

Frederick L. Holborn Oral History Interview – JFK#1, 02/20/67
Administrative Information

Creator: Frederick L. Holborn
Interviewer: John F. Stewart
Date of Interview: February 20, 1967
Place of Interview: Washington, D.C.
Length: 20 pages

Biographical Note

Legislative Assistant, Senator John F. Kennedy, Massachusetts (1959-1961); Special Assistant to the White House (1961 - 1966). In this interview Holborn discusses his relationship with Congressman John F. Kennedy [JFK], the difficulties and criticism faced by JFK as he ran for various offices, and his experiences working for JFK during both his presidential campaign and in the White House, among other issues.

Access

Open

Usage Restrictions

Copyright of these materials has passed to the United States Government upon the death of the interviewee. 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 The copyright law extends its protection to unpublished works from the moment of creation in a tangible form.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

Frederick L. Holborn, recorded interview by John F. Stewart, February 20, 1967, (page number), John F. Kennedy Library Oral History Program.

Oral History Interview

Of

Frederick L. Holborn

Although a legal agreement was not signed during the lifetime of Frederick L. Holborn, upon his death, ownership of the recording and transcript of his interview for the Oral History Program passed to the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library.

The following terms and conditions apply:

1. The transcript is available for use by researchers.
2. The tape recording shall be made available to those researchers who have access to the transcript.
3. Copyright to the interview transcript and tape is assigned to the United States Government.
4. Copies of the transcript and the tape recording may be provided by the Library to researchers upon request for a fee.
5. Copies of the transcript and tape recording may be deposited in or loaned to institutions other than the John F. Kennedy Library.

Frederick L. Holborn– JFK #1

Table of Contents

<u>Page</u>	<u>Topic</u>
1	Early memories of John F. Kennedy [JFK] and his plans to run for the Senate
2	JFK as a senator and his potential to become Vice President
6	Writing a speech on Algeria for JFK
8	His role in JFK's 1958 campaign for the Senate
11	Observed opinions about a potential presidential run by JFK
12	Criticism over JFK's stance on Joseph R. McCarthy
13	How he approached working for JFK; what he did early on for JFK's presidential run
17	Working for JFK during the transition and early White House years

Oral History Interview

With

FREDERICK L HOLBORN

February 20, 1967
Washington, D C

By John F Stewart

For the John F Kennedy Library

HOLBORN: ...was my first year at graduate school at the Harvard School of Public Administration. And in those days, then Congressman Kennedy used to come up to Littauer School at least once a year and speak in the seminar or perhaps the professor to whom he had been closest through the years, Professor Arthur Holcombe. My first year there I was not taking that seminar but I did have a roommate who was taking that seminar and he got me invited in the fall, I believe it was the fall of 1950, shortly after the beginning of the Korean War, to attend that session. And subsequently Professor Holcombe gave a little dinner at the Harvard faculty club for Congressman Kennedy, and there was sort of an hour, hour and a half, bull session after dinner. I suppose that was the first time I met him. Almost a year later in the very same seminar, I was again invited. This was definitely 1951. Pretty much the same procedure: a dinner at the faculty club afterwards, and apropos the first time, I think he recognized me by name. After dinner, I remember, we walked with him to Harvard Square, another fellow and I. I don't remember who the other one was. We had a rather long conversation. It was a rather wintry night, I remember, in Harvard Square. Those, I think, were the first two times I met him. I remember he told us in 1951, in some detail, about why he was probably going to run for the Senate. There were a good many people baiting him to run for governor. And he laid out with considerable candor that evening why he thought he could best Henry Cabot Lodge and why, in his mind, the governorship was really not an office very much worth running for.

STEWART: Do you remember what his major reasons were for not being interested in

being governor of Massachusetts?

HOLBORN: Well, I don't think they were anything that sounds startling now. I think, first, it was the shortness of the term; the fact that one of things he disliked about being a congressman, even in a district as safe as the one that he came from, was the treadmill of the biennial election, and he argued that you'd only have this all over again in a closer election; that running for governor was a much more expensive and difficult thing. And he felt that the action was in Washington, that state government was not a dying thing, I remember he said, but still kind of depreciated the experience in state government; and he felt the time was ripe to take down the champ. And ultimately, if he didn't run against Henry Cabot Lodge then, he'd still have to run against him later, and he didn't think that Henry Cabot Lodge would ever be any weaker. He felt that that was probably the time to do it.

STEWART: One of these sessions became somewhat controversial. Wasn't it discussed or written up in an article in the *New Republic*?

HOLBORN: Yes. I wasn't present at that meeting--I always forget--I think it was the second of these two meetings at which one of the graduate students senior to me, Mr. Mallan [John P. Mallan] was present. He later became a professor at Smith College. Several years subsequently, Mr. Mallan did publish an article in the *New Republic* which purported to be based, in part, on the notes which he took at this seminar. These seminars--similar seminars at Littauer had been rather sacrosanctly off the record for years. This was a tradition. I believe that some of what Mr. Mallan wrote accorded with my own memories of the occasion. I did not take notes, and I have nothing to refer to. But Professor Holcombe did have to intervene, and I think, though Mr. Mallan was no longer at Harvard, it kind of led to his ostracism for having broken the rules of the academic game. But some of what Mr. Mallan wrote, I remember, rather startled me at the time during the seminar, but I couldn't recall all of what Mr. Mallan wrote.

STEWART: When did you see him after that time? Do you recall?

HOLBORN: Well, I didn't really see him frequently during the next five or six years. I think the next time that I saw him, I believe, it was in the fall of 1953. Again so many of these things are accidental. By that time I was a teaching fellow at Harvard. I think, well it was the second term in which I was doing any considerable amount of teaching, and it was a time at which Mr. Kennedy's youngest brother, Ted Kennedy [Edward M. Kennedy] had returned to Harvard. And he turned up in my section, in an introductory course in government, Government 1-A, that fall. During that fall, I think it was the weekend of the Princeton-Harvard game if I'm not mistaken, I gave a party after the game to which I invited all my students, mostly two teas, in the house where I was living, Winthrop House, which was also the house where Mr. Kennedy had lived as an undergraduate. I recall that Ted Kennedy came. And suddenly, rather late in the afternoon; the then-newly-married Mrs. Kennedy [Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy] appeared. This either startled me and I think startled everybody there, and almost, I think, somewhat startled Ted

Kennedy. She appeared and shortly thereafter, by now Senator Kennedy came in in order to pick up his wife. I don't believe he himself was there more than ten minutes. We talked for just a moment.

Then I think just a few weeks later--I think I'm correct it was this year--a few weeks later, Senator Kennedy, I think on the weekend after Thanksgiving, had to go to make two speeches in Canada, in Montreal, and he was, as usual, spending the Thanksgiving week at Hyannis Port. And I think he first called his brother again, Ted Kennedy, but then he called me. He asked me whether I could prepare a few--I don't think he wanted a speech, but sort of an outline of remarks which he could make, I think, at the University of Montreal, which I did. I think it was a little more than an outline, but something less than a speech. Five pages or so of material. Also, he wanted to have sort of the situation in Montreal scouted out. I believe the night before this speech he had to go to some ball or social event which was under the sponsorship of Cardinal Leger [Paul-Emile Leger], who maybe then was only Archbishop, but now Cardinal Leger of Montreal. And I had two friends who came from Montreal. I did some research, and I also wrote a memo on some of the problems of a Catholic university in Montreal and some of the clerical problems--a situation in which the previous cardinal had been more or less rusticated. As it turned out, he was really much more interested in this memo on clerical politics than he was in the speech. And a week subsequent, or two weeks subsequent, perhaps, from Palm Beach, he sent me a hand-written letter thanking me for the memo and this speech material. That I believe was in '53. And then sometime in '54, again through Ted Kennedy, I believe, I met him in Boston at--I just don't remember whose house it was, but again it was extremely cursory in a rather large group. And then I don't think I really saw much of him except once after his speech again that he gave at Harvard--this time before an open group, not the seminar. I believe he stopped going to the seminar after about 1954. Of course, during '54-'55 he was pretty much out of action then, anyway. I do know the next time I saw him I didn't talk to him. It was Commencement Day at Harvard in 1955, which was just shortly after he had really resumed his work in the Senate. He was still extremely gaunt, walking was still quite painful. And that year he had run for the first time for the Harvard Board of Overseers. As you probably know, this was really the only occasion in his lifetime in which he lost an election. And I remember he was walking through Harvard Yard that day and I remember he looked extremely melancholy. I wasn't even as yet aware of the Overseer's vote; and I'm not even sure I knew he had been running. But I think he was extremely depressed by his failure to win that election, and I think it rather startled him. I don't think he expected to run first--I think he realized there were some difficulties--but I think he did expect to win.

STEWART: Did he ever discuss it with you later?

HOLBORN: Quite whimsically. I must say the fact that he lost was kind of rubbed out by the ease with which he won the second time. At least as of that date, not at this date, but as of that date, he had the high number of votes that any candidate had had. Yes, I do remember him once saying that so far as he could tell, one of the reasons--it was once in connection with how Harvard was changing and how the alumni were changing, and some of the alumni groups he talked to.... And I think he did kind of suggest, I don't remember his exact formulation--I think this is probably in '58--he did suggest that the

first time he lost in part because there was a preponderant number of older voters among the alumni in such an election. And I think--I don't think I'm wrong--he also said it was not only the preponderant number of older voters, but a preponderant number of sort of the Brahmin aristocrat types. And the congressman said, "Well, in those days I really wasn't too acceptable for this. It was only after '56 and the national..." I think it is true that the number of voters in such an election have increased drastically in the last few years at Harvard, and the kind of youth vogue began to appear in the electorate there, too. But that time I only saw him, I didn't talk to him. But he did strike a very melancholy impression; I do remember that.

Then I suppose the next time I saw him was once when I was in Washington for some reason. Well, I guess that was also in '55. I think that was in the summer of '55. But it was one of these things where you shake hands if you go in the office to get a Senate pass and nothing more than that. Then in the year '55, the academic year '55-'56, I was on a year's traveling fellowship in Europe, and I spend most of that year in London. And toward the late spring of 1956, I suddenly got a letter from Ted Kennedy, who was at this point about to graduate from Harvard. I had been contemplating--indeed one of the sort of purposes of this traveling fellowship, especially for undergraduates, but even for the graduate students such as I was, was not to stick to one place all the time. And I figured one of the interesting things to do would be to spend a month toward the end of this fellowship going somewhere where most people didn't go. And I guess I had mentioned to somebody, some common acquaintance of Ted Kennedy and myself, that I might go to North Africa. Well, he wrote and said that he was also interested in going to North Africa, and that his brother thought this was such a good idea, and would I be willing to go on part of my journey, or part of his journey, with him.

STEWART: Did his brother have anything specific in mind then? Or was it just a...

HOLBORN: Well, we'll come to that. Well, yes. I don't think he had anything clearly in mind, but I think he himself had made himself a little bit of a specialist on sort of the dying parts of particularly the French empire--and to a lesser extent the British--in Vietnam particularly at that time. And his curiosity was somewhat aroused by North Africa. He himself couldn't go that year because this was shortly before the Democratic Convention in 1956, in August. So I wrote back, and I said, well, yes, I had a limit on how long I could stay. I remember I had to go on and give some lecture in Germany in late July, and I also wanted to be back for the Democratic Convention in Chicago.

But in any case, we worked it out, and around the 21st, 22nd of June, we met in Paris. We set out on this trip, and Senator Kennedy did send a letter, or give a letter, to Ted Kennedy which permitted us to get passes to go to the more sensitive areas in Algeria. And it helped, no question it helped clear the road, and most of these bureaucratic details and all these various passes you have to carry were handled in rather quick order in one morning.

Well, I needn't go into this trip. It's not really relevant. We went to Spain, spent a longer period in Morocco, and spent about a week in Algeria, and Ted Kennedy himself, alone, subsequently went on to Tunisia. In any case, Senator Kennedy was reasonably interested in this. And I remember one night in Algiers, Ted Kennedy.... Also, by the time we got to Spain--I remember we looked at a copy of *Newsweek*--it became quite clear that the vice presidential thing was becoming a real possibility. We saw a few papers, the *Herald-*

Tribune here and there. I remember one evening, perhaps the third evening we were in Algiers, he placed a call to his brother, then living in McLean. The call didn't go through immediately, but about three o'clock in the morning the phone did ring. We were awake in this hotel, and it was Senator Kennedy. There was a good amount of conversation about the vice presidency. He sounded sort of fatalistic about not quite knowing whether he ought to be in it or not. But clearly his interest had been aroused by then. And I remember Ted Kennedy got a completely different impression than what he'd had when he left, had last seen his brother in Washington or Hyannis Port or wherever he had been two or three weeks previous. But it didn't sufficiently arouse his brother in order to encourage him to return to the United States for the convention. Ted Kennedy didn't come back to the United States. He was in Europe during the convention. But he kind of suggested at the time, or at least suggested to me, that he thought he really had a rather good chance without his quite knowing why. I think the momentum had rather surprised him. I remember for a moment he put me on the phone, and Senator Kennedy said--well, he didn't say anything to me about the vice presidency, you know, but I wanted to talk to him about North Africa and all that because it had been sometime. So, that was it.

So I did subsequently return; I did go to Chicago and I got very slightly involved in whatever you want to call it, vice presidential campaign or vice presidential effort in the suite that was established there in the Conrad Hilton Hotel. And oh, I guess about three times during the convention, once can't say one did much more than bump into Senator Kennedy. We once talked for, perhaps, three minutes, and he again said he wanted to find out more about North Africa, and as soon as the excitement was over, I should call him. But in any case, the excitement, of course, was never over. We never talked about it. I do remember the very last day about the campaign we bumped into each other again in the Conrad Hilton, and he said, "Well, come and see me sometime about it in Washington or Boston." So that was pretty much that.

I remember I sent fairly long letters to Ted Kennedy about what I thought had happened at the convention, and it took a while but they reached him while he was out sailing with his brother. And I know that Senator Kennedy apparently read this. He thought it was a rather interesting letter and showed it to a couple other people. But in fact I never did talk to Senator Kennedy about any of the trip in North Africa. And I didn't see him again until May, maybe it was late April, early May of 1957 when he came and spoke at the Winthrop House. I remember he was very late that evening. He was supposed to speak at a dinner. It was a very chaotic evening, and the dinner had broken up and there were some students and a few others left. And he appeared about two hours late. We didn't do anything more than shake hands, and I remember I asked a couple of questions during this session, one of which he considered quite silly, and the other one....

STEWART: Do you remember what it was?

HOLBORN: Well, it was something--I don't remember exactly what it was but it was at the time that there was a controversy. He had then just gone on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and there was a controversy about the appointment of Scott McLeod as ambassador to Ireland. This was, I guess, just before the vote in the Foreign Relations. He voted against him, but he didn't wish really to be asked about it, and he treated

the question in a very offhanded fashion. And then, suddenly on the, well, I suppose it was the Monday or Tuesday, I guess the Tuesday of again, commencement week at Harvard in '57, I got a message one afternoon--I think it was Tuesday afternoon--that Senator Kennedy had called. And as usual, I'd call back. As is true in any Senate office, early in the afternoon I'd get, "He's busy. Call back in another half an hour." And it was one of these ping pong games on the phone which went on all afternoon. One-nothing, you know: they'd return the call; I'd return the call.

In fact, I did get a hold of him then late in the afternoon or early in the evening, and he said that he'd been thinking about making a speech on North Africa, particularly Algiers. I learned subsequently that he had really been thinking about this for at least two months previous. Ted Sorensen [Theodore C. Sorensen] and a couple others had put together a little material already. And would I be willing to come down for, I think he said, three or four days to see whether I could help work up some material, work up a speech on this. And I said, yes, I could do that.

It was a somewhat awkward week. I had to be in a couple of weddings and.... But in any case, I did go down, I guess the day after commencement. Maybe it was the very day--I guess the day after commencement. And of course, this turned into sort of a situation of the man who came to dinner, leaving aside the future. As it turned out, I then started to do some hectic commuting for the first ten days or so between these weddings and cleaning up things in Cambridge. It did turn out that I spent more of the summer in Washington, and first of all, it was soon clear that he wanted to make a major speech out of this.

There was a good deal of work to be done: the actual drafting of the speech; its revision by Ted Sorensen; and his going over it. I remember he quite startled the Washington press because he sent this speech out about four days in advance to all the major correspondents' homes. And I think, more than he anticipated, the speech for the first time embroiled him in a major controversy--really, almost of any sort, but at least in foreign relations. As a senator, he had handled relatively safe subjects. He had gotten into a pretty big fight over the electoral college reform in 1956, but otherwise he had been handling sort of Hoover Commission reforms, and subjects that didn't create storms generally.

STEWART: Could you briefly run over the contributions of both yourself and other people to that speech on Algeria?

HOLBORN: Yes. Now, just let me finish up this one thing.

STEWART: Okay.

HOLBORN: So, it took, as I say, almost two week to write the speech. And the speech was given. Then it created really quite a heavy volume of mail. He had to make one elaborating statement on the Senate floor. And suddenly he was being interviewed on foreign policy matters. And it was also the time which his presidential campaign was, for the first time, really beginning to get tuned up. He was doing quite a lot of traveling during that period. Shortly before I came down, he'd been in Georgia and Arkansas. And he did quite a bit of traveling during that summer. And Ted Sorensen's time was increasingly being deployed on political matters. I think mid-way in the summer Ted

Sorensen got ill for a week or two and then went on a short vacation, so there was about three weeks that he wasn't in the office. It was a rare absence for him.

But in any event, the work in the office was such, and the kind of mail that he.... He asked me to stay until the end of the session. In those days everybody assumed that the end of session would be about August 1st that year. In fact, I had to leave before the end of the session, and I think I stayed until about the 21st of August. And I got thrown into a number of things which we can talk about later, particularly the civil rights famous jury trial amendment of '57, for which I had very little premonition or preparation.

But in the preparation of the Algeria speech, which we really did in the last two weeks of June, I think in the first draft of the speech I think he gave me fairly wide latitude. He didn't prescribe any exact formula as to whether he wanted independence for Algeria or whether he wanted--exactly what he wished to recommend. I think there is no question that one of the things on his mind was that he was looking for an area of special competence with which he could identify himself in foreign policy. And now that he was--this was '57, the first year that he was a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. And I think he realized that nobody, hardly anybody, in the Senate and nobody in that committee, with the possible exception of Senator Green [Theodore F. Green], who had a kind of a *National Geographic* interest--knew anything about Africa, that this was sort of *terra incognita* that he could carve out very much for himself. I think he, in general feelings, transposed the attitudes that he had had as a congressman and the first couple years as a senator on Vietnam. I think he wished pretty much to apply the somewhat similar thinking to Algeria.

Now, in the drafting of this speech, there was a certain amount of tension. In the final draft.... I guess that I was slightly more moderate in the group. Ted Sorensen wanted to make it much more a sermon on anti-colonialism in general. I didn't particularly agree with him. I thought it was a somewhat too sweeping first page, or first page and a half, that came out in his speech. Other parts of it were compromised pretty much. But I was a little bit uneasy with what I thought slightly over-flamboyant beginning because the prescriptions which he made were not for immediate independence or didn't require immediate independence and the resolution which was submitted with his speech was really somewhat more moderate in tone. But Ted Sorensen assured me that I didn't understand the political meaning of this.

STEWART: Which was...?

HOLBORN: Well, that you had to give it more sense of drama. Well, I think this was a speech which created its own sense of drama. I think you were touching a raw nerve by simply discussing it. And to a large extent this is what happened, and I think Senator Kennedy was really quite taken by surprise. I mean, the front page of the *New York Times*. It was one that had a lot of follow up articles and particularly, of course, in the French press, which then has playbacks here. And the Fourth of July intervened. I think he gave it, I guess, on the 2nd or the 3rd--2nd I think. And for two or three weeks I think he really felt quite beleaguered and the *New York Times*, which at that time still had a very pro-French editorial line, attacked him quite vigorously. And he did not get the resonant editorial reaction, the favorably resonant editorial reaction for it.

STEWART: You say he didn't anticipate this?

HOLBORN: No. He didn't anticipate this as much.

STEWART: At all?

HOLBORN: No. And there was about a week at where he had really considerable self doubts as to whether he had done the right thing or the right way, whether he had stepped into this too far. And there was always a certain amount of kidding for many months thereafter about the trouble I had gotten him into. But I think, if I may jump for a moment to '62, I guess, he did once say that once he was president, though probably this speech did him no good as a candidate, once he was president, this was probably one of the few things he had done that gave him some capital in the bank and that it did give him the freedom dealing with the new African nations when he was president; that it gave him, in fact, a calling card that he really didn't have in any other area; that once he was president and all these matters had moved further, this had been a good thing.

So, as a result, I stayed there about eight or nine weeks that summer and towards the middle of August, he asked me one day whether I would be willing to join the staff at least for that following year when the new Congress assembled in January and whether I'd be willing to help a little bit that fall with speeches, since that fall he really had one of the heaviest speaking schedules he ever did. That was really a pre-presidential push. He figured that in the fall of '58 he would have to concentrate a good deal on his reelection in Massachusetts and that, therefore, much of the national coverage, ostensibly, he'd have to get that fall. And he did do quite a bit of traveling, though with some restraints. Of course, Caroline was born in late November.

In any case, I, of course, consented. I said I could start the first of February, and I'd come down for a week in January. During the fall, I helped out, I suppose, on four or five speeches, as I recall, and worked a little bit out of his Boston office and traveled with him on a couple of meetings in the state--two or three times, but not more than that.

STEWART: How was your role defined before you came down? Was it a very general thing that you would help on speeches and foreign affairs, or was it anything more specific than that?

HOLBORN: No, I think Kennedy was not a man who really defined job classifications very much. And I think, as I recall it, it was partly to help with his work on the Foreign Relations Committee--he said that Ralph Dungan [Ralph A. Dungan] was increasingly tied up on domestic things, and of course, the labor legislation was on the horizon for the first time--to help some on speeches, particularly those that had foreign policy aspects to them, and generally to help with the mountain of legislative mail, and also to help in drafting many of these short articles that he had to write, book reviews. Generally speaking he had me work on, particularly that first year, quite a number of book reviews.

But as all those things happened when the office was still rather small in those days, a lot depended from day to day as to who was around. When Ted Sorensen was on the road, the work in the office necessarily shifted quite a bit. And somewhat to my surprise, in the fall I found myself in Boston with Ted Reardon [Timothy J. Reardon, Jr.] organizing what had to

be organized. That is, what had to be brought from Washington to Boston to Steve Smith [Stephen E. Smith] for the campaign. And so I worked for that whole, almost the whole period of the campaign after the Senate adjourned in Boston, which I hadn't particularly anticipated doing. So I think neither he nor I had an altogether clear idea what I'd be doing, even though he kept saying, "Don't worry, there's enough to do."

STEWART: Yes.

HOLBORN: There certainly was. And as that year went along, increasingly Ted Sorensen withdrew from the legislative area and put much more time on the political and speech writing alone and worried very little about the mail and all those kinds of things. He became much more of a national....

STEWART: What was your role in the campaign in Massachusetts, in '58?

HOLBORN: Well, it was such an odd campaign. It was hard to...

STEWART: He was only there for about three weeks, two or three weeks.

HOLBORN: Well, he was there. Well, right after Congress he went to Europe for two weeks. Then he came back for the primary. Well, he was there the better part of six weeks, I guess. But even during those six weeks, he went out to the plowing contests in Iowa, and he spoke in New Jersey, and he gave a couple of speeches in New York, and helped out a couple of other people running for the Senate. So it was not that intensive a campaign.

But I was sort of responsible for meeting people who came into the headquarters who wanted Kennedy's position on the issues; or if something had to be sent to a newspaper, you know; the League of Women Voters, where candidates stand on what; and to be available for people who sort of wanted to write background articles, not the day to day press work which we handled by Bob Thompson [Robert F. Thompson] in those days; and helped find work for the volunteers, particularly help with the mail. It turned into a little bit of everything. I was not concerned with the organizational aspects of the campaign in any way. And also to keep linked with the Washington office, keep in touch with Ralph Dungan who was then back in the office handling the Washington side with Mrs. Lincoln [Evelyn N. Lincoln]. It's pretty hard to define what you were doing, but I think more than anything it was just a need to have somebody there who could see people who had some reasonable purpose in wishing to find out what the Senator's position was on this or that. There was very little speech preparation in that campaign. There was some press release preparation, but he had very few texts that he spoke from, but such as there were, I guess I worked on two or three. I remember once he spoke at Concord. Mr. Gabion [James Gabion] invited him, whatever company it was out there that he was then the head of. And I helped out a few of the reporters. That's, I remember, how I first met Mary McGrory, was during that campaign when she came through.

But I must say, one didn't have a sense of enormous pressure. One worked pretty hard, the hours were long, but one never, against Vincent Celeste [Vincent J. Celeste], never

had a sense of being in the real campaign.

STEWART: Yes. There was a considerable effort at that time to enlist support from Harvard, MIT [Massachusetts Institute of Technology].

HOLBORN: Yes. At that time I was involved in a good bit of that. I remember helping setting up the meeting at Sanders Theatre at Harvard and making sure that we got some professors there and other notables from the Harvard community.

When I was hired by President Kennedy, I think, one of the things that he did wish me to do was to try to help with those links, both at Harvard and MIT. And already in the fall of '57, I remember.... My second job, as a matter of fact, after Algeria--well, in the summer of '57, my second job was to work on a speech on Poland which he gave in August; I forgot that earlier. And I worked with a couple of people at Harvard on that.

When I left that August, he said the first thing that he wanted to give a speech on the following year, was on India. And in the fall, December of '57, I first got together with Mr. Rostow [Walter W. Rostow] and Millikan [Max F. Millikan], and another gentleman named Malenbaum [Wilfred Malenbaum] at MIT to work up some ideas for this speech which he first sketched out from an article for the *Progressive* magazine and subsequently a speech he gave in March or April. So actually a good deal, I actually went around and spoke to a couple of college groups, I remember, during that campaign, this began to be organized much more systematically. Ted Sorensen undertook to mobilize this in a somewhat more coherent fashion to get a spread across fields and to get a few other colleges represented as well as Harvard and MIT, such as Mr. Latham [Earl Latham] who was of Amherst and Jim Burns [James MacGregor Burns] at Williams and the like. I helped on that and continued more or less to handle the, particularly again, in the foreign policy area, especially with a group at MIT from whom, I think, in the foreign area, Senator Kennedy found he had the readiest response and the most help. I suppose Rostow was more responsible for this than any other, but even the year that Rostow was in England, in '58-'59, Max Millikan and the others continued this without any kind of interruption. Millikan was, if anything, a Republican. It was always amazing in those days how easy it was to get help if you asked people. There was this sense of estrangement from Washington then, and even those who didn't favor Kennedy's presidential aspirations, were really quite happy to be asked. Ask them to a meeting, they would almost surely appear. Another thing I remember arranging in '58 for Kennedy was a meeting with the Nieman fellows at Harvard. Indeed, there were two--he met with them twice. Early in '58, he for the first time appeared before the various newspapermen, and there again there were a number of members from the faculty. And again, as so often happened, I wondered a little bit about whether I had gotten into something he shouldn't have gotten into, but I must say that was one occasion that worked out very well. He was extremely happy he had done it, and I think that at that time he made a number of important conversions on the Harvard faculty.

[END SIDE 1, TAPE 1]

[BEGIN SIDE 2, TAPE 1]

STEWART: What was the most common reservation that people expressed about him at that time as far as his presidential ambitions--his youth, lack of experience or what?

HOLBORN: Well, of course, some people just didn't believe it. You ran into a good many people then who really felt that this was a kind of decoy operation; that he obviously would be quite happy to be vice president; that he really didn't expect to get the presidential nomination; and that this is merely trying to establish your credentials for the vice presidency, or for consideration at some later date. That happened. That was one of the most common reactions.

But I would say, of course, at least in the Harvard community, I would say the thing that one most often encountered, as I recall it, was a suspicion of President Kennedy's views on civil rights and civil liberties, a combination of what people felt was a reluctance to embrace a strong civil rights position on the vote for the jury trial amendment during the legislative battles of '57, combined with the family association with McCarthy [Joseph R. McCarthy], combined with the feeling that he had not taken a resolute stand on the issue in his own campaign in 1952. And, I think, the father [Joseph P. Kennedy, Sr.] was till a major issue then. I think that vanished after a while but I think when I first went to work for Kennedy, the father really was still a very big issue in academic circles. And then academics managed to raise all the issues that anyone else can raise. His youth.

STEWART: Yes.

HOLBORN: And certainly there was a feeling that he owed it to Stevenson [Adlai E. Stevenson] to let him run once more and be his vice president. Quite a number of people had that view. Not that they professed to be against Kennedy, but simply that it was a question that had to be a kind of "Stevenson deserved redemption," and that Kennedy could help him and, in turn, be his successor. A good bit of that. And among students, simply a feeling that he wasn't particularly liberal, I suppose that's what one encountered for any number of reasons. I think, perhaps academic people also disliked.... I don't think they stated this very often, but I think there was a feeling that he had never really gotten into a real sort of ideological roughhouse, that he didn't really, you know, sort of fight things out with guns blazing; and that there wasn't sort of an issue of this sort that they could identify him with as against Humphrey [Hubert H. Humphrey] or Stevenson.

STEWART: Let me ask you, what were Senator Kennedy's reactions to the criticism or lack of enthusiasm that was coming from the Harvard-MIT area? Was he deeply concerned that he wasn't receiving as much rapport with these people as he felt was needed, or did he feel that politically it really wasn't that important?

HOLBORN: Well, I don't think he felt as time went on in '57-'58.... You will recall that in June of 1957, he did finally get elected to the Board of Overseers, and he had, finally, a foot in Harvard and an easier way of getting in touch with people, and feeling the pulse and so on. I don't think his deepest grievances, by and large, were Harvard and MIT. But, of course, in a certain way, perhaps it was exaggerated, he was rather

popular at Harvard. I mean, I think there was a feeling that, unlike his father--and many people did make this contrast all the time--he really had a very deep interest in Harvard, and then he was much more intellectually motivated, that he placed a great value on their advice. Even the very first year that he went to the Senate, for example, when he was engaged in what might be considered somewhat sub-chauvinistic enterprise about these three speeches he made on an economic program for New England, from there he drew on Seymour Harris and a number of other Harvard economists. So I think he quite early felt that it was not difficult for him to get entry into Harvard. I think he also always had considerable faith in his ability to satisfy people or at least to take the poison out of their feelings if he was able to have a face to face encounter, sort of question and answer. He always had tremendous faith in his ability to handle Q and A [Question and Answer], which, of course, was one of his great skills and added to it this sort of sense of candor that he gave. There no question every occasion that I saw at Harvard, whether it was before the Niemans....

Or I remember, very early in 1958 he had a tremendous success before a meeting sponsored by the Harvard Law School Democrats at which a high proportion of the Law School faculty was there, where there was a good deal of spirit--and the meetings he had as a visiting committee, as an overseer and the like. I think he realized that he could open up a successful dialogue with these people, and I think after awhile he didn't feel that Harvard was in a sense an opposition base.

And even people in the early stages like Galbraith [John Kenneth Galbraith] and Schlesinger [Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.], whose first loyalties, then at least, in '58 lets say, were still to Stevenson, and even second choice to Humphrey, they adapted themselves to each other, and gave him help the same way that they gave others. And I think he did find that he could breach sort of the academic enclave or advisory enclaves that Stevenson had, quite successfully. I think what did bother him, however, was that this had very little ripple effect elsewhere in the country, and that there was a sense of sort of having to reestablish your credentials to every place you went.

I mean I think during the Wisconsin primary, for example, he was extremely bothered by the academic hostility which was quite evident, particularly at the University of Wisconsin, which set up a kind of academic advisory counter group there with Professor David Feldman and a few others. And I think it bothered him when he went out to--the sense of hostility he felt--when he went to California, some of it in Oregon, during the Oregon primary. And he once did say that it was so much easier for him to be popularizing himself in poor Catholic colleges for which he had little respect than in the places....

STEWART: Yes.

HOLBORN: And I think that's where he had a sense of irritation, if not grievance. I think he found really that at Harvard he had managed to damp down much of the hostility, and he managed by '60 to create a fair amount of enthusiasm. So I don't think that there was really a serious wall of misunderstanding between him and the Cambridge community. I think it was more between him and the wider community.

STEWART: What about the criticism based on his stand on McCarthy? Did this continually frustrate him, that he felt people didn't understand the reasons,

because he had to keep explaining it over and over again, or wasn't this of that much....

HOLBORN: Well, I must say, on this I guess he even kind of surprised me. I think he told me once.... Again one of the early jobs I had was to draft a book review that he had been asked to do of Oscar Handlin's book on Al Smith [Alfred E. Smith]. I guess I can look it up, but in my first draft of it I had some remark about Roosevelt which he said he couldn't possibly let that go. And he got a little irritated, and he said, "You ought to be bright enough to see the political implications of this." But then he calmed down rather quickly.

I guess I had just come back that weekend from Harvard and he wanted to know sort of what the feelings were and everything. And I guess I raised something about this McCarthy thing and he said sort of openly, "Well, it's--in a way it's an issue I can't.... I just can't handle that issue very well. It's always bound to be a somewhat difficult one." And he said quite openly at the time, "Well, after all, Bobby worked for him and there's just no getting around that. And I certainly did nothing to discourage him at the time. The rest of my family didn't." And then went into a little bit of the details of the constellation of forces that were necessary to win the election in 1952. I think on that he was--I think he rather understood the criticism. I mean I think he could see.... He really didn't see why anybody in Massachusetts couldn't see his position, but I guess he did kind of make some allowance for people in other places not seeing, necessarily seeing the problem or the family--Massachusetts plus the family problem. But he did sort of shrug his shoulders, and he said, "Well, you know in some ways that's an unanswerable problem. There isn't anything you can do particularly to erase it. You just do other things that ultimately overshadow it."

But it was a question he most disliked being asked about on any Q and A, *Meet the Press*. And the irritation always showed through. I remember how extremely irritated he got in a show in which Martin Agronsky was interviewing him, which I guess was probably in the fall of '57. "You know," he said, "you get in trouble if you say too much; you get in trouble if you say too little." And it was the one thing that he really.... Any other subject he didn't mind having.... But he always got slightly tense about that because he felt it was really one of the few subjects that he couldn't--partly he was tense because he couldn't be candid. I mean, "Other things," he said, "you can explain away by simply telling people exactly what happened or why it happened." But he just felt it was almost impossible in this case, without involving a great many other people.

STEWART: Yes. You've mentioned a couple of times now, the slight problems or situations, which at least suggest to me, and correct me if I'm wrong, which seem to fall from your lack of involvement or understanding, if you will, of the clear political implication of something. Let me ask you a slightly personal question. Did you, coming from the academic world, have any real problems fitting your work and your approach to things into the clearly political goals and political operations of this whole operation? And, if so, when did this whole situation change? Did you find yourself getting into the swing of things, so to speak, after a while or just what was your own personal feeling--just what were your own personal feelings?

HOLBORN: Well, I think, as a generalization, at least the sort of thing that I was working on principally during those years, I actually found the gulf between academic work and the kind of work I was doing there, was not as wide as I had expected. And I think there are certain very difficult adjustments, particularly when you have to write a great deal. I think there is a real problem of style which is not so much a question of political discrimination but of pitch that's hard to get. When you make the adjustment, you have to always have a clear sense of the various audiences that you must be speaking to at once. I think this takes, and did take a certain amount of discipline. On the other hand, I think, academic people go, if anything I had always been a little bit too politically involved, and my disposition perhaps made academic work too political. So you know there were certain secrets. And every so often you walked into a--one walked into a trap without knowing it.

I think there was a little bit of a problem at first, too, in I think the very candor of the senator, his willingness to tell you just about everything that sometimes it was very hard to know, you know, what was private and what was on the record, off the record, and you had to be rather careful. So, you know, obviously one got much better at it--better the second year than the first year--and one became much wavier. And, of course, the pressure of the campaign imposed its restraints. But I wouldn't want to exaggerate this because, if anything, I was surprised that there were bridges across this gulf.

STEWART: It was, in fact, easier than you had imagined it would be. Do you want to just go on then and briefly summarize what you were doing after the '58 campaign, during 1959, and then moving on to the primary period?

HOLBORN: Yes. Well, why don't we run through the Senate period. First of all, very little of my work after the campaign of '58, when guess I was more deeply involved in the political mechanics and the like than any time subsequently.... I wasn't really very much involved in the organizational side of the primary campaign and only to a very limited extent of the final campaign. And indeed during 1960, I was sort of in charge of the Senate office. Sort of the residuary legatee, particularly after Mr. Feldman [Myer "Mike" Feldman] took over the formal research operation.

Sorensen, of course, was almost entirely on the road or preparing for the convention and the like. So, of the regular people in the office, I think I was less politically involved than any other. And I guess from about March on in 1960, except for occasional periods when he was in the office, I was pretty much responsible for legislative mail and all that kind of thing.

However, I think after he came back in '59.... After that Kennedy said, "Well, I think you ought to spend a little more time dealing with press people. You obviously know a lot of them. Be careful." Again the usual caution, "Don't involve yourself in political tactics and the like on which I will speak or Ted Sorensen or whoever it is. You know what my positions are on things. You know some of the foreign press." He began to get a little worried about the foreign press which was another area where there was unnecessary hostility. And he said, "One role that you can play sort of quietly and, you know, build up the fact that I do have some position on things, and what I've been working on." So, I think increasingly, more so in '60 than in '59, I did do quite a bit of this. Again, staying away from the day-to-day stuff. Then I continued the legislative work on the foreign relations side, and then both in '58 and

'59, Kennedy had a number of amendments to the foreign aid bill. He got particularly interested in the aid to India, and in 1959 and early '60 we had a rather complicated maneuver going with Senator Cooper [John S. Cooper] setting up a special commission to study Indian aid needs which we were finally able to work out with Eugene Black. And also got a little bit more involved in domestic things, in Massachusetts things.

I worked quite hard, and he was interested in getting the Cape Cod National Seashore passed. So Senator Saltonstall's [Leverett Saltonstall] legislative assistant and I, and a man named David Martin and later another legislative assistant, Jonathan Ward, worked on this for three years. In fact, it didn't finally go through until the spring of Kennedy's first year in the White House. Here again we used.... This took several trips to the Cape. We talked to all sorts of lawyers; we got the Student Research Bureau at the Harvard Law School working for us; we got a number of professors at Harvard. And that took a fair bit of time. Then still working on the occasional articles and the like, book reviews that came up. There were two or three in the *New York Times*, one or two in the *Saturday Review of Literature*, a couple in the *Washington Post*.

STEWART: Didn't you have a major article in *Foreign Affairs*?

HOLBORN: That was in '57. Actually, that's right, that was that summer in '57. Actually, more happened in that summer of '57. Yes, I did work on that. In the primaries I used to work with Mike Feldman and others in preparing these position papers. Also, helped Ted Sorensen and others in putting together *Strategy for Peace*-I worked particularly on the first and last chapter of that and the very short section on Europe. And since it was only summertime that Ted Sorensen could put in on this I continued to deal with the MIT group particularly in foreign policy, though, as you know, that became even more formalize late in '59 when Dierdre Henderson and the group were put together. So except for sort of helping to draft position papers and these press inquiries and the like, I really didn't.... I wasn't on the road during the primary period, at all.

I did somewhat help set up the Esso Building headquarters with Steve Smith, helping organize the mail system there, going down occasionally and helping to draft some general replies, helping a little bit with setting up a not very successful, Young Democrats youth group for Kennedy there. And I really didn't go on the road till the convention itself when I was out in Los Angeles for ten days. And except for being summoned to New York twice to help on a couple of things, I didn't travel during the campaign itself until the last ten days.

STEWART: What did you do at the convention?

HOLBORN: There I was primarily, again, supposed to be available to the press, who had to write these long articles on Kennedy's foreign policy is, and what Kennedy's this or that is. And again, helped some especially on the foreign press there and eve, to some extent, on the day-to-day stuff, although Pierre [Pierre E.G. Salinger] handled, of course, the domestic operations entirely.

STEWART: Yes.

HOLBORN: But that wasn't my principal duty. Just someone, again, who could talk to these hordes of people who have to....

STEWART: Were you at all involved in helping Burns in writing his book in 1959?

HOLBORN: No. He interviewed me, and we had lunch a few times while he was working on it, and I helped him find a few things in the files. But I was not really intimately involved with that. I knew Burns a bit, but I wasn't in on the crunch there. That was entirely Ted Sorensen, the senator, and Burns himself.

STEWART: Were you the only person remaining in the Senate office, say, during the campaign? You and a few girl or what?

HOLBORN: Well, Mrs. Lincoln was there during most of the time. Well, no. Ted Reardon was there some, and Mike Feldman would come in occasionally. But there were period when I was practically the only one there, yes. Ralph Dungan would come in a few time, but there was rarely, at least, more than one other. Mike Feldman's operation was mostly downtown, the research. And I spent--well, actually I didn't even spend full time at it. I also, with Dave Hackett, ran the mail operation of the campaign which was down on Connecticut and D, and I used to go down there for two or three hour a day and help drawing up some brochures and that sort of thing.

STEWART: Where did you pick up your expertise in mail handling? You've mentioned that quite...

HOLBORN: I don't know. It's not an expertise I particularly value. But after one had dealt with this legislative mail for awhile, hordes of it, you know, there just wasn't anybody else.

STEWART: You mentioned you were involved in setting up the Esso office. Does this include this card file that has been written about and talked about?

HOLBORN: No, I didn't have anything to do with it.

STEWART: You didn't have anything to do with it?

HOLBORN: No. Not with the card file. I helped interview some girls who would work there. Tried to get some help, again, mostly on the mail and help on several brochures and mailings. Again, they had these various things on Kennedy; they had various brochures on Kennedy and religion, Kennedy and foreign policy, and so on. I don't even recall how many of those things I worked on. You know, half a dozen or so.

STEWART: Yes. You mentioned your dealings with members of the foreign press and Kennedy's concern that possibly he wasn't being viewed as favorably as he might. Did this activity increase as the campaign went along or did it...?

HOLBORN: It increased. Yes. And actually after awhile he began to hold me a little bit responsible for this. I remember he was extremely annoyed by an article that appeared about him--oh, I just don't remember the date, but I'd say the winter of '60--in the *Economist*. He was quite annoyed by it. It turns out it was written by an American. And he was rather nervous about the German press. He felt there was a good deal of hostility from Adenauer [Konrad Adenauer] and the like which was reflected in the German press. He wanted to see if that could be remedied in any way.

Indeed there was sort of a major episode--what seemed might be a major episode. I guess if you looked back on it, it probably wasn't. At the very end of the campaign there was a series of articles that appeared in Germany from unidentified sources about how worried the German government was about a Kennedy victory, much of which apparently emanated from Franz Josef Strauss, who was particularly strong in the press in Munich. And there was a speech which Nixon [Richard M. Nixon] made in Buffalo about twelve days, two weeks, before the end of the campaign in which he alluded to the worry the Germans had about Kennedy becoming president, and also appearing to recognize.... And then there was a question about claims to the eastern territories that Nixon got involved in. I dealt with the German embassy, and the German ambassador made a statement, sent a letter to the *Baltimore Sun*, which was one of the papers that highlighted this, about how there wasn't any German government position. But there was that kind of trauma. But when Kennedy meant the foreign press he was of course particularly interested in the British because that's what he saw, or heard about and read. I think, all the time when he was talking about this, half of it was really the British in his mind.

STEWART: Moving on, during the transition period: one, did you always intend in your own mind or hope in your own mind that you would automatically go to the White House or did you consider going some place else in the administration?

HOLBORN: Oh, I would certainly have considered going elsewhere in the administration. I don't think I believed it inevitable that would go to the White House.

Actually, I don't think he even asked or suggested that until about three week after the election. I guess it was toward the end of November. In that period. But I must say I don't even really remember thinking about it. I felt the period after the election was busier than the period before the election. Perhaps not being as much under the gun during the campaign as some people, I was particularly under the gun immediately after the election because things did flow back into the Senate office then. Though, his own home became the real nerve center; that's really where most of the problems and the appeals came. It took quite a lot of energy to keep the office going during this interval because the Democratic Committee wanted to cut down the staff as quickly as possible. Mail, for example, was just voluminous, and much of it was extremely important mail now that came back there. People wishing office and all kind of--a lot of foreign mail and heads of state and telegrams and all this sort of thing. So, that was in many ways the most difficult period of all. But I guess in my own mind, honestly, I assumed that he probably would ask me to come to the White House, but I think I would have certainly considered something else in government.

STEWART: You say he did ask you around the end of November?

HOLBORN: Yes. Rather casually, offhandedly. You know, "You're probably coming to the White House, aren't you?" sort of thing. And again not very clear, not at all clear, about what you would be doing exactly. "Everything will work itself out in time." And I suppose probably this was in a period in which I was in many ways closest to Kennedy, particularly so during the picking of people--I received many more phone calls from him and many more questions about sizing up people and so on than at any other time before or after. But that was just a part of the accident of location. He knew I was there in the office. He knew the telephone number.

STEWART: I'm not quite clear. What did he feel in particular that you in your situation really had to contribute to these appointments? What types of things did he ask you or was he looking for about these people that he was considering? As far as you were concerned?

HOLBORN: I think he was not so much interested in my estimate necessarily but trying to find out what I knew of other people's estimate of these people and simply to get these contacts, academic and other. I mean, these suddenly became important to him.

STEWART: Yes.

HOLBORN: Indeed, the first thing he asked me to do right after the election--the only time I talked to him, I guess, the first week after the election--he did want me to go up to Harvard to find out a number of things about what the arrangements were if you hired somebody from Harvard as to whether they had to resign or get a leave of absence; what was the general feeling; he did ask me to sort of see whether I could smoke out Bundy [McGeorge Bundy] as to whether he had interests. I was by no means the only one doing this. I think the day after I saw Bundy, Bundy was also called by Shriver [R. Sargent Shriver]. But Bundy was quite... [Interruption, phone call]

STEWART: ...during the transition.

HOLBORN: And, for example, I went on that trip to Cambridge. I remember I talked to Abe Chayes [Abraham Chayes]. I talked to Bundy who, though he was, as always, cryptic, did appear to have some own interests, although he talked very dispassionately about, you know, how tough Harvard would be on these people who left, that there was no commutation of sentence. Two years was the absolute maximum. And Kennedy wanted to know whether Pusey [Nathan M. Pusey] or Bundy had to know whether--if you were dickering with these people, whether the administration wanted to be advised. Fiercely, Bundy said no, they didn't have to be advised; every professor was his own man.

And he also wanted me to scout out a little bit about whether he ought to go up to the Overseers meeting in January, I must say all the complications of which I didn't realize then because by then you had the full retinue of the Secret Service and the like. But I guess I did

recommend that he go, for reasons which escape me. But in any case, I think he had made up his own mind. I don't think he wanted advice. He just wanted to know what some of the problems might be. He did feel a little guilty about having given the Overseers short shrift. And he wanted to know whether actually....

The other thing he wanted to know was whether he should resign from the Overseers. And Bundy and Pusey's assistant both said they very much hoped they wouldn't, which surprised me. Because I think they were well aware that he couldn't put too much time into any of it. And subsequent to that meeting of the Overseers, the only time he met them--though he had intended to go to the commencement in 1962--was when he had them at the White House in May of 1963 which was his next to last meeting on the Board of Overseers.

But he was very concerned even at that period about keeping these little bridges open to Harvard. I think he always had some awareness that he might live there, put his papers in the library, and all these sorts of things were always at the back of his mind. And he wanted to be sure that everything was in good repair, even then.

STEWART: You didn't have anything to do with the speech he delivered at his last visit there?

HOLBORN: No I didn't. No I think Arthur Schlesinger by that time did much of the drafting, but I had nothing to do with it content. Nothing.

STEWART: One last question. Was there anything really anything significant about closing up the Senate office? And, also, did you have any role in the selection of Senator Smith [Benjamin Smith]?

HOLBORN: No, I didn't know Smith. It's funny. It's one of the president's friends I had never encountered so far as I know. Though I heard his name mentioned about a week before it happened, I didn't....

One the thing that was worked out was that in the Senate the rule was that--and Kennedy was very conscious of this and he liked to save money--a member of the Senate staff could be paid for thirty days after the resignation of the boss. So he worked it out in such a way, December 21st, so that there would be exactly a month till inauguration to cover people. This was very much part of the design. Again, I did interview a couple of people who were interested in working for Senator Smith and I had two short meetings with them offering odd bits of advice. And Milton Gwirtzman [Milton S. Gwirtzman], who came in as one of his principal assistants, I knew quite well. So the transition there was relatively easy.

There was a certain amount of problems dealing with the Senate files. I worked with the Archives. We'd started this already in the summer making provision that all of the Senate records would be kept intact and sent to the Archives right away, not to Massachusetts or some other place where they would be lost. And indeed in December Kennedy asked me to go to New York for a couple of reasons at the time of the American Historical Association and meet with Herman Kahn to discuss some of the problems about papers before, and also about trying to salvage the Democratic National Committee files--I was somewhat involved in that--which of course we did do for many files that antedate the presidential campaign which really exist by a process of seizure. There was no rule that governed it.

STEWART: Yes. Were you surprised at how concerned he was about things such as this?

HOLBORN: Yes. I was amazed about that. I mean I must say I thought it was a curious time for me to go and see Herman Kahn, though we had a rather good meeting. And I think as a result we lost.... He did lose some of his files from his House of Representatives period which we just don't know whatever happened to them. Burns discovered this when he was working on his book. But I think as a result, the Senate records are as intact as possibly could be, plus the campaign files. So I did do a certain amount of work on that, and I worked with Kahn and Trever [Karl L. Trever]--well, Kahn was not here then--and Grover [Wayne C. Grover] in helping to get that organized. And then just cleaning up that office was a major....

STEWART: Yes, the transfer of power.

HOLBORN: Cleaning up myself was hard enough.

STEWART: Well, that's just about it, I think.

[END OF INTERVIEW]

Name List

A

Adenauer, Konrad, 17
Agronsky, Martin, 13

B

Black, Eugene, 15
Bundy, McGeorge, 18, 19
Burns, James MacGregor, 10, 16, 20

C

Celeste, Vincent J., 9
Chayes, Abraham, 18
Cooper, John S., 15

D

Dungan, Ralph A., 8, 9, 16

F

Feldman, David, 12
Feldman, Myer, 15, 16

G

Gabion, James, 9
Galbraith, John Kenneth, 12
Green, Theodore F., 7
Grover, Wayne C., 20
Gwirtzman, Milton S., 19

H

Hackett, Dave, 16
Handlin, Oscar, 13
Harris, Seymour, 12
Henderson, Dierdre, 15
Holcombe, Arthur, 1, 2
Humphrey, Hubert H., 11, 12

K

Kahn, Herman, 19, 20
Kennedy, Edward M., 2, 3, 4, 5
Kennedy, Jacqueline Bouvier, 2

L

Latham, Earl, 10
Leger, Paul-Emile, 3
Lincoln, Evelyn N., 9, 16
Lodge, Henry Cabot, 1, 2

M

Malenbaum, Wilfred, 10
Mallan, John P., 2
Martin, David, 15
McCarthy, Joseph R., 11, 12, 13
McGrory, Mary, 9
McLeod, Scott, 5
Millikan, Max F., 10

N

Nixon, Richard M., 17

P

Pusey, Nathan M., 18, 19

R

Reardon, Timothy J., Jr., 8, 16
Rostow, Walter W., 10

S

Salinger, Pierre E. G., 15
Saltonstall, Leverett, 15
Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., 12, 19
Shriver, R. Sargent, 18
Smith, Alfred E., 2, 9, 13, 15, 19
Smith, Benjamin, 19
Smith, Stephen E., 2, 9, 13, 15, 19
Sorensen, Theodore C., 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14,
15, 16
Stevenson, Adlai E., 11, 12
Strauss, Franz Josef, 17

T

Thompson, Robert F., 9

Trever, Karl L., 20

W

Ward, Jonathan, 15