Carroll Kilpatrick Oral History Interview – JFK#1, 05/16/1966
Administrative Information

Creator: Carroll Kilpatrick
Interviewer: Charles T. Morrissey
Date of Interview: May 16, 1966
Place of Interview: Washington D.C.
Length: 19 pages

Biographical Note
Carroll Kilpatrick (1913-1984) was a journalist for the *Washington Post*. This interview focuses on the press's coverage of John F. Kennedy during the 1960 presidential election and during his presidency, among other topics.

Access
Open

Usage Restrictions
According to the deed of gift signed March 5, 1969, copyright of these materials has been assigned to the United States Government. 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 The copyright law extends its protection to unpublished works from the moment of creation in a tangible form.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

Carroll Kilpatrick, recorded interview by Charles T. Morrissey, May 16, 1966, (page number), John F. Kennedy Library Oral History Program.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

Gift of Personal Statement

By Carroll Kilpatrick

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, _____, 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 material transferred hereunder, and all literary property rights, 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 terms of this instrument available for research as soon as it has been deposited in the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library.

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.

Signed Carroll Kilpatrick

Date Mar 1 1969

Accepted Herbert E. Angel
acting Archivist of the United States

Date March 5, 1969

GSA FORM JUNE 67 7016

GSA DC 67 [illegible]

Carroll Kilpatrick– JFK #1

Table of Contents

Oral History Interview

with

CARROLL KILPATRICK

May 16, 1966
Washington, D.C.

By Charles T. Morrissey

MORRISSEY: Let's start with your first recollection of John Kennedy.

KILPATRICK: I think my first recollection of him was when he was on the Labor Committee in the House of Representatives, and I think I'm right that he was on the Labor Committee. I did not know him at that time; I remember seeing him a few times. That's my first recollection of him--covering that committee and hearing him. I really did not know him until he began campaigning for the presidency. I knew him somewhat when he was a Senator for several years, but never well. I talked to him a few times when he was in the Senate; I'd met him occasionally and on social occasions, but my first real contact came in the 1960 primaries. I remember we had dinner with him at someone's house in Georgetown about 1954; it was just after he'd gotten to the Senate.

MORRISSEY: Was it before he had had the trouble with his back?

KILPATRICK: It was before he was married. I don't know of any detail of that evening that would be particularly worth reporting.

MORRISSEY: Did his talk tend to center on politics?

KILPATRICK: It did. We talked about his election to the Senate, the campaign for the Senate. I don't think I have any record of that or any notes, and my memory is hazy. There were some people present who had participated in the campaign with him, and they were reminiscing about it. The things that I remember that may have some interest did take place in 1960. I went with him to Wisconsin in that campaign and was out there two or three weeks covering him. I think the first impression I started off with was that perhaps he was a very young and inexperienced person, and why was he being considered for the presidency. I quickly got over that. The first thing that struck me were his speeches which were really extraordinarily good I thought. I thought so at the time; I thought his delivery and the content of his speeches were so far above the ordinary political level that I suddenly thought, "Well, this man really has something." Then I began asking myself, "Well, just because a man can make a good speech, does that mean he can be a good President?" And of course there is no answer to that. He seemed relaxed during that campaign. I kept wondering just how really committed he was to trying to win. It seemed more like an academic exercise at first.

MORRISSEY: You mean they were assuming that /Hubert H./ Humphrey would do better in the state neighboring on Minnesota?

KILPATRICK: I think we thought that Humphrey would do reasonably well there, and I think also we really wondered--those of us covering that campaign--whether John Kennedy would really be nominated at that point. We thought of him as one of a number of candidates. While he immediately appealed to me as a person and as a politician and as a speaker, I think for a while I must really not have thought that he really might end up in the White House. I remember Mrs. /Jacqueline B./ Kennedy was on one of the trips, and I don't know whether I ever asked her this question, but it

certainly occurred to me, and I may have asked her, whether she could really picture herself as the wife of the President. He was certainly the most relaxed and accessible candidate that I'd ever seen. She was with him, and I remember several incidents that were striking.

It was terribly cold; it must have been February. We would walk through these towns as he would shake hands and speak and campaign. The Wisconsin farmer is a very reserved person, as he learned. Once when I remarked to him that I was surprised at their lack of enthusiasm, he said, Well, if he hadn't known of that, hadn't come to realize that they were very reserved, it would have been a hard thing for him to do. But he would walk along the street and shake hands with people, and their response was never very enthusiastic. It was pleasant but just a sort of a grunt and a nod of the head. I remember Mrs. Kennedy in a bright red coat with him shaking hands with these people, and so often they would hardly nod or tip their hats as they shook hands with her. And it struck me as a very odd thing.

Then one day in one of the small towns he had made his speech, and he walked around the block and came to either a restaurant or a beerhall, and he walked in there and walked toward the back. And some men were playing checkers, or dominoes, or cards, or something in the back around a big table. He walked back and shook hands with all of them. Not a one of them stood, and one of them said to him, "We'd planned to come to hear you speak, but we didn't finish our game." And that struck me as being one of the hardest things a politician would have to take. He took it very well, smiled, and shook hands with all of them, and left.

I was not in Wisconsin on the night of the voting. I had come back to Washington. I remember that we were uncertain in the office whether this victory he won there would be enough to keep him in the campaign, keep him really ahead. Humphrey had done a little better, I think, than most of the people had predicted, and better, I suspect, than Senator Kennedy thought he would do. Senator Humphrey was very rough on him in that campaign, I remember. I was quite surprised by the allusions that Humphrey made on several

occasions to the black bag, indicating that the Kennedys were buying the election. Kennedy never did respond in kind and he never attacked Humphrey that I recall. I thought that showed a very honorable position on his part and was surprised that a politician didn't begin to reply in kind.

MORRISSEY: Did you follow Humphrey's campaign closely?

KILPATRICK: I did not. I stayed with Kennedy most of the time and traveled with Humphrey only a few days before coming back to Washington.

MORRISSEY: Did you have the impression that the Humphrey campaign was not as well organized as the Kennedy campaign?

KILPATRICK: Well, the Humphrey campaign struck me more as a typical political campaign whereas Kennedy's struck me as something of a very high order. I came away from that with not a high opinion of Humphrey. I've changed it since, but at that time I felt that he was just the old slashing campaigner with long-winded speeches. And Kennedy's had, it seemed to me even then, real substance and real form to it. He was appealing to the higher instincts of people, and Humphrey was appealing to the lower instincts.

MORRISSEY: Did you run into the religious issue?

KILPATRICK: Yes. I think that I was one of the first that wrote about the religious issue there. I remember debating in my mind whether I should write about it at the time. I encountered it in talking to people in the crowds and on the street, and I realized that it was a very real problem. I did begin reporting this, always wondering whether in doing so I was injecting the religious issue into the campaign unnecessarily. But it was a factor in those congressional districts where Kennedy did not do well.

MORRISSEY: Do you think it was a factor the other way around?

KILPATRICK: Well, I suspect that it -- I'm sure it must have been although at the moment I don't remember all the details of the various districts well enough. But I'm sure that in some of the Catholic districts he did extremely well. I was not aware of it being used by him as an issue in any sense at that time certainly. He began talking about it in West Virginia for the first time, I think. My recollection is that he began talking about this issue in, I think it was Clarksburg, West Virginia. I remember that rather vividly because he had been campaigning for some days in West Virginia, and all of the reporters recognized this as a big issue and were writing about it. If I'm not mistaken, he had not said anything about it openly. Then, very vigorously one morning -- I think first in a meeting in the hotel -- he spoke out on this, saying he thought this should not prevent him from seeking the presidency. Then we went down the street, and in an openair speech he gave on the street, a pretty sizable crowd, he again spoke very vigorously on the subject. I know my wife was with me on that day and was extremely impressed by the speech he made.

MORRISSEY: Since you're a reporter writing for an eastern paper, did you have the feeling in Wisconsin that Kennedy and others in his entourage were especially sensitive to the press they were getting in the East?

KILPATRICK: I heard that they were. I never had any problems with him on that. Once I interviewed a Catholic priest in West Virginia who said that there was as much bigotry in Boston, where he had come from, as there was in West Virginia. I think this rather annoyed Kennedy, and he laughed about it and said something about it. But I never did have any difficulties with him as far as what I was writing. He may have objected to some of the things I wrote, but he never said anything to me about it. I can't

remember whether /Pierre, E. G./ Salinger objected once to something. I don't remember. I don't believe so during the campaign.

MORRISSEY: Did you have a feeling in Wisconsin that perhaps the Kennedy people were overemphasizing Humphrey's chances of scoring a fairly impressive victory?

KILPATRICK: I really don't remember on that. My recollection is that the time I was there Kennedy was not talking about Humphrey, and he was saying -- he may have begun talking about him later because I left there and came back, and somebody else went out for the /Washington/ Post. But I don't remember that he ever did much talking about Humphrey. Humphrey attacked him personally, but he very seldom attacked Humphrey. His was always a positive campaign promoting Kennedy, so I was unaware of how serious he thought the Humphrey challenge. I think he was obviously aware of it at all times. The time I was with him was before I went with Humphrey and before I was quite aware of how much Humphrey was attacking him. He later, much later, remarked one day on the plane, after he had won the nomination: "I listened to some of those speeches Humphrey made in Wisconsin, and he certainly did cut me up." And it was true; Humphrey certainly did cut him up, on farm issues, on money, and by innuendo.

MORRISSEY: When you were reporting Kennedy in Wisconsin, would you stick with him throughout the day, even when he went into some of those northern or western rural areas?

KILPATRICK: Oh yes, yes. We stayed with him. We stayed with him; they were long days. And I thought that and the West Virginia primary were very exciting. He had stamina and he could take the long days, and we had to take them.

MORRISSEY: The reason I asked that question is that I've heard that more than a few newspapermen retreated to Milwaukee as the weather turned cold . . .

KILPATRICK: Oh, really?

MORRISSEY: . . . and the day turned into twilight.

KILPATRICK: I don't remember that. I know there were some very bad days, we traveled in very heavy snow, and went very far north. But I know, certainly for a morning paper reporter, you had to stay right to the end because the later it got the nearer it was to your deadline and you were always afraid something would happen. You had to be on the scene.

I remember one thing on that. I was amazed at his ability to quote verbatim some phrase or comment that some statesman -- Bismarck, or Churchill, or Thomas Jefferson, or what have you -- would make. These always seemed to come to his mind at the appropriate time. And one day on the plane in Wisconsin I said to Mrs. Kennedy that that was certainly a great attribute and I didn't understand how he could do it. And she said, well, she didn't either, but a few days before she said that she had read in the New Yorker some sentence that was quoted from George Bernard Shaw. And she said she really didn't think her husband was listening when she read that to him. But two nights later it came back precisely in a speech he made. So this fantastic memory was for real.

MORRISSEY: What do you think turned the tide in West Virginia?

KILPATRICK: I don't know what turned the tide in West Virginia. It may have been the debate with Humphrey, but I doubt it. I think it was Kennedy's appeal as a person; the fact that he'd talked about the issues, talked about West Virginia's problems, got around the state. It was always amazing to me -- I remember at one place we went to a mine shaft, and the miners came out very glum and dirty. And he shook hands with them, and they all seemed to like him.

But he never said anything to them. He just said, "How are you? I'm Jack Kennedy." And that was about the extent of the conversation. But somehow they were impressed by him, and it seems to me that later we discovered that about 90 per cent of those miners, who might have been expected to vote for Humphrey, had voted for Kennedy.

I think that most of us were writing that it looked as though Humphrey would probably win in West Virginia. We were basing that . . . I say "we." I think that I, at least, tried to give the impression in my stories without predicting, which we're not supposed to do, that I thought that all along Kennedy had a real chance in West Virginia. I did feel that. I felt that he was at least going to make an awfully good showing. And yet I couldn't document this; I couldn't prove it. But I think that his campaign had a positive note to it. He appeared to the people more like a presidential candidate at that time than Humphrey did. While the debate that he and Humphrey had, it was impossible for -- judges could not have said one got so many points and the other so many points. The net impression was that he was a stronger personality, I think. I think that got over to the people. I think the people also did not want to prove, by voting against him, that they were as bigoted as some of the outside writers were saying they were. We found evidences of real bigotry, there's no question about that. I remember in one place interviewing one of the fundamentalist pastors. After saying at first he would not talk, he began talking. He spoke very violently against the Catholic Church and against Kennedy. And I think he told his flock that. Later, we all thought, of course, that West Virginia had ended the religious issue in the campaign. I think Kennedy thought that; I think he said that. I remember very vividly his coming back that night he won -- it was a very bad rainy night, and he flew in well after midnight. It seems to me he said, "The religious issue is buried here in the hills of West Virginia." And everyone thought he was right, but it proved not to be true. It came up again after he was nominated.

MORRISSEY: When you were covering him in Wisconsin and West Virginia, would you have frequent encounters with him in a bus or a plane?

KILPATRICK: Yes. We were with him at all times. He had the Caroline; the reporters traveled with him on the plane most of the time if there was room, and there usually was. If he was traveling on a bus, we were on the bus with him. So we did have intimate contact with him at all times, and he was as accessible as the reporter next to you would be. No problem at all of talking to him. In fact, we always did talk, much of it banter and laughter and comment about the situation.

MORRISSEY: That's what I was wondering about. Would he comment on his own prospects?

KILPATRICK: Well, my memory fails me on some of this, but certainly in Wisconsin he talked about it. And I'm sure he went over with us the areas where he thought he was weak and strong. I can't remember ever having that kind of conversation with him in West Virginia, making a prediction.

MORRISSEY: I'm interested in that because some people have emphasized how analytical Kennedy could be about himself.

KILPATRICK: Oh, that's true. And he would be analytical about how well he did or how poorly he did in a speech. Or he'd say, "I don't think I did well in that community." There were many conversations like that.

MORRISSEY: Did you cover him between the West Virginia primary and the Convention in Los Angeles?

KILPATRICK: Yes, he was here in Washington a great deal of that time. I did not go to the Oregon primary, and I did not go out for the California primary, I think. So I wasn't with him a great deal in that period

except from time to time in short trips in this part of the country. I remember covering some press conferences that he had here.

MORRISSEY: Did you go to Los Angeles?

KILPATRICK: I was at Los Angeles.

MORRISSEY: What's your overriding recollection of the brief boom for /Adlai E./ Stevenson before the votes were cast?

KILPATRICK: I know that we began writing very shortly after we got there that Kennedy would win. We never did think that the Stevenson boom would take off. I don't believe that I ever thought it would. We also thought fairly soon after we got there that /Lyndon B./ Johnson would be picked for the vice presidency.

MORRISSEY: Oh, really?

KILPATRICK: And that was partly because of /Philip L./ Phil Graham's connection. Graham was for Johnson for vice president, and Kennedy told him at some point that week that he would like to have Johnson in second spot. I doubt that I have anything else on the Convention that you haven't very thoroughly covered with other people because I was sort of bouncing around all that week in various places. I'm sure that there are much better records than my memory would be on that now.

I went from there to the Republican Convention, which was in Chicago, wasn't it?

MORRISSEY: Or San Francisco.

KILPATRICK: No, it was in Chicago. /Richard M./ Nixon was nominated, and /Henry Cabot/ Lodge. Then immediately after the Republican Convention, I went to Hyannis Port. And I remember the first thing, when I saw Kennedy, he said, "Well, Lodge made a good speech, didn't he?" And I said, "Yes, it was a very good speech." At that point I think we were all, at least I was thinking that he was

going to win fairly easily over Nixon. And I believe that he thought so. And about, I guess sometime in August, maybe early August, a Gallup poll showed that Nixon was, I believe, leading. That caused quite a bit of surprise. I stayed in Hyannis Port for some several weeks. I can't remember how long. Of course you know he had many meetings there; all the groups in the Democratic party came to see him; Johnson came to see him; Walter Reuther; Negro leaders. A great many foreign correspondents came to talk to him. He was always as relaxed and casual as ever. Always after a press conference or after a meeting on the lawn with one of these officials where he'd come out and introduce them to the press, and there'd be crowds of people on the street, and he would always take these people over and introduce them across the fence to the people standing there.

Then I remember leaving Hyannis with him when he began the campaign. We were all on the Caroline. Senator /Stuart/ Symington was there. He had been there to see him. I guess we flew to Washington for the first stop, then the campaign began. This must have been about Labor Day or the first of September. I don't have anything to add on the campaign except that I flew back and forth between Nixon and Kennedy -- I was with Kennedy toward the end, and he spoke in Oklahoma. I know I went by to see /A. S./ Mike Monroney after that. I dropped off the campaign plane and stayed there and did a story on the situation in Oklahoma. Monroney was very optimistic; he thought that Kennedy would win very easily, big vote. He was very doubtful about Oklahoma, but he even thought he had a chance there, which, of course, he did not.

I came back to Washington from there and worked election night in the office. Earlier, I was in Memphis. And there I encountered the religious issue in all its fury. I interviewed a lot of people who were leading the fight on religious grounds against him. They were certainly active. He lost Tennessee. Nixon carried Tennessee. It was unquestionably on the religious issue. I was surprised at how open so many people were in opposing him on religious grounds. That issue almost lost the election for him.

MORRISSEY: Did you, or any of these other political figures that you talked with, have any premonitions that it would be as close as it turned out?

KILPATRICK: No, I can't say that I did. I thought that Monroney was correct when he predicted a big victory. I do remember [F. Kenneth] Kenny O'Donnell would always say, "It's going to be close." Yet, I don't believe they expected it to be that close. I'm sure Kennedy thought he would win Ohio, for example.

After the election I remember he came to Washington. It was Thanksgiving weekend. On Thanksgiving night, he flew to Palm Beach. By then we were on separate planes because his plane was not large enough to hold the press. The press plane flew into Palm Beach, and we landed first. I took my wife down because I thought we would be there for that weekend. His plane landed a few minutes later; it was nearly midnight; and they said immediately they had a telephone call for him. Mrs. Kennedy had been taken to the hospital. So he immediately got onto the press plane, which by then I think had refueled, and it was going to come back deadhead to New York or Washington. But everybody got back on the press plane, and he got word after we were airborne that John [F. Kennedy, Jr.] had been born. Even under the stress of that, he was as polite and relaxed as ever. I know at least three or four times after that, when we were in Florida or traveling, he'd say, "Well, why didn't you bring your wife? Doesn't she trust me?" Or, "When is she coming in? Sorry I messed up her weekend." Little things like that were part of him.

MORRISSEY: During the campaign against Nixon, do you recall any occasions when Kennedy analyzed his prospects?

KILPATRICK: I don't. I'm sure that he did. The campaign was more hectic. We did not have as much direct contact with him as we'd had in the primary. We saw him, we had press conferences with him, and we traveled on the bus with him and all, but I don't believe that I had any private talk with him during that time. And I spent about half the time with Nixon in the campaign.

MORRISSEY: Did the Nixon people feel that their prospects were good?

KILPATRICK: Well, they always drew big crowds, But I think they always recognized that they had an uphill fight. They were putting on a lot of steam at the end. I think they thought they were going to make it toward the end. But we never had a talk with Nixon. The first week out, I remember we were somewhere in the Midwest, and he had a press conference, and it did not go well from his point of view. And that was the last press conference he had. He never did talk to reporters after that except maybe a very few, favored few. He certainly drew big crowds everywhere. Of course, Kennedy did too.

MORRISSEY: Did you have any chances when Kennedy was President to see him personally?

KILPATRICK: I saw him a few times, but it was always where records were made. For example, we had those meetings with him at Christmas of each year. But you have that. One very vivid memory is in 1962. He gave a party on Christmas Day for the press. It was in Palm Beach, and we went to the house, the Paul home there that he occupied. He wandered around the room, talking to everybody there. This was immediately after the Nassau conference with /Harold/ Macmillan. And the one thing that stands out is that we were chatting, and I asked if he thought it was clear that Britain would get into the Common Market. And he shook his head and said, "No, no, it's very difficult, very difficult. I'm not sure at all." That was a great surprise to me because everyone else had been saying it's a forgone conclusion; they would be in within a month. And I must say that I then went up the next week and had a conversation with George Ball at his home in Florida, and he was absolutely confident that Britain would get in. Then in January /Charles/ de Gaulle announced his veto. So Kennedy certainly had reason to be doubtful. I don't know what it was or whether it was just his own good judgment, but he knew that de Gaulle might pull something like this.

MORRISSEY: Many people have commented . . .

KILPATRICK: The last time I was with him was in Florida when he went there in November, 1963. He spoke in Tampa at noon, I think to the state Chamber of Commerce. It was one of his very best speeches; he was trying to say to the business people, "Look, I'm not an enemy. I'm really trying to keep the economy going," and so on, and he did it extremely well. He always seemed to me to be best in his speeches when he was under some disadvantage. Another speech that was an extraordinary speech was the speech he made to the NAM /National Association of Manufacturers/ and I would judge that was in '61 in December, in New York when he announced before the NAM that he would ask for the Trade Expansion Act, and gave his reasons. That was a hostile audience. It was a very long speech, much longer than he had intended, and one of his most effective ones. I think that was also true of his speech when he answered /Harry S/ Truman in the campaign, which would have been in the summer of '60, when Truman said Kennedy was not ready. Kennedy was very effective in answering that; very effective in the debates with Nixon because he was on the defensive.

MORRISSEY: Were you covering the White House during the two Cuban crises?

KILPATRICK: Yes, I was.

MORRISSEY: Did you see anything of him directly during either one of those two?

KILPATRICK: No, I covered them day and night, but I don't think that I have anything that you don't have in the record. I do remember that I was in Connecticut with him the week before the Cuban missile crisis. He at that point knew about it, but we did not; Salinger did not. In the afternoon he made several speeches, I guess we stayed overnight, and he came back to Washington the next day. That must have been about Thursday. He went to Chicago Friday night or Saturday morning and came back Sunday morning or Saturday night and made the announcement to the nation Monday night on the missile crisis.

MORRISSEY: Did you have any inkling?

KILPATRICK: I had no inkling. I was not in Chicago. Maybe the Connecticut trip was as early as Tuesday or Wednesday because I stayed in Connecticut for a couple of days to do a political story on Connecticut, and then I was back in Washington that weekend. I'm sure that /Edward T/ Eddie Folliard of our paper went with him to Chicago. I know I was surprised and unconvinced that he had a cold--that was the reason given for his abrupt return to Washington. But I had no inkling of the true facts. But by Sunday afternoon we had reports that something was up in a very dramatic way. Both the missile crisis and the Bay of Pigs were hectic days at the White House, but our contact then was with Salinger rather than with the President.

MORRISSEY: There were charges of managed news during the Kennedy Administration. What's your observation on that?

KILPATRICK: Well, I never did think much of those charges then, and I don't now. The press secretary in every administration attempts to put the best possible light on the news. But I thought that was a completely phony issue. We had our squabbles with Salinger many times, and we fought. We were no doubt misled, as everyone is, on some occasion. The President was always remarkably candid, I thought, in his talks with us.

MORRISSEY: Some people have commented on his extraordinary sensitivity to what was published.

KILPATRICK: He was very sensitive to what was published. I was rather late learning this. At first I thought he didn't care because, I remember, for example, in 1960 at Hyannis, one day there was a column someone had written in a New York paper, a humorous column, that made great fun of him. And he showed me that column. He thought this was one of the funniest things he'd ever seen. And I thought, "Well, he has a completely thick skin and is completely objective about himself." But I found our later that was not

true. While this was a spoofing--as I remember it, it was even cutting column--he thought it was very funny and got a great kick out of it. But later he many times showed his annoyance with things that were reported about him. But every President does.

A group of us, a group of newspapermen had a dinner for him in 1959--it seems to me it was in the fall, September or October--about a dozen people had it in a room at the National Press Club. He told us then that he would announce his candidacy after Christmas. As I recall, he predicted that Symington would win, however. He thought Johnson could not make it because of his heart attack and his Texas background, and that Humphrey would not because he was too far to the left. He thought they would probably compromise on Symington, which was one of his worst predictions. He always had great respect for Johnson as a man, as a politician. I don't believe there was very much love lost, but at that time and at other times, he told me how able he thought Johnson was. I remember flying from Washington to Palm Beach, I guess in December of 1960, with him. It was after the baby was born, and the baby was on the plane with Mrs. Kennedy, and they were sleeping, I think, in the back, and so he was up forward. I sat by him and talked to him at some length. I remember he mentioned [McGeorge] Bundy, and he said something about Secretary of State. And I said, "Well, why don't you go on and make Bundy Secretary of State if you want him?" He very quickly responded. said, "Oh, no, you couldn't possibly do that. You can't put anybody like that in charge of a big department who hasn't had any real government experience. You've got to have somebody with experience." And then he mentioned Whizzer White, Byron White, and said, "Now he, too, could become head of an agency, but he's got to have some testing first." He rejected the thought of Bundy as a Secretary of State, but he certainly had him in mind as a future possibility, just as he had White in mind for some bigger job later. I remember he asked me on that trip if I knew Robert Weaver. He'd had some reports on him and obviously wanted to take him into the Administration. I know that he considered [Dean] Rusk, David Bruce, and a third person for Secretary of State--[J. William] Fulbright. I don't think Fulbright was ever a serious contender. Johnson wanted

Fulbright, but Kennedy did not. Kennedy was thinking in terms of David Bruce. He considered him at length, and finally chose Rusk.

MORRISSEY: I've also heard it said that during the Kennedy Administration the ship of state leaked at the top.

KILPATRICK: Yes, that's quite true, it did. He had already announced the appointment of Secretary Freeman, of Orville Freeman to be Secretary of Agriculture. I remarked to him on the plane going to New York that Freeman certainly had a tough job ahead. He said, "Yes, but I've gotten /Charles S./ Charlie Murphy to be Under Secretary. And that's a good second man for the job." Well, I waited a day and then wrote the story. And the following day he said, "Where in the world do you folks get leaks like that? How did you find out about it?" And I said, "Well, somebody in Washington told us." /Laughter/ I didn't have the courage at that moment to say that, "You told me." I think the /Washington/ Post was the first paper to say that Rusk would be the Secretary of State. And I'm sure that that came from the President himself to Phil Graham, and I know that he was annoyed that that was printed and asked for investigation of who leaked it. He finally realized that he himself had done it.

MORRISSEY: Did you cover the Dallas Trip?

KILPATRICK: No. No, I'd gone the week before to New York with him and then to Florida where he spoke at Tampa at noon on Monday and spoke that night in Miami and, I believe, came back late that night. At that time Eddie Folliard and I were alternating on a good many trips, and he took the next trip, and that was the Dallas trip.

MORRISSEY: Is there any other aspect of press relations during the Kennedy Administration that you'd like to comment on?

KILPATRICK: No, I don't believe so. I think it's all on the record. I know that toward the end, I got a little tired, and I gather he did, of the press

conferences. And yet, as we look back on them, they're so much better than what we have now that there's no comparison. Salinger was an able press secretary; he was careless about things, made our life difficult at times. But he was informed, and he knew what he was talking about. And then the President himself made himself available to the press on a regular basis. That, after all, is the important thing.

MORRISSEY: How about the men around the President, were they equally accessible?

KILPATRICK: They were available, surely. Yes, I saw them regularly, saw all of them, and I found them always helpful. Always helpful, that's not correct either, not always, but I found them understanding, as much as any staff could be.

MORRISSEY: Is there anything in the books by /Arthur M., Jr./ Schlesinger and /Theodore C./ Sorensen and others that, in your experience, is inaccurate?

KILPATRICK: No, I don't recall anything at the moment. I remember there was one thing in Schlesinger's book that I thought was just a very small matter of detail that was wrong. I'll try to find that and let you know.

MORRISSEY: Would you make notes of many of your conversations with the President?

KILPATRICK: I do have some notes on them, yes.

MORRISSEY: What we often do, if people are willing, are append Xerox copies of them to the transcript of the interview.

KILPATRICK: Alright, let me look and see if I can, because I suspect they'll be valuable . . . I think I have some that I could show you.

MORRISSEY: Excellent.

KILPATRICK: Alright.

MORRISSEY: Is there anything else you think . . .

KILPATRICK: I don't think so.

MORRISSEY: . . . we've overlooked?

KILPATRICK: I can't think of anything.

MORRISSEY: You've been on the grill for an hour. Thank you very much.