn't really a government matter." It was a personal matter. And he did desist from writing anything about it. Not Mollenhoff, he never... I did this once with Mollenhoff, too, but it didn't work. I gave him the facts, but I asked him to think again about using it. But, those two were the troublesome ones.

Oh, well, we had a lot of people who were ideologically opposed, you know, conservative Republican types, *Chicago Tribune* people, people like that, who wrote things critical of foreign aid, but we got around a lot of them by being honest about things. They softened their attacks. Then there were a lot of people that were all on our side like, we could call up Roscoe Drummond and he'd write anything we wanted. In fact he would volunteer to help. "If you're in trouble." He'd tell us, "I'll write a helpful column." Felix Belair always tried to be helpful. He wanted all the stories, and he usually wanted the stories first, but he believed in foreign aid, and he wrote favorable stories. Marq Childs was always favorable, and I think he, occasionally, would try to help us out.

[-78-]

HACKMAN: What kind of policy did you have on giving out stories? Would it vary on, if you had something coming out, would you give it to the *New York Times* man first, or was there any set policy on something like this?



BAYLEY: No, I did have a policy on that, against that. Our releases of major factual events went out on an equal basis. Now, that's not to say that everybody got it the same because there's a difference in how hard reporters work. I know from being on both sides of that. Felix Belair often scooped other reporters on the foreign aid budget, for example, the proposal that's going to Congress, simply because he spent time and saw enough people and put pieces together, and he'd make a guess, an experienced guess, and he'd come pretty close. But we didn't leak things to him ahead of the others. I never believed in that. But if a reporter comes in and asks you questions about things, we felt we had to answer them. And so sometimes one or another of these people would get a scoop on the others just because they asked the questions at the right time.

HACKMAN: Were there any of the—I can't remember exactly what you call them—the regional people like Gaud, Hutchinson, who were particularly good with the press, or who created problems with the press, didn't know how to handle them?

BAYLEY: Janow, Hutchinson were lousy with the press. Gaud was good. Let me look at this list here. Coffin was good with the press, but he was always so cautious that a story didn't result, you know. We'd hold a press conference for Frank, and everybody would get along just fine, but he never said anything quotable or announced anything significant. Well, Moscoso, I don't know what you'd say about Moscoso in that respect. He got a lot of good publicity, but that's another whole story. Perhaps I should.... [Interruption]

Kennedy was very, very concerned about the Alliance for Progress. He talked to me about that the first time he

[-79-]

talked about going to AID. Then, about a month later, after I'd gone over there, I went over one night about 7:30 to take something over to Pierre, some announcement that the White House was going to put out for us, and Kennedy was in Pierre's office reading papers when I came in. And so we chatted a little bit, and he said, "How's the Alliance for Progress going?" from a publicity standpoint. I gave him some kind of report, it wasn't either here or there. He said, "I'm very concerned about that. I want you to take special steps to see that that program is better understood." About a week later I saw him over there again, and he said, "I've decided I want you to go down to the Alliance for Progress yourself and run that."

Well, this kind of upset me a little bit because that was one of my—I forgot to mention that—that was one of my divisions. It was like, you know, demoting yourself. Who's going to do the supervisory job if I'm going to step down one level? So I did. I was down there for about a month and organized that information department. Then I went back to my other job after I hired Bob Goldman [Robert Goldman], who was a very high-powered, aggressive guy, who really was better qualified than I in that field. He's was a specialist in Latin American stuff. He spoke fluent Spanish. And he's still working for Moscoso in private

life. It gradually became quite a good operation and, I think, satisfied Kennedy to the extent that it could.

The Alliance itself, it's one of those things like the poverty program or many other agencies where it's oversold to begin with. It had a slogan and some rather brash claims. I think this is, again, Dick Goodwin, sloganeering. You just couldn't do some of the things that they said they were going to do. You don't change the face of Latin America in one year. So there was a disappointment. Some of the factual things weren't accomplished, model housing that was started, and things like that. So it was a constant source of irritation, and Moscoso was always in trouble the same way Hamilton—well, he was in more trouble than Hamilton, really.

Now something's coming back. He and Lingle clashed, Moscoso and Lingle. Lingle just couldn't stand Moscoso—wild, disorganized, everything repellent to a captain of industry, you know. I think now maybe that was the clash

[-80-]

they had at the White House. Lingle and Moscoso had an open fight over there, I'm pretty sure of that. Anyway, Moscoso was disorganized. He didn't husband his time. He took foolish assignments, speaking engagements that didn't matter—very good-hearted and meant well and everything, but just was not efficient. But Bob Goldman did a great deal for him and more than just in a publicity way, he sort of organized him, and it got better. But Hamilton, too, I think had a feeling that Moscoso really wasn't getting anything done, that it was a lot of activity, but not real accomplishment.

HACKMAN:           Was there any move ever, any serious consideration of moving Moscoso out in that period on Dungan's part, or Hamilton's part, or maybe Bell?

BAYLEY:            Yes, there was, there was. Bobby Kennedy sent a guy in when it became serious, and they were in doubts about Moscoso as an administrator. This must have been about six months in. A fellow named Rex Nicholson, who had been active in the Stevenson [Adlai E. Stevenson] campaign in California and then the Kennedy campaign, and was a millionaire, he ran a trucking company and a variety of other enterprises. This was a funny incident. Bobby Kennedy sent him in as a consultant to survey the Latin American operation. I don't know if Bobby Kennedy sent him, Bobby Kennedy was the guy that enlisted him. I was very much impressed; Fowler Hamilton was very much impressed. He made half a dozen trips down to various AID missions in Latin America. He came back and wrote some very terse, critical reports which impressed me, and I think impressed Fowler. And I think had he stayed there long enough, it would have led to a reorganization of the Alliance for Progress and probably the replacement of Moscoso, not by Nicholson because he was just, obviously, temporary.

But here we got into trouble with the press because it turned out, through a strange coincidence that Hamilton had even forgotten about, some years before, Hamilton had represented one of Nicholson's firms in an anti-trust case. Hamilton was an anti-trust

specialist. It's this outfit—it's a big outfit that makes all the dry ice in the country, not Union Carbide, but it's something with carbonated or

[-81-]

carbon. Anyway, it's a big company. Liquid Carbonic. It has branches all over. And Nicholson is the principal owner. Hamilton had been his lawyer, and he'd been convicted or he'd settled out of court. He'd pleaded guilty, and then the settlement of some kind.

So some reporters discovered this—it was a guy named Dave Barnett [David L. Barnett] for North American Newspaper Alliance—had discovered this thing and made a big scandal out of it. Here was a guy convicted of violation of the antitrust laws, defended by Fowler Hamilton, and here he is working for Fowler Hamilton, So Nicholson resigned. I worked with Barnett to try to temper the story, and the story, actually, drew very little attention. Nobody else picked it up. It was a static situation, and Nicholson resigned at the time the story came out, so that was all there was to it. We lost a good man, and I think it might have changed the whole Alliance for Progress setup. It was too bad.

HACKMAN: You mentioned Robert Kennedy being involved at this point. Did he frequently get involved at AID? Did you have any contacts with him or his close staff?

BAYLEY: No, no. I think Frank Coffin did. I certainly had the feeling that Frank was sort of the liaison with Bobby. Oh, we all got involved in some open things like the physical fitness program, people had to go over and serve on committees in that. The counterinsurgency program. And that was a funny program. I don't know the whole story on that, but at one point some edict went forth that everybody in an executive capacity had to take a counterinsurgency course. They told us that a month or two, I'm not sure, go through all this sort of military type training and be dropped out over a jungle and work your way back for three or four days. I think a couple of people did go off on some such training course. But, you know, this filled us with dismay. I didn't want to take two months off. Here I am working day and night. I thought I had an important task to do, and the idea of going off on a silly thing like that, nuts. Again, that was Bobby Kennedy's deal. We had to fill out forms periodically

[-82-]

saying we were too busy to go off on this course. [Laughter]

HACKMAN: I never heard that before.

BAYLEY: Yeah. And after awhile, everybody just forgot about it, but it was one of those.... I think that was one of the things where Bobby Kennedy made an initial bad impression. He was so gung-ho for some of these things.

HACKMAN: Another group that was operating that Robert Kennedy was involved in was this group, I think it was under Lucius Battle for awhile, it was a youth group. Did AID have any feed in to that thing? It was an international youth program.

BAYLEY: Yes, I think so. I didn't have anything to do with it myself, but I think we were involved in it, yeah.

HACKMAN: You'd mentioned O'Brien's staff as being reluctant to take on a lot of the AID push. Did that apply to the Alliance for Progress, too? Here's something that's the President's program. It would seem strange that they would stay out of that too.

BAYLEY: Well, you see, the Alliance for Progress only entered Congress as a part of the AID bill, and we didn't encounter the same kind of opposition to that part of the bill. That, from a public relations and congressional relations standpoint, was a very strong part of the AID program. And that wouldn't be cut as much as the other parts would be cut. I think the record would show that. But there wasn't anything separate about that from a legislative standpoint.

HACKMAN: Anything particular with the foreign press that you got involved in?

BAYLEY: We didn't get involved much with the foreign press. The foreign press generally hung around the White House, and Jay Gildner was assigned, primarily, to handle the foreign press because they're a

[-83-]

big headache, except for a few of the British reporters who were sophisticated and friendly with everybody. You have a mass of Indians, and Japanese, and people who are difficult to communicate with, and they're always asking questions. And Pierre didn't want to bother with them so Jay took that over, and I think that helped a lot. But we didn't get a great many of them. Oh, occasionally, but we didn't have a great deal to do with the foreign press.

We had one incident that I remember that made sort of an international incident. A Greek reporter came in, a very aggressive fellow, phoned for an appointment a month in advance. I got in an argument with somebody at the White House, Dungan, I guess, about this. No, State Department, this is where we had a fight with the State Department. I'm skipping now. This is under Dave Bell. He wanted an interview with Bell, he wanted an interview with somebody else. I got him all the interviews except Dave Bell, pleaded that he was busy or something, but he submitted written questions, and we submitted written answers. The wonderful ways of Greek politics, this guy is in opposition somehow to our position over there, and he took what we gave him, which is little enough, and blew it up somehow and made a story which had our embassy over there in a panic. So we had a big flap about that. Some people got annoyed with me, but I said, "We can't discriminate. If a reporter comes in here, we can't say, 'You're Greek, we can't talk to you.'" So I just stuck to

that. Sometimes if you're stubborn enough, you can win those battles. I felt I was in the right on that, and I just stuck to it.

HACKMAN: Were there any problems at an embassy level that came to your desk that you tried to create any changes on? Or did you get involved in that at all?

BAYLEY: Yes, there were things like that. We got a lot of cable traffic with the embassies, and many of the things that we—well, you get into this in writing a press release. You'd have to have it cleared by the embassy if it was an important matter. There were a lot of things. We had to go back and forth with Galbraith [John Kenneth Galbraith] in India, and with Bowles later, and with people in Viet Nam, and other places around

[-84-]

the world. I think more in India than anything else where we had a lot of big projects, and if you're announcing a steel mill in India, there's all sorts of ramifications in India on this thing. We'd work very closely with embassy people, and often they'd send in a man for a couple of weeks while this was being prepared.

HACKMAN: Any of the Kennedy appointees who created problems because of their independent lines to the White House for your operation?

BAYLEY: Oh, let's see.

HACKMAN: Galbraith or Attwood [William H. Attwood]?

BAYLEY: Galbraith, of course. There were many things like Jim Loeb [James I. Loeb] in Peru, and Attwood, to an extent, and Galbraith. I think if somebody ever could collect the Galbraith cables from India, it would be as good a book as Galbraith's ever written, probably better because they were real. My God, he used to make powerful arguments, and he could do it so well.

That was another thing about government: if you wrote in plain language, you got into trouble, or you created a stir and caused trouble. I used to do the same thing. Frank Coffin used to plead with me to write in government jargon. My idea was to cause trouble, you know, to get this to the point where somebody would consider it. And Galbraith did the same thing, only a better writer. But his cables would just cause consternation in the State Department when they'd come in. They used to be bootlegged around, you know; people would go around showing you—and they were classified—they were so good. People would roar with laughter. He'd just make these points, demolish the official State Department position. Oh, he was a constant source of trouble. To some extent Bowles, Bowles didn't do that as well, and he didn't fight the same way.

Jim Loeb, whom I knew quite well, got in trouble another way, of course. Jim ran a very good operation there in Peru, and we had a good AID mission there. Everything was

going nicely until that election came along, and then they thought that—Jim said he didn't, but the common impression was, and I think the State Department believed, and the

[-85-]

White House, that he had sided with the APRA [American Popular Revolutionary Alliance] party man who won and then was ousted, so they felt his usefulness was over there. It was, in a way, the result of being a political appointee. Jim was a Peace Corps type, you know. He was going there genuinely concerned about that country and our relations with it and wanted to do all he could to help its development and felt that he had to talk to the people there. Whereas an old State Department hand would have played it completely cool and not be friendly to anybody, he was friendly to almost everybody. And it blew up, and I think he was treated rather harshly, because I thought he did very well. I thought AID missions and some of our embassies in those countries ought to do just what he had done.

And to some extent Attwood had the same situation. He didn't get the same trouble—his only trouble was health, really—but he did just what Jim Loeb did, but it worked in his case. Let's see, who were some of the others? Are there a list of any mission directors in here?

HACKMAN: No, I don't think so.

BAYLEY: Yeah. Let me see if any of these names remind me of anything. Well, this everybody knows. I see Herb Waters' [Herbert J. Waters] name here. He was, of course, a Humphrey appointee.

HACKMAN: He got into a lot of trouble.

BAYLEY: Yeah. Yeah, I'll say. Poor Herb. He ran a pretty good operation there, I think, on the whole. It was a funny area, you know, but, hardware and just sort of a business operation.

HACKMAN: What kind of relationship did you have with Salinger after you went over to AID?

BAYLEY: Oh, it was better then. Yeah.

HACKMAN: No problems on who was going to do these things?

BAYLEY: No, no. We cooperated on all the regular things,

[-86-]

White House releasing our stuff and vice versa. I don't remember any

more trouble that way. It was simply that he was insecure. I think his own security improved about that time, too, and he wasn't as worried about his job as he was before.

HACKMAN: I remember something, you were talking about going down and helping Moscoso and then sending, was it Goldman down...

BAYLEY: Yes.

HACKMAN: ...to help Moscoso. Didn't Bill Haddad [William F. Haddad] come over from the Peace Corps at one point and do something for AID? Do you remember that?

BAYLEY: Yes. That's during the time that I was in the Alliance. That was the time that they sent him over at the same time I went down myself. No, actually, the sequence went like this: Bill Haddad came over on a Monday, say. He went down there, and in three days he had the whole thing upset. Typical operation of Haddad, he comes in and starts making phone calls and just calls up everybody he can think of, and he likes to have three secretaries, all putting in phone calls simultaneously. Big, unthoughtout ideas, you know, some of them silly ideas. And poor old Moscoso didn't know what had hit him. Within about three days, he was getting a hundred phone calls a day. People had forgotten who Moscoso was, Haddad was running the thing. And Moscoso came up and pleaded to get rid of this fellow. And I think he went over to the White House and asked that, so that was the point at which I went down there, and I said, "Haddad, get out." And I took over personally. That was how that went.

HACKMAN: I'd wondered how that worked.

BAYLEY: I still like Bill. I see him occasionally here, and I helped him in his campaign, but the way he operates in those things is incredible. And it's not at all what was needed there. The kind of thing he does is alright for a one week big campaign to sell something and forget it, you know.

[-87-]

HACKMAN: I don't know if you want to make a big jump back now on the Peace Corps and relate this to your relationship with him and how Shriver [R. Sargent Shriver, Jr.] used the two of you and how this all worked out at the Peace Corps.

BAYLEY: Alright. Bill Haddad came to the Peace Corps, I would guess, about a month after I did. Shriver thought he was hiring a speech writer because he had written a couple of speeches when he had been at the *New York Post* for Shriver, and Shriver liked his style which was jazzy and punchy. But Haddad didn't want to be a speech writer. He consented to write a few speeches, an

occasional speech after that, but he wanted to be in operations. He didn't want to be in publicity; he didn't want to be a speech writer; he didn't want to be in any kind of promotion; he wanted to be in what he always called a line position. And so, within about two months he was, first, a special assistant to Shriver; then in about two months or three months, he set up and organized a new department called Research and Evaluation.

This really was a promotional department because what he did is hire good newspaper reporters. Some people transferred from my staff over to this operation, and some came in from outside. This really didn't get going until about the end of the first year of the Peace Corps, actually. I guess he stayed as a special assistant longer than I said at first. About the time I left to go over to the White House, he was setting this up. And he'd send these reporters out to Nigeria, say, and they would make a thorough investigation of that mission and collect all kinds of anecdotes, reports on progress, and reports on negative things. Then they'd come back and write this up and turn it in. And then these would be the basis of feature stories. Sometimes they would leak these reports, raw, to friendly reporters. But they were very useful in creating a lot of good feature stories about the Peace Corps. Later on, when he went to the poverty program, he did this same thing. I forget what he called it there. I think he called himself [BEGIN SIDE 2, TAPE 2] Inspector General. Are you alright?

HACKMAN: Yes.

[-88-]

BAYLEY: And he had somewhat the same operation going over there, but it wasn't as easy there, this country, for one thing, and not an exclusive foreign situation. I don't know if I talked about Bill Moyers [William D. Moyers] or not.

HACKMAN: Very little.

BAYLEY: I think of him in the same context. Bill Moyers and I came in at the same time. He was foisted upon Shriver by Johnson, not that Shriver was unwilling to take him, but Shriver didn't recruit him. He had handled a couple of advance jobs for Kennedy in the campaign, I think, but he'd been on Johnson's staff. He was interested in the Peace Corps, and Johnson helped get him a job there. There was a little confusion at first as to where his responsibility started and mine.... I think he headed the department called Public Affairs and mine was Information. It boiled down to that he was congressional liaison. Shriver, like Hamilton, spent most of his time out on the Hill, and in the company of Moyers. The whole Kennedy Administration, at that time, was particularly concerned with the Southerners, Westerners, conservatives, and they were the key people on the committees in order to get this legislation through. So we used to get into a few arguments on issues and principles, the concessions they would make to people like Smathers [George A. Smathers], or other Florida congressmen, Texas congressmen, I can't remember in detail. Sometimes they'd want to compromise, I thought, a little too much. But Bill did that quite effectively.



HACKMAN: Can you remember specifically instances of—I'm going to let you light that cigar this time.

BAYLEY: Alright.

HACKMAN: I don't know if—you were still there maybe when the legislation was up on the Charles Kamen thing, the guy who'd given the Rotary Club speech down there and there was a budget cut or something.

BAYLEY: Oh, yes. This was at the back of my mind what I'm saying about principle. Oh, I certainly do

[-89-]

remember that. I was personally embarrassed by that in one respect with a reporter named Dave Kraslow [David Kraslow]. Kamen was a Peace Corps volunteer from Miami, president of his senior class at Brandeis, I believe. In the middle of his training period, a Florida congressman and Smathers objected to his being there. Oh, I know what happened. He went home on Christmas vacation, was invited to a meeting of the Rotary Club, I believe, in Miami. They were showing a film of "Operation Abolition," at the end of which Mr. Kamen got up and gave his opinion of that film, which was negative, at which point Rotarians all decided he was a communist and started calling their congressmen. They made him leave the meeting.

Then this pressure started, so all the Florida congressmen, Dante Fascell [Dante B. Fascell] and—I've forgotten who the other one is in the area—and Smathers, so they got a hold of Shriver and Moyers and said, "You've got to get this guy out." Then we started a whole series of internal debates as to what about this. I was for saying, "Well, you can't do that." And on my side in these arguments were Charlie Peters [Charles G. Peters, Jr.], who was a lawyer from West Virginia who eventually wound up as Haddad's deputy in that department of Research and Evaluation, but was then kind of a special assistant to Shriver, and handling a lot of.... This thing really came to Charlie first somehow. He was handling spot situations, trouble shooting. Well, they announced....

I'm trying to think how the sequence went. I know what happened later, that's the trouble. Shriver and Moyers came to me to ask me to make an announcement that he was being dropped out of the training program for psychological problems or something of that kind. They'd first tried to make him resign voluntarily, I guess, and he refused. Then they somehow got somebody to say he was psychologically unfit. This later turned out to be untrue. They convinced me.... Oh, I know how it went. Charlie Peters and I won. We were arguing with Moyers. Moyers wanted to drop him out because of this pressure. Charlie and I said, "You can't do that." Shriver was sort of sitting as the "You're my staff, now what should I do?" I had to issue the release and tell the press, and actually

[-90-]

had a little press conference, that he was being dropped for psychological reasons, and at that time I believed that because Shriver swore to me that was true.

So the stories were written that way, and the issue finally disappeared only to be revived about three or four months later, six months later, when I got a call from Dave Kraslow. I think he was then for the *L.A. Times*, or maybe he went to the *L.A. Times*. He's still in Washington. I think he won a Pulitzer Prize or something. He was a good digging reporter. And he called up and he said, "I never thought that you would do this to me. You're the one information officer in government I didn't think would lie to me." And I was really shocked because I didn't think I had lied to anybody. Then he said he had found out long before this incident took place that at the very outset Shriver and Moyers had made a deal with the AA for Smathers who had resigned from Smathers' staff and had told Kraslow this whole story.

Kraslow was with the *Miami Herald* or *Miami News* at that time. Then he went to the *L.A. Times*. But it was a local story for him, and this guy had told him the whole story, that there was a deal made. He said, "You didn't tell me about this. You told me another story. You lied to me." And I felt terrible about this. I went back, and I found out from Moyers that it was true. But they gave him a very bad deal. It was just simply to placate the Florida congressmen.

HACKMAN: Can you remember how that tied in to the legislation—I believe at that point the legislation had been passed and was in the appropriations stage. I had heard that...

BAYLEY: I think that's right.

HACKMAN: ...there were calls from the Hill saying that, "If you want ten million cut, keep Kamen in."

BAYLEY: There probably were. I wouldn't have got those calls. Moyers would have gotten those calls, or Shriver himself. But I'm sure that was true.

[-91-]

It's a hard question, you know. What do you do? Do you sacrifice the program for being honest with one guy? I would have chosen that and fight it out on that basis. I think you'd have won because, for the most part, those congressmen don't care about whether they win or lose or anything like that as long as they satisfy their constituents by making a fight against evil forces.

HACKMAN: Going back to the Peace Corps press operation, was the White House concerned that the Peace Corps was—I don't know whether it was just Haddad who was looked at, I think, as a pretty leaky place. Did the White House ever show concern on any of the stories, particularly in the dispute on where the Peace Corps was going to go? Is it going to be under AID, is it going to be independent?

BAYLEY: In the very early days, you mean?

HACKMAN: Yeah.

BAYLEY: There was concern at the White House about the actual operation, about where it should go. I think there was a difference of opinion over there. And if I recollect correctly, I think Dungan wanted it under AID.

They were not sure that Shriver was the man either. I don't know if I mentioned this before or not. I got a call one day from Dungan shortly before Shriver was appointed. Ralph said, "Now, tell me frankly. We want to know." I think by we, he meant he and Kenny O'Donnell; Kenny was in on this. "Is Shriver heavy enough for this job?" He said, "There's some people here that think he's a light weight. You've been over there now for two weeks, you ought to have some idea of his abilities." And I said, "Yes, I think he is. I know what you mean, but I think that his qualities of salesmanship, of enthusiasm, and I think he genuinely believes in the Peace Corps idea," which I think is true. I said, "I think he'll do it very well." Ralph said, "Okay." And then the next day they made the announcement. It was an awful lot of responsibility, I thought, to ask me, having been there two weeks; I'd never met Shriver before. But as long

[-92-]

as I was asked, I thought I had to respond. But they were doubtful about it.

And I knew these debates were going on about where it should be placed. I, myself, was on the side of keeping it an independent agency, and I'm sure Shriver was. I think all of us over there were of a mind about that. It was just that there were other people. I think the Secretary of State, I think Rusk [Dean Rusk] probably felt it should be under AID. The State Department never liked the Peace Corps, either the idea of it or the operation of it, because it's uncontrolled, and these people are not held responsible to the embassy or anything like that. They would have felt happier with it under somebody's thumb. But it wouldn't have worked that way, I don't think.

HACKMAN: Do you know, on the White House staff, when you went over then, when you left the Peace Corps, what was their feeling about Shriver at that point? Were they still doubtful or had...

BAYLEY: No, by that time he'd proved himself, I think, and the thing was going so swimmingly. Sarge was never much of an administrator, which was later demonstrated painfully at the poverty program. But it wasn't an administrator that was needed at the outset there, it was a person like Sarge who was a promotion man, really. The arguments I had with him—and I had a lot of arguments. We didn't get along real well because I was much more conservative than he was in this area. He once told me that you didn't have to worry about being consistent with the press, "You tell them one thing today and the next thing tomorrow. They'll forget." Well, they don't forget. He said, "That's the way we ran it in the campaign." Well, in a campaign it's a little different. There's usually something breaking every day, and one day is forgotten. But in an agency

like that, that's not true. It went against all my philosophy, and so I was constantly arguing with him about half-truths and things that wouldn't really hold up on examination, and cutting them out of his speeches, and telling him he can't say that. Or he'd want me to put out a release that I felt was phony, and I wouldn't do it. And so we had quite a few clashes. And, again, Bill Moyers was usually on his side on these things.

[-93-]

HACKMAN: Can you remember any of the kinds of things that were differed on?

BAYLEY: Well, let me see. It's hard to remember. Those were the day by day things, there might have been two or three a day sometimes. It was on a matter of editing and arguing over a speech. I can remember one rather flagrant one. We were in Lagos, Nigeria, on that trip around the world, and Sarge said to me, "What are you doing today?" And I said, "Well, I'm doing this and that." I told him what I was doing, and he said, "None of that sounds very important to me. Here's what you do today. *Holiday on Ice* is in town, an American cast. You go over there and find the fanciest blond in the cast, take her out to dinner, tell her all about the Peace Corps. Then call a press conference and television and have her tell the Nigerians all about the Peace Corps." And I said, "Sarge, you're crazy." He said, "That's an order." And I said, "That's ridiculous. I won't do it." And he said, "That's an order." I said, "The hell with it." And I didn't do it. He was mad at me for several days. That's his idea of a good story. Especially, I knew the Nigerian press; we'd had a press conference the day before. They're dead serious, you know. They would have considered this an affront. It would have been the worst thing you could have done.

HACKMAN: Would he use the Haddad side on some of the wilder things that he wanted to do like this?

BAYLEY: Yes, he used Haddad, and he also used a man that I brought in as my deputy, Tom Mathews of San Francisco. He used him for such things. I remember Tom planted a story with a friend of his who worked on the *New Yorker*, and it got into the "Talk of the Town" column, completely phony, about this trip, about how the whole trip was tourist class. The whole trip was first class. And that poor Sarge had to sleep on the floor. Well, he slept on the floor, it was the best place you could sleep. They'd give him that section about a yard wide back of the last seat in the first class section and fix it up with pillows and blankets, and he was very comfortable. All

[-94-]

this hardship was completely phony. That's the kind of thing that I didn't like. You didn't have to phony it up. There were some creditable things about Sarge on that trip. He paid his own way. And, as a matter of fact, that's his rationale for going first class, he was paying his own way. Nothing wrong with that, but it had to be made that he was a hero and going tourist

class. Well, that's just one little incident. But Haddad and Matthews would plant that kind of a story. They always had to push the truth a little bit farther than was justified.

HACKMAN: Were there any major decisions concerning the Peace Corps that came out of that trip?

BAYLEY: Oh, yes. Yes. That trip was really a scouting trip to see if anybody wanted Peace Corps contingents. In this, I discovered today, I sort of hate to give them up, but I have a diary of that trip, two notebooks in which, day by day account. Nothing very profound, but just what happened and some comments—just like a reporter's notes. I wanted to ask you about this, this is not for the record here. My only concern in this is that I don't want to embarrass some—I'm talking very candidly with you, you know, about Haddad and Moyers and everybody. I don't want to embarrass anybody.

HACKMAN: There's no problem.

BAYLEY: I don't want a story about Kamen coming in the next few years.

HACKMAN: Nothing is open until the Kennedy Library opens, that's '72 or '73, and then we'll write into the agreement ten years or whatever you want beyond that. Even if you agree to open it right away, the Archivist would not let anybody see this. He would overrule you, in effect.

BAYLEY: Oh, we were talking about that trip and its meaning, its importance. It was a very important trip. The whole Peace Corps was launched with such speed and without, really, sufficient backgrounding if you were going to do the thing under ideal conditions. I think it was the right way to do it; you

[-95-]

had to strike while the enthusiasm was there. But if it had been a typical AID project, or something, they would have spent two years of diplomatic negotiations on this thing, and it probably never would have gained the same momentum. But we didn't really know anything about the other countries.

And here, again, it was like a diplomat of the type of Jim Loeb and Attwood and the rest of them; Shriver going abroad was a total amateur. He got into to see the heads of governments everywhere because he was a brother-in-law of Kennedy's. While he didn't like that introduction, he had to use it because that's how he got in there. He was royalty to them, a concept which they understood. So we did see the heads of every government every place we visited and got very good treatment and, actually, concessions that otherwise couldn't have been achieved by a year of diplomatic negotiations with the embassy.

But we found out there wasn't any overwhelming desire to have Peace Corps units come into a country, except perhaps in the Philippines where they were so desperately in

need of teachers that they welcomed it. But most of these countries, I think it was partly an adjustment of thinking. They were used to foreign aid, and they liked the idea of experts coming in, they liked to have money coming in, but to have a bunch of enthusiastic young people, even though almost every one of them recognized the need for teachers, it was a strange idea, and they were negative at first, usually. But Shriver, again, being a good salesman, and being a brother-in-law, sold them on these things, and he got semi-concessions out of them in some cases that he presumed upon later, and they were pushed into a position where they couldn't say no. It worked alright. But we didn't really know what the Peace Corps was going to be until we made that trip. We had to actually find out from the people over there what they would accept, what kind of aid they would welcome.

HACKMAN: Can you remember two fairly controversial things in the first year of the Peace Corps: one was the draft status, and the other, the approach to take, the policy to have toward religious groups running projects? I'd wondered if you could recall any of the discussions on either of those.

[-96-]

BAYLEY: I remember a good deal of discussion about the draft status thing. I don't think there were any real arguments. I think in our other conversation I told you about how we hammered out policies at white heat all night; this executive committee and the task force would come back with the policy, and then we'd argue it out.

HACKMAN: Right.

BAYLEY: I believe that draft matter came up in those meetings, although it didn't go away, it wasn't settled as firmly as some of them because the public and the volunteers themselves kept asking the questions. But I don't remember any basic argument about it. There was always the idea that there was a deferment for the period of time. Now that's been eroded, I guess, because they are drafting people out of the Peace Corps. But, at that time, the rule was that you could not be drafted while you were in the Peace Corps, but that it gave you no exemption beyond that, which I thought was the only sensible way to do it. Of course, we didn't have the Viet Nam war in the same way, so it wasn't as sore a point as it later became. On the matter of the religious groups, I can't remember much about that. That was an issue at AID, too. I remember being about that, to tell the truth.

HACKMAN: How much time do you have?

BAYLEY: I might as well finish off the afternoon.

HACKMAN: Okay. So British Guiana was one you were involved in at AID.

BAYLEY: Yeah, I've been reading the stories about that recently, and the

situation hasn't changed very much since that time. The question then was a very sensitive one for the Hill because it was the Jagan [Cheddi B. Jagan] government. And the recommendation of the Bob Nathan [Robert Roy Nathan] group was to give a limited amount of aid. It was a classic case of the dilemma of foreign aid

[-97-]

with a hostile government: Do you try to do something about changing that government, or lessening that hostility, by giving foreign aid, or do you just cut them off and let them go?

Well, this was argued for about two days in Hamilton's office, and the decision was that there was more to be gained by giving a limited amount of aid than in neglecting them. I think that policy was proven to be right, but at the time it was thought that this would become a great political issue, so they were very fearful of how to present this. Well, again, it's one of those arguments, what do you say about it? You try to gild the lily—or try to fool anybody, that's really the question. Do you lie to the public or not? I don't believe that we did. We gave all the facts. And Hamilton made this decision, and I think he did it right. I argue on that side of the course. There were some, typical State Department people, who just, well, cover it up, you know. But I think it was the right decision, and it didn't actually last very long. That's the thing about these situations, that people forget. It gets hot for a couple of days, and it's forgotten. No one can talk forever about British Guiana.

HACKMAN: Hadn't Jagan made a controversial *Meet The Press* appearance when he was up here?

BAYLEY: I believe he had. Or was it his wife [Janet Jagan]?

HACKMAN: The Chicago communist?

BAYLEY: Yeah. No, I guess it was he. It was hot because of that. And, of course, all the publicity about his wife, too. And I guess he'd gotten some people on the Hill angry somehow. So there was more pressure on that one than on most.

HACKMAN: Can you remember Schlesinger being in on this at all because he writes in his book, I think he has three or four pages, as one of the things he did get substantively involved in?

BAYLEY: No, he was not over there for those meetings.

[-98-]

There was somebody from the White House. It was either Carl Kaysen or Bob Komer [Robert W. Komer]. I think at that time, it was Carl Kaysen; I think Komer came on the scene later. He sat in on some of these meetings. Well, I guess Moscoso was in there, of course, because it was Latin America, although I can't

remember Ted saying very much about it. I think he had something to do with the decision about and whether it should get aid or not, but he was bypassed, this went over his head. I think the real decision was made by Hamilton and the man from the White House.

HACKMAN: How did CIA come into this? Because hasn't there always been controversy that the AID mission was a cover-up for CIA to really find out what Jagan's policy was?

BAYLEY: Yes. Yes, and I'm sure that part of our mission was CIA. We once had a briefing by Roger Hilsman when he was in the Intelligence—I don't want to say anything that's.... I don't know if this is security things or not. I can say it generally. What it amounted to was that he told us how many CIA men we had in each mission. We didn't even know that.

HACKMAN: I'd wondered how many people knew, and how it got to them.

BAYLEY: Hamilton did not know. There may have been somebody in the personnel office or something that had a connection with CIA and knew, but we were quite surprised. Wait, I'm not sure this was Hamilton or Bell. No, it must have been Hamilton because Hilsman shifted over about the same time that Hamilton left. He had about a dozen of us from AID, we had to get some special clearance for this, had this briefing down in Hilsman's office, and he had charts and all kind of things explaining—really, it was to orient us to the intelligence activities that were taking place in the government. I remember being astounded at the number of intelligence agencies that there were operating, things we'd never heard of. But we got around to the AID missions and gave us numbers, in some cases, of how many

[-99-]

people in each mission were CIA men. He didn't tell us which ones. But we were all quite surprised at this because we had no idea it was that extensive. I remember particularly the Saigon mission, and it's understandable, but about half the Saigon mission was CIA.

HACKMAN: Why did Hilsman make this effort? Was this something that was traditionally done periodically?

BAYLEY: Well, it was being done systematically. I don't know if it was traditional or not, but it was just a matter of orientation so that people in different parts of the organization would know what was going on.

HACKMAN: How far down would this go at...

BAYLEY: It went down about as far as me. It didn't go below presidential appointees. I wasn't officially a presidential appointee in that I didn't



have a flag, I wasn't Assistant Secretary although part of my deal in going over there was that I was going to be one. They were all taken up. We have a certain number by statute for the agency, and they were all taken. Fowler wanted me to come—you know, I was foisted on him, but he was enthusiastic about the idea after he got to know me. And he promised me that I would get the first vacancy that occurred, and none occurred during his year. There wasn't any turnover. A vacancy came up right after he left, and, of course, his promise didn't extend to Dave Bell. And so when a vacancy did occur, Hollis Chenery got it. I told Bell about it after the fact, and I said, "You didn't even know about this. There's nothing you can do about it." But I was kind of disappointed.

HACKMAN: Just glancing at the Government Organization Manual, any significance in the change from the Director of Public Affairs to Information Director?

[-100-]

BAYLEY: I did that myself. It was part of the reorganization, but I really wanted to distinguish my staff from Manning's staff for the State Department, which was called Public Affairs. I wanted a clean break, and so I chose that terminology. And Fowler Hamilton agreed with it because we wanted to establish a separate identity. But on the other hand, in order not to preclude whatever prestige that title, that name, carried, I had one of my two main divisions called Public Affairs.

HACKMAN: Going back to the CIA question, was there any move on the part of anybody at AID that you know of to try to get CIA out of any of the things they were involved in?

BAYLEY: No. The CIA issue was an important one in the Peace Corps, too. We were, Shriver and all of us, we were determined not to have any CIA involvement or any intelligence activity at all. It worked rather a hardship on a few people, very good people, who wanted to get in. But if they'd had any military intelligence activity whatever, they were ruled out immediately. And we were very serious; we said it openly; we would screen out any person connected with the CIA just as we would screen out a Communist, you know. We considered them about in the same class as far as the Peace Corps was concerned. I think this was an excellent policy with the Peace Corps, and one that without that—of course, propaganda in a lot of countries, the Communist element in almost any country that we went to would make charges of that kind. But as far as I know, in the early days, at least, they were groundless. We did try to keep them out. Now whether the CIA got to anybody afterwards or not, I don't know. But we tried to do that. Anybody found with that connection, out they went.

Well, AID didn't have that attitude; AID being older and more cynical, you might say, they expected this. And they knew it was going on, even if they didn't know who it was. I suspect that.... You know, there were a great many of these public safety advisors, and I suspect most of them were CIA, but also a lot of other people.

[-101-]

And every embassy, of course, had a CIA man. It used to be very humorous. You'd go into an embassy staff meeting, as I did on several of my travels, and they'd always have one guy they'd never identify. Or if they'd do anything, "It's the man from the other agency." The CIA was really funny.

HACKMAN: I'd wondered if at the Peace Corps had any disagreements with CIA attempts to get in ever came up? I heard somebody mention that a couple of times this had to be taken to the White House.

BAYLEY: If it was taken to the White House, I think they'd have backed us up on this because we had backing from the White House on that policy right to the President. I think Shriver took it up personally with Jack Kennedy. The Peace Corps was Kennedy's own program. He didn't want anything to spoil it, and he understood, I think, the idealism of the people who were going into it. If they thought they were being used that way, it would have destroyed it right from the beginning.

HACKMAN: Something that is sort of the same type of problem, can you remember any discussion of whether FBI full field checks would be done on everybody coming into the Peace Corps or whether that was...

BAYLEY: Oh, yes. Yes, there was discussion of that. I think it was our position that we didn't need full checks. I can't remember how it came out...

HACKMAN: I think they were done by the FBI and eventually by Civil Service on contract. I heard there was some discussion as to whether this would turn people off.

BAYLEY: Yes. And the kind of people, the idealists, the kind of people that were being attracted by this program resented that. It was a problem. I think what we did, Larry, was that, it wasn't exactly a subterfuge, but we got some concession out of the FBI that it would not be a full field check, but a limited thing of some kind. What we tried to do was get them to eliminate any political connection, any political test.

[-102-]

HACKMAN: I'm skipping around a lot here, you mentioned your efforts while at AID to—well, the criticism from some of the conservative press. The President was having these meetings with publishers.

BAYLEY: Yes.

HACKMAN: Did this help any to turn off criticism on AID that you remember?

You'd said you'd written the memo for the Minnesota meeting. I think that's while you were at the White House.

BAYLEY: Yes. I rather doubt whether it came up very often. The kind of memo that I wrote to the White House was Minnesota problems between the state and federal government or legislation that they were interested in, that affected their state. I wasn't asked for information on the big issues of government. Whether they came up in those sessions or not, I don't know. I never attended one.

HACKMAN: The Clay [Lucius Dubignon Clay, Sr.] committee, maybe you can talk about the beginning of this, if you know what side the idea came out of.

BAYLEY: I did know all about it. I'm not sure how much I can remember. That's where Bill Dentzer came into the picture, I believe.

HACKMAN: He was what? A friend of Dungan's?

BAYLEY: A friend of Dungan's. They'd been at Penn State together. And, of course, Dentzer later turned out to be—well, we always figured he was CIA at the time, somehow or other.

HACKMAN: Oh, I didn't know that.

BAYLEY: Yeah. Well, he was exposed in the...

HACKMAN: This last time around?

BAYLEY: Sure, the National Student Association. He was an official of that.

HACKMAN: I've lost the name.

[-103-]

BAYLEY: Yeah. And he turned up again in the middle of that. He was one of the original two or three NSA people who made the deal with the CIA, and I think he'd been connected with the agency every since. You know, Dentzer was one of those guys, he almost was playing the part of a CIA agent. He always had this air of mystery about everything he did. I don't think this had anything to do with the Clay commission.

The Clay commission was related to this problem of a citizens' commission, and it was another effort in order to get a bunch of prominent conservative citizens to take a hard look at the aid program and say it's a great thing. That's what it really boiled down to. It got to be more than that, of course, because of the kind of person General Clay was. And it got to be quite a problem because he took his responsibilities very seriously, and after a while, it

was almost as if he were running the agency because all major policy decisions were going to him. And everybody was sort of glad when it faded away. I think some of their recommendations had merit, but they really weren't anything new. Dentzer did most of the investigation, wrote the report; Clay put his stamp on it. He went over it carefully. The rest of the commission didn't do much. George Meany never attended a single session, as far as I know.

HACKMAN: I'd wondered if there were any efforts when this was first proposed or when it got going at the AID side to try to keep it from getting started.

BAYLEY: There was doubt about whether it should be done, but I can't remember the actual—I'm sure I was there, but just what the arguments were, I can't remember.

HACKMAN: Can you remember any discussion, then, of how to respond to the press or in your releases, to the committee? I think AID's attitude was, and Bell's attitude in his testimony was, we agree with the things the Clay...

BAYLEY: That's right, yeah. We didn't agree that much, you know, but that was the public posture. And mostly we could agree with them; they weren't radical recommendations. Larry, excuse me just a minute.

[-104-]

I've got to go see what Jack... [Interruption]

HACKMAN: I thought maybe we could talk about what you know about how Bell came over. Whether anybody else was considered and what impact he had, particularly on your operation.

BAYLEY: Let's see. First of all, they didn't have Bell lined up when Hamilton left. His resignation took them by surprise. There was a period of speculation, I believe, but it wasn't very long. I can't remember who else was mentioned, if anybody.

HACKMAN: The press was talking about Shriver.

BAYLEY: That's right. That's right. I remember that now, yeah. I remember my own feelings. I was glad when Dave Bell came because I didn't think Shriver had the right kind of attributes for that job.

HACKMAN: More than a selling job involved.

BAYLEY: Yeah. It isn't the kind of thing that he could have sold, I didn't feel.

And more than that, it did need administration. By that time, the need for a good administrator was clear, and I think that's why we felt very pleased that Dave Bell was coming because we thought that—remember his excellent reputation in the Budget Bureau. And I think that his approach to it was that; he did take over the administration personally. To him the selling job was.... He knew he had to do it, and he worked at that, although it was a difficult thing for him to do. I don't think he'd had to do anything quite like that before. But his main attention went on the proper administration of the agency, and he paid a lot of attention to the programs themselves. I'm not sure whether Dave is an economist or not, but he got...

HACKMAN:           Everybody's always debated just what he is.

BAYLEY:            Yeah. But he got along well with the economists, and he thought as they think. From that standpoint it was a happier internal situation.

[-105-]

Everybody was pleased with the choice, I remember that. But as far as my own operation was concerned, it was a little more difficult working with Dave Bell than with Fowler Hamilton. Fowler had taken the attitude, "You run your operation. Tell me what you want me to do, and I'll do it." Dave Bell was a little more difficult because he didn't want to go out and make speeches. He knew he had to go up to the Hill even though he didn't like it, but he resisted the public side of it. We had to push him a little more. He didn't interfere in any way with my operation, and we had a good relationship. I can't think of anything out of the ordinary, really. He was a good guy to work for.

HACKMAN:            Would you get at all involved in discussions of what kind of budget should be sent up as far as impact on Congress and the public? I know everybody says that Bell, then, made the decision to go for the tighter budget rather than the usual budget with a lot of padding in it. Did you get involved in anything like this?

BAYLEY:            No, I don't think so, not really. We got involved in all those things at the time. My department had to put out the congressional presentation, and that inevitably leads to some policy discussions, more a matter of emphasis, I think, than actually dollars. He did run a tighter internal budget, and I think I remember now, I was disappointed. I had ideas for expanding, naturally, in other areas in which we could operate with more money, but instead, my staff like others in the agency, got cut or held back, don't fill vacancies, that sort of thing, reflecting the tighter congressional budget.

He brought in a tough, a good, but tough—well, first he brought in one, I didn't think a very good administrator, a fellow named Brennan [Bernard T. Brennan] who came from outside. He was a New York businessman. And he did some rather erratic things, and it got to be kind of a shambles awhile. Then they brought in Bill Hall [William O. Hall] who was a

career fellow. And while I may speak disparagingly of career people in some contexts, I think in the adminis-

[-106-]

trative job that's the right kind of person to have. Hall, even though he was faced with some of these limited finances, he administered quite well and with some sympathy for the Problems of the departments.

HACKMAN: Did Bell get along with Dungan and the other people at the White House much better than Hamilton had?

BAYLEY: Yes. Bell was an insider. He had worked in the White House or near the White House, well actually, worked in the White House under Truman [Harry S. Truman]. In the Budget Bureau you're over there a great deal. And he was more of a Kennedy Administration type than Hamilton was, and I think that relationship was quite smooth.

HACKMAN: Can you recall people at AID feeling that the President, when he would have a foreign visitor and talk AID projects, would give things away too easily? Was this something that people talked about a lot?

BAYLEY: There was that talk, yes. Yes. There was great fear around there every time an important foreign visitor got to see the President that there would be commitments made that weren't in our plans. They always felt that they were the professionals, and they knew better what to do about this. And quite often it would happen that there would be commitments made, and then they'd come over to work it out with AID people, and we were committed to things that we hadn't really wanted to do. This happened, I recall, with Morocco, and it was the kind of aid, it was arms aid. I know there was a feeling that he'd gone much too far. I think there was a situation involving India, too. I don't remember other particular countries. But there's no doubt there was that feeling.

HACKMAN: Did you have many ties with Sylvester's office, after you went over to AID, on military aid projects, anything here on working it out?

[-107-]

BAYLEY: No, not really. I saw Art socially now and then. He was an old friend of mine from newspaper days. And occasionally I wanted something from him, or he from me, but no regular, and not really anything in connection with military aid.

HACKMAN: Briefly, before, you mentioned that India was one of the things you can remember in addition to British Guiana. Anything here that you

can add on this deal, the deal in how to handle...

BAYLEY: Oh, yeah. That again was a sensitive issue with Congress. And the question there was how best to present it. There wasn't any real doubt in anybody's mind that it was a good project and that there was nothing you could do for India that would do any more in the long run than that project. [Interruption]

HACKMAN: You were on India and the steel mill.

BAYLEY: I remember that a fellow, the deputy, came in from the India mission for that discussion. He was the retiring AID mission director, Tyler? [C. Tyler Wood] That's the name I remember, a career fellow. He came, and he was ambivalent on the question. Galbraith was all for it, and, in fact, the way Galbraith had presented it made it impossible to turn it down; arguments were very persuasive. Tyler, the career guy, there's arguments on both sides, but he was just keeping himself uninvolved. And I think, also he was a Republican, and by nature probably had some reservations about this.

The issue was first argued as to whether they should do it for a couple days. Bell and Gaud both decided that it had to be done. It was the largest single aid grant, I think, that was ever made, at least in recent days. I don't remember if there was anything larger in the first days when they were giving aid to France. But it was a major story. It was a very complicated story, too, and we had a lot of special sessions for the press in advance of the thing.

And again came the question of what do we tell, and again we decided, and Bell decided, that we tell the whole

[-108-]

thing. There were some people in Congress—I can't remember who they were at this time, but this would be all in the papers—they were sniping at it already. They knew that something was going on, and they were making an issue of it. And, again, the old thing saying, “Democrats are socialists, giving aid to a socialist government,” making an ideological fight out of it.

So we decided to do it openly. We made great preparation, and got copies of all the important documents, not enough that people could take away, but we had them in a room down in my office where people could spend a whole day, and a lot of them did, going over these things and finding out just what was involved, how it was going to be done. There was people from technical journals, as well as the regular press, and there was some foreign press. It all worked out rather well. The stories that appeared gave the arguments for it very cogently, I think. The critics had their day, but it didn't become an issue that would have toppled any governments.

HACKMAN: One other issue, and that's population control. Can you remember was this...

BAYLEY: Playing a little cozy with that one, yeah. Everybody knew that all of our other aid was going down a rat hole without that. At the same time, there was fear of the domestic repercussions among Catholic voters.

The question was how to do it, or whether not to do it now or put it off some more. I don't know how that would have come out. I think the Kennedy Administration was more sensitive would have been, not that they were opposed to it on religious grounds themselves, but I'm sure that anybody that was raised in Boston, in Catholic politics in Boston, would have been very, very afraid of this one. I got quite impatient with it and a lot of people at AID did that felt they were pussyfooting, and that we should have been into this long before we were.

We had a lot of trouble with the press on this one because we were instructed to give out a standard statement which some Assistant Secretary of State had written, and it said absolutely nothing, about a one page statement.

[-109-]

We had to put off all real questions about it with that little statement. People got quite annoyed with us, but we were just under orders to do that. I really think that from a historical standpoint, that's one thing you could criticize the Kennedy Administration for, that we didn't get into that earlier.

HACKMAN: When you say some Assistant Secretary, do you have somebody specifically in mind? Harlan Cleveland on [J. Harlan Cleveland]...

BAYLEY: It wasn't Harlan Cleveland. That was a person...

HACKMAN: Battle [Lucius D. Battle]?

BAYLEY: No. Something like McPhearson or.... I never saw this fellow. He only came upon my consciousness as the author of this statement. That shouldn't be hard to obtain though. (Gardner, I think he had been at the UN)

HACKMAN: The only thing I can think of that did come up, John Gardner [John W. Gardner] gave a speech at the U.N. [United Nations], I believe, on population control which was controversial.

BAYLEY: That's right.

HACKMAN: I'd wondered if that was any sort of trial...

BAYLEY: I have the feeling that this man had been attached to the U.N. delegation.

HACKMAN: Kotschnig [Walter M. Kotschnig]?



BAYLEY: No. I know him.

HACKMAN: Yost [Charles W. Yost], Plimpton [Francis Taylor Pearson Plimpton], or the people up here?

[-110-]

BAYLEY: No, none of these names. I tell you, I could get that. I'm sure it's still in the AID files. McCrory could dig that up.

HACKMAN: Let me see what else I've got. There's not much left really. While you were at the White House press office, I've seen somebody mention your name in regard to mental retardation and the President's Panel [President's Panel on Mental Retardation].

BAYLEY: Yes, there's a little stuff in there about that, too.

HACKMAN: How did you manage to get in on that?

BAYLEY: Well, among my other miscellaneous duties in the White House was taking care of Eunice Shriver [Eunice Kennedy Shriver]. Eunice Shriver thought I was a great publicity man because the Peace Corps had taken off well. Of course, her mania was mental retardation. And so a presidential commission on mental retardation was formed, and I was assigned the task of handling the publicity for it. I picked up a couple of little things like that, I'll tell you that later. But this was very difficult because Eunice is not the easiest person in the world to deal with. She's insistent and, I felt, unreasonable, and she just can't imagine.... She thinks it's the most important thing in the world, and she doesn't understand why it isn't a headline in the *New York Times* everyday.

They had the first national meeting of this council on a Saturday afternoon at the White House in the Fish Room. Oh, I pulled every string I could. I practically pleaded with friends in the press to write something about this meeting. They had a statement which didn't say anything which I was distributing. They invited reporters to cover it. Well, I think two on three did, there were a couple of fellows who were on the Saturday afternoon shift which are about the third string men in the bureaus. And some of them wandered in and out, and maybe sent a paragraph. But she envisioned interviews with every one of these famous people and pictures all over the paper.

[-111-]

I remember the next morning after that meeting I got a call from Eunice about 9 o'clock. She'd gotten the *New York Times*, and she was just livid, screaming at me, "There isn't anything in the paper." And I hadn't seen the paper yet, she got me out of bed. So I explained to her what I had done, the way I tried to promote this thing, and that I had talked to the *Times* reporter, and they must have just decided that wasn't news. Then finally I

endured all that and hung up and went back and got the paper and started just reading the paper, and on page fourteen I found a story about six inches long. So I thought she must have missed it, so I called her back, and I said, “The story is in the Times. It's on page fourteen.” “Well,” she said, “I know that little story, but I meant the big story. Why wasn't it on page one?”

I was still doing that from time to time when I left the White House, and I must say that that's one, I was just as glad to go over to AID. And once in awhile while I was over there, she called me for some service in connection with that, but I think she got someone else eventually. I also did some—there'd be little presidential commissions which had no press staff; you know, there'd be three or four researchers working on something; and I would get assigned to work with them whenever they had a report to issue. There was one on campaign finances, I believe, things like that.

HACKMAN: On that mental retardation panel, was this strictly a publicity panel or was it of substantive...

BAYLEY: No, it was a substantive panel. These were scientists, teachers. Josh Lederberg [Joshua Lederberg] was one of them...

HACKMAN: Leonard Mayo [Leonard W. Mayo], if you remember him.

BAYLEY: Yes, yes. I remember that name.

HACKMAN: Then some guy named Weingarten [Victor Weingarten] or something like that?

[-112-]

BAYLEY: Yeah. They were all big people in the field. They were taking it seriously, but, you know, you just don't have a meeting of those people and find the answers to all these things. And there was a limited number of things they could do. What they could do, and, I think, eventually did do, was try to direct research money into the best channels, but it's a research project.

HACKMAN: Did you have any worries, or did Salinger, or maybe the President, if you know of these, that he might be liable to criticism as doing this as a personal thing because of Rosemary [Rosemary F. Kennedy], or that he would be liable to any kind of criticism for this?

BAYLEY: I suspect that was always in their minds. But that was no secret, and I think that people understood, and I think they felt people understood that there was personal interest. But it was a good project; it was a subject that—well, nothing was selfish about the subject. It wasn't going to help them personally. It's just that they had a personal reason for being interested in a good subject. I didn't feel any sensitivity that way. They were all sensitive about Rosemary, of course. I

remember one time when my old paper, the *Milwaukee Journal*, I think discovered Rosemary, she was in a Catholic mission of some kind, school, out in Wisconsin, and I think somebody wrote a big story about that. And that pained them a great deal, I know. They didn't like any attention brought to that. But other than that, I don't think it entered into this.

HACKMAN: Alright, a couple of other things. When we talked about Wisconsin appointment, we hadn't talked at all about Nestingen [Ivan A. Nestingen]. Do you know how that...

BAYLEY: Oh, sure. Well, Nestingen was their prize catch in the campaign days. He was Norwegian Lutheran, and they were fearful that all their best workers were going to be Catholics. Pat Lucey [Patrick J. Lucey] being an Irish Catholic who was the real head of their organization,

[-113-]

they were terribly happy to capture Ivan as the nominal head. And Ivan, I think, saw this as an opportunity to advance his own political fortunes, and so he devoted a good deal of time to it and expected a reward which he then obtained. I always thought that—I didn't think the Under Secretaryship of HEW [Health, Education, and Welfare] was, that he was up to that job really. But, of course, he wasn't any worse than the one they chose to head it up, probably better than Celebrezze [Anthony J. Celebrezze] who was a complete frost, I think, as an administrator and Cabinet head. Ivan's a nice fellow, but he just isn't all that heavy.

HACKMAN: Do you know if they eventually felt that way? Did you hear this?

BAYLEY: Oh, I think so. I think so because, you know, the way you do if you have people in jobs like that, you bypass them. And long before he became Under Secretary himself, I think they worked with Wilbur Cohen who was the man with ability in that whole organization.

HACKMAN: What do you know, as things developed, about the relationship between Governor, now Senator, Gaylord Nelson and the Kennedy White House, particularly the President, during the Administration?

BAYLEY: I don't think that any real good relationship was ever achieved. You had a continuing, a festering kind of thing about the Wisconsin federal judgeship. They had appointed Dave Rabinovitz [David Rabinovitz] who had been treasurer of the campaign committee. That federal judgeship, of course, never came out of the Senate committee. He was not Gaylord's choice; Gaylord never fought for him or anything because he was one of the Lucey partisans in the internal battle. And besides, the Bar Association and everybody, every newspaper in Wisconsin was against this nomination just on a matter of merit, his ability, rather than partisan. Gaylord had always pushed for Jim Doyle [James E. Doyle] for that judgeship, and later, with Johnson, achieved it.

[-114-]

Oh, they had a working relationship. I remember he talked to Ralph Dungan on appointments sometimes, and Dungan would check things with him. I think what it really boiled down to, and now I think of the Gronouski [John A. Gronouski, Jr.] case as an example, that it wasn't friendly, but it was a civil relationship. They gave him the usual senatorial courtesies. If you're appointing somebody from his state, they would clear it with him. But I don't think that he got any favors out of them, probably never tried. I don't recall any that he tried, and I don't think they ever gave him anything that would have made the relationship any better.

The Nelson-Lucey relationship waxed and waned, and it finally became just utterly impossible during his campaign for the Senate. I wasn't on the staff at the time, of course, but I heard stories about it, and I think there's some mention of that in some of the letters here, my personal letters from people in Wisconsin telling about this. It got to the point that Pat Lucey was circulating rumors that Gaylord and Bill Fairfield [William Fairfield], his press secretary, were homosexuals. And Fairfield was going all around the state making speeches against Pat Lucey. It was an open, bitter, malicious battle on both sides. And this all affected—while all this was going on, Pat Lucey's breezing into Washington and being ushered right into the presence of Kennedy, and I'm sure that Gaylord felt that Lucey was telling him things about him and this state battle that was negative. So I don't think it ever became a very warm relationship. I don't know if I told you about the Gronouski thing or not.

HACKMAN: No. I wish you would.

BAYLEY: Well, John Gronouski was an assistant professor of economics or something at Wayne State University and was a member of a task force that was hired to do some kind of a study on Wisconsin taxes. He's a personable fellow, and I think was quite able in that field. I was still on Gaylord's staff at this time. We'd been trying to oust the incumbent state tax commissioner who was very well entrenched and had Republican backing, and we had no majority in the state senate for confirmation.

[-115-]

But somehow or other we were able to finally move him over somewhere, move him sideways. He was getting along in years, anyway. We got him out. Upon my urging and that of Howard Koop, the financial secretary, we got Gaylord to appoint Gronouski, and for awhile it seemed like a very good choice.

One of the last things I did before I left Gaylord's staff was to write a couple of his key messages, and one of them was a tax message. That was the big issue all through Nelson's two terms, and we had a blue ribbon tax committee studying taxes. What they were really doing was paying the way and educating the people over a period of about a year's time of the necessity of adding a sales tax to the income tax as a principal source of revenue

in Wisconsin. At the same time, Gaylord was stuck with a party platform which actually banned the sales tax, and so he was playing a very delicate game there.

Well, Gronouski was maneuvering this for us and with us and supplying the factual data. We made a tax proposal in which we took the position we're forced into this. It was the sales tax. He was hand-in-glove with this whole effort. Then, a few months later, John Reynolds [John W. Reynolds], who was a close personal friend of Gronouski's, declared for governor. Gronouski declared for Reynolds, and Reynolds ran on a slogan of "Beat the Sales Tax." Oh, he had run for attorney general on that slogan, and for this he got great criticism in newspapers who said, "What issue is that for an attorney general?" He had billboards all over the state, "Beat the Sales Tax. Elect John Reynolds." And that was absolutely, you know...

HACKMAN: Out of his...

BAYLEY: Yeah. But he felt he'd been elected on this kind of an appeal, which I don't think was true at all. So his campaign for governor is, again, beat the sales tax, but this time it's Gaylord Nelson's sales tax. And so the chief part of his campaign was John Gronouski, still incumbent state tax commissioner, stumping the state denouncing Nelson for imposing a sales tax, a stratagem in which he'd been hand-in-glove, you know. Gaylord was furious about this, regarded this as deception and, worse, treason. So they became very cool, and this put

[-116-]

Gronouski, of course, in the Lucey camp thoroughly where he'd had about one foot in each camp before.

So Gaylord's Senator, and he gets a call from Ralph Dungan wanting to know what did Gaylord think of the appointment of Gronouski as the Postmaster General? Gaylord hit the ceiling, and he said to Dungan, "I wouldn't trust John Gronouski with a canceled stamp." [Laughter] After a half hour of such discussion, he finally cooled off a little bit and said he wasn't going to object to it, that he had personal reasons for feeling that this was an unfortunate choice, but he was not going to object to it. Which is all they wanted anyway. They knew he wasn't going to be happy, but they were afraid that he would get up in the Senate on a personal privilege and stop it. They would never have let it go to that point, but they were afraid he would tell them he's personally obnoxious.

And this was revived again when Gronouski came back from Poland. Let's see, when was that? He was still Ambassador, he came back on a leave or something. And I'm sure what happened, he was given some orders at the White House to go out and make some speeches in favor of Viet Nam. Well, Gronouski had never been in favor of Viet Nam, he was anti-Viet Nam, but he went back to Wisconsin, of all places, and at the University of Wisconsin delivered a speech denouncing all doves. It was a thing, I didn't hear about it in Wisconsin, and I think what he did is issue a statement or release of some kind saying he'd given the speech, but he gave it to a small group, probably in closed session. It may have been in his living room, you know. But at least it got on the record that he'd made such a statement, so this was then inserted in the *Congressional Record* where I first saw it. So it didn't make much of a stir in Wisconsin, but there it was.

Then it was picked up after it was in the *Congressional Record*. But Gaylord again felt this was interference, and I don't blame him for being angry about that one. Here he's out on a limb in a campaign here, and his own man comes back and, in effect, denounces his position. So that's been a very stormy relationship.

[-117-]

HACKMAN: The only thing I've got left is something of controversy you may want to respond to or not. When you were at the White House press office, we've heard several rumors that there were problems in keeping out of the press, or that the press was very aware of and there was some worry about, relationships between the Kennedy staff people, particularly in Salinger's office, and all the girls in the office. Can you remember this being a problem at all, and how widely it was known?

BAYLEY: Are you talking about personal relationships with the girls?

HACKMAN: Yes, yes. Even some including, you know, the President and the immediate staff.

BAYLEY: There were always rumors around about the President and girls, and especially one member of the press, but not a member of the White House staff. I can't recall any.... As a matter of fact, I'd be hard pressed to even think of who it might be.

HACKMAN: These were very, very young girls on Salinger's staff.

BAYLEY: Yeah. I knew them all, you know, somewhat. By and large, they weren't a very attractive bunch. I know Barbara Gamarekian quite well. I'm sure that wouldn't be the one.

HACKMAN: No. It's always hard to tell how much credence to give to them.

BAYLEY: I'd be very dubious about that because—oh, there was one sexy little girl there, Jill Cowan. I happened to run into her at a literary cocktail party in New York a couple of years ago. I rather had the feeling there was something going on between her and some of the reporters, but there might very well have been that something else.... But I never heard anything directly about Kennedy or even Salinger in connection with them.

[-118-]

HACKMAN: Would the press people who were covering the White House talk about this openly in terms of the President being involved with any of these people?

BAYLEY: Sometimes. There were all kinds of rumors out of the campaign. But I never really heard any.... No, I never heard any talk among the press at that time, and I was in regular contact with them, in connection with that staff. I'd be very surprised if there was any truth in it. And I don't say that with an idea of trying to whitewash anyone because I'm pretty sure there was truth to some other rumors, but you never know. I thought of something else a minute ago that I thought I could add. Can't think of it. I'm just running over the periods of time there in my mind.

HACKMAN: Anything on Viet Nam while you were there that you can remember being...

BAYLEY: No. Viet Nam, you know, it hadn't really surfaced yet. The only thing that we ever heard was really at AID. And we knew the kind of operation that was going on there, a combination of CIA, military aid. And there was always something funny about every part of AID activity in Viet Nam. In fact, that's where most of the scandals arose because they did things there that would not be considered proper in other countries, cut corners, and, I'm sure, bribery, or whatever. There was always an element of corruption in Viet Nam. Of course, now, that's no secret, but in those days, it really didn't make a difference because it wasn't a war.

HACKMAN: How would you be able to tell this? Cables, or just...

BAYLEY: No, a lot of it surfaced. This is where Mollenhoff came in with that kind of thing. A lot of people he picked on were Saigon mission people. Another way was there was a lot of turnover there. They'd be pulling people out because they got in trouble, and that usually wouldn't get in the papers, but we'd know it. They were brought out and given some job, sometimes jobs that we knew

[-119-]

about, to get them out of there. There was always ferment there and always something kind of semi-secret about everything that happened there. But other than that, Viet Nam never really... I sometimes wondered about myself because I've been so deeply concerned personally in recent years, and it seems I was kind of blind to it then. I should have seen in coming, but I guess I was in the same boat with a lot of other people.

HACKMAN: That's all I have.

BAYLEY: Alright, Larry. Shut it off. [BREAK IN TAPE] I think it happened when he [Frank Coffin] was at the Defense Loan Fund, or I mean the Development Loan Fund, but it may have been at AID. There was some kind of a reception at a foreign embassy where there were a lot of congressmen present, and Lyndon Johnson, as Vice President, was present, and Frank Coffin was there. And there was an informal discussion about foreign aid. And Lyndon Johnson, as they were leaving, in the vestibule or in the living room, Lyndon Johnson made a number of positive statements

about foreign aid. And Frank Coffin, it seemed a little funny for cautious Frank to step in like this, but one of the statements was erroneous, and Frank corrected it. It wasn't a matter of contradicting, but just sort of, the real significance of that, or the real meaning of that situation was this.

Lyndon Johnson was furious. He said to Coffin, "You have held me up to ridicule before my peers. I'll never forget this." And Frank apologized and didn't realize he'd insulted him, affronted him, but nothing else took place for several years until November 1963. Frank Coffin's nomination as ambassador to Panama was on Kennedy's desk when he went to Dallas. It was ready for signature and would have been one of the first things for him to do when he returned. Then, of course, all that happened, and then it's one of the first things Lyndon Johnson is confronted with when he took office, came back. And I'm told that he looked at that, stood up, threw it to the ground, and tore it up in little pieces, and made some

[-120-]

statement about, "Frank Coffin will never be appointed to anything as long as I'm President."

Then, of course, Frank left the government shortly thereafter, and I'm very surprised, really, that he ever was appointed federal judge. And I don't know the story about how that happened. I'm sure there is one.

HACKMAN: Well, that's that story, right? Okay, let me ask you, maybe you can remember something on Panama. There was this big thing that came up, supposedly, Ambassador Joe Farland [Joseph S. Farland], the Republican, built a road off into the jungle. Do you remember anything?

BAYLEY: Yes, yes. I was down in Panama. I saw him. I know about that story. Ambassador Farland was an Eisenhower appointee. He was a flamboyant character who, I think, did a pretty good job. He was the kind of fellow Jim Loeb or Bill Atwood was, but he was Republican. He was so popular, or he had such a good reputation. I think there was a big story in the *Reader's Digest* which made him the epitome of an effective diplomat. And he kept on getting this publicity, that road, particularly, and some schools and other things. I know there was always a desire to get him out of there, but it was a political problem, when could you do it? And I guess this is the time at which they were going to do it.

HACKMAN: There was an investigation by Morgan [Thomas E. Morgan] on the House Foreign Affairs committee. A couple of his staff people exposed some kind of disagreement between the AID mission and Farland or something down there.

BAYLEY: Yeah. Well, there were some. I mean, I found when I went down there that they didn't like him at all, the AID mission didn't like him, nor did the USIA [United States Information Agency] people, because he was a flamboyant, self-publicist, and I think he probably paid a minimal amount of attention to



the normal affairs of the embassy. He liked to get out and meet the people, you know. Alright.

HACKMAN:           Okay.

[END OF INTERVIEW #2]

[-121-]

Edwin R. Bayley Oral History Transcript – JFK #2  
Name Index

**A**

Anderson, Jack, 78  
Attwood, William H., 85, 86, 96, 121

**B**

Barnett, David L., 82  
Barr, Joseph W., 57  
Bartlett, E.L. "Bob", 75  
Batt, William L., 57  
Battle, Lucius D., 83, 110  
Belair, Felix, Jr., 68, 74, 78, 79  
Bell, David E., 57, 81, 84, 99, 100, 104, 105, 106,  
107, 108  
Bowles, Chester B., 60, 84, 85  
Brennan, Bernard T., 106

**C**

Carter, Clifton C., 75  
Celebrezze, Anthony J., 114  
Chenery, Hollis Burnley, 70, 100  
Childs, Marquis W., 68, 78  
Clay, Lucius Dubignon, Sr., 103, 104  
Cleveland, J. Harlan, 110  
Clifton, Chester V., Jr., 68  
Coffin, Frank M., 61, 62, 64, 68, 70, 79, 82, 85,  
120, 121  
Cohen, Wilbur J., 55, 57, 114  
Cowan, Jill, 118

**D**

Daley, Richard J., 56  
Dentzer, William T., Jr., 65, 103, 104  
Donahue, Richard K., 69  
Doyle, James E., 114  
Drummond, Roscoe, 78  
Dungan, Ralph A., 61, 65, 67, 69, 72, 75, 76, 81,  
84, 92, 103, 107, 115, 117  
Dutton, Frederick G., 60, 61

**E**

Eisenhower, Dwight D., 57, 59, 67, 121

**F**

Fairfield, William, 115  
Farland, Joseph S., 121  
Fascell, Dante B., 90  
Fenn, Dan H., Jr., 75  
Freeman, Orville L., 56

**G**

Galbraith, John Kenneth, 84, 85, 108  
Gamarekian, Barbara, 118  
Gardner, John W., 110  
Gaud, William S., 62, 70, 79, 108  
Gildner, Jay, 83, 84  
Goldman, Robert, 80, 81, 87  
Goodwin, Richard N., 59, 80  
Gronouski, John A., Jr., 115, 116, 117

**H**

Haddad, William F., 87, 88, 90, 92, 94, 95  
Hall, William O., 106, 107  
Hamilton, Fowler, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 68,  
69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 76, 80, 81, 82, 89, 99,  
100, 101, 105, 106, 107  
Hilsman, Roger, 99, 100  
Hoffman, Paul, 59  
Houghton, Amory, 59  
Humphrey, Hubert H., 75, 86  
Hutchinson, Edmond C., 70, 79

**J**

Jackson, Henry M. "Scoop", 70  
Jagan, Cheddi, 97, 98, 99  
Jagan, Janet, 98  
Janow, Seymour J., 70, 79  
Johnson, Lyndon Baines, 59, 75, 89, 114, 120

**K**

Kamen, Charles, 89, 90, 91, 95  
Kaysen, Carl, 99  
Kennedy, John F., 58, 59, 60, 61, 65, 67, 71, 75,  
75, 79, 80, 81, 85, 89, 96, 102, 103, 107,  
109, 110, 113, 114, 115, 118, 119, 120  
Kennedy, Robert F., 63, 75, 81, 82, 83  
Kennedy, Rosemary F., 113  
Komer, Robert W., 99

Koop, Howard, 116  
Kotschnig, Walter M., 110  
Kraslow, David, 90, 91

## L

Labouisse, Henry Richardson, 57, 58, 59, 67, 70  
Lederberg, Joshua, 112  
Lingle, Walter L., Jr., 61, 62, 63, 64, 68, 80, 81  
Loeb, James I., 85, 86, 96, 121  
Lucey, Patrick J., 113, 114, 115, 117

## M

Magnuson, Warren G., 70  
Maguire, Richard, 55  
Manning, Robert J., 77, 101  
Mathews, Tom, 94, 95  
Mayo, Leonard W., 112  
McCrary, James T., 74, 75, 111  
McPhearson, 110  
Meany, George, 104  
Mollenhoff, Clark R., 77, 78, 119  
Morgan, Thomas E., 121  
Moscoso, Teodoro, 63, 79, 80, 81, 87, 99  
Moyers, William D., 89, 90, 91, 93, 95

## N

Nathan, Robert Roy, 97  
Nelson, Gaylord, 114, 115, 116, 117  
Nesting, Ivan A., 113, 114  
Newman, Joseph, 74  
Nicholson, Rex, 81, 82  
Nixon, Richard Milhous, 64

## O

O'Brien, Lawrence F., 66, 69, 83  
O'Donnell, Kenneth P., 58, 92  
O'Gorman, George D., 55

## P

Passman, Otto Ernest, 69  
Pearson, Drew, 78  
Peters, Charles G., Jr., 90

Peysner, Seymour M., 70  
Phillips, Wayne, 55  
Plimpton, Francis Taylor Pearson, 110

## R

Rabinovitz, David, 114  
Raupe, Craig, 67, 70, 71  
Reed, Philip Dunham, 59  
Reynolds, John W., 116  
Ribicoff, Abraham Alexander, 55  
Rosenthal, Jerry, 74  
Rusk, Dean, 93

## S

Salinger, Pierre E.G., 60, 61, 80, 84, 86, 113, 118  
Salter, John, 67, 70, 71, 75  
Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., 68, 98  
Seigenthaler, John, 75  
Shriver, Eunice Kennedy, 111, 112  
Shriver, R. Sargent, Jr., 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 101, 102, 105  
Smathers, George A., 89, 90, 91  
Smith, Margaret Chase, 60  
Stern, Philip M., 72  
Stevenson, Adlai E., 81  
Sylvester, Arthur, 76, 107, 108

## T

Thompson, Arthur, 73  
Truman, Harry S., 107  
Tubby, Roger W., 77

## W

Waters, Herbert J., 86  
Weingarten, Victor, 112  
Wood, C. Tyler, 108  
Wright, James C., Jr., 71

## Y

Yarmolinsky, Adam, 60  
Yost, Charles W., 110