

Edmund A. Gullion Oral History Interview – JFK#4, 07/31/1964
Administrative Information

Creator: Edmund A. Gullion
Interviewer: Samuel E. Belk, III
Date of Interview: July 31, 1964
Place of Interview: Washington, D.C.
Length: 11 pages

Biographical Note

Gullion was a United States Diplomat in Saigon from 1949 to 1952; the Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Administration from 1960 to 1961; and the United States Ambassador to the Republic of the Congo from 1961 to 1964. In this interview Gullion discusses his impressions of President John F. Kennedy's [JFK] character; JFK's attitude toward and experience with disarmament; President JFK and the arts; and JFK's concept of the presidency, among other issues.

Access

Open.

Usage Restrictions

According to the deed of gift signed May 10, 1999, 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 The copyright law extends its protection to unpublished works from the moment of creation in a tangible form.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

Edmund A. Gullion, recorded interview by Samuel E. Belk, III, July 31, 1964, (page number), John F. Kennedy Library Oral History Program.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION
JOHN F. KENNEDY LIBRARY

Legal Agreement Pertaining to the Oral History Interview of
EDMUND A. GULLION

In accordance with the provisions of Chapter 21 of Title 44, United States Code, and subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, I, Patricia Gullion, of Winchester, Massachusetts, do hereby give, donate, and convey to the United States of America all my rights, title, and interest in the tape recordings and transcripts of personal interviews with Edmund A. Gullion conducted on July, 17, 1964, July 23, 1964, July 31, 1964, and August 21, 1964 in Washington, DC, and prepared for deposit in the John F. Kennedy Library. This assignment is subject to the following terms and conditions:

(1) The transcript shall be made available for use by researchers as soon as it has been deposited in the John F. Kennedy Library.

(2) The tape recording shall be made available to those researchers who have access to the transcript.

(3) I hereby assign to the United States Government all copyright I may have in the interview transcript and tape.

(4) Copies of the transcript and the tape recording may be provided by the Library to researchers upon request.

(5) Copies of the transcript and tape recording may be deposited in or loaned to institutions other than the John F. Kennedy Library.

Patricia P. Gullion
Donor

October 31, 1998
Date

John W. Paul
Archivist of the United States

5-10-99
Date

Edmund A. Gullion – JFK #4
Table of Contents

<u>Page</u>	<u>Topic</u>
34	Gullion’s consultations with President John F. Kennedy [JFK]
35	JFK as President: controlled and resilient
36	Leading American statesmen and visiting the Congo
37	JFK’s attitude toward disarmament
38	Two of President JFK’s first big tests
38	Disarmament: balanced reciprocal strategic deterrence
40	The question of a test ban
40	JFK and disarmament—small steps
41	The President as an arbiter of taste: JFK and the arts
42	JFK: continuously striving to improve his speaking performance
42	JFK’s concept of the presidency
43	JFK: “the man who very coolly accepted very, very great risks”

Fourth Oral History Interview

With

EDMUND A. GULLION

July 31, 1964
Washington, D.C.

By Samuel E. Belk, III

For the John F. Kennedy Library

BELK: Ambassador Gullion, we alluded earlier to various conferences that you had with the President [John F. Kennedy] and consultations when you came back to Washington. Can you describe these perhaps now in greater detail?

GULLION: Well, now or later I can. When I refresh my recollection I can best do that by consulting my telegram file. I did not, as I think I indicated here somewhere else, I always made it a practice not to keep a memorandum of my conversations with the President, I imagine, about four times alone and possibly three times with other State Department personnel during the course of my tour in the Congo. I saw him shortly after I had gone out there. I think I came back in about three months' time; my wife was ill. There had intervened this Kitona crisis where we had tried to bring together, the President's intervention, Adoula [Cyrille Adoula] and Tshombe [Moise Kapenda Tshombe]. And as I say, whatever disappointments that later brought for the time being it looked pretty good; the President was pleased with it and was good enough to say so. When he met with me we met alone at that time, we had dinner here. We talked a great deal about the Congo, of course,

about everything, we talked about the people involved, the people he wanted me to see, for example. Now I was always conscious that the really weighty reservations about the Congo didn't really come from very vocal fanatics or the politicians who were getting the press play but was more from people who had built the Atlantic Alliance and were worried because the Congo was putting strains on that alliance, and I asked him, for example, if he didn't want me to see Dean Acheson [Dean G. Acheson] because I'd worked as a cub for Dean Acheson. And he thought a bit about that for a while and said no, he didn't really think so, that he didn't think that would really work. I believe he thought Mr. Acheson's views were pretty firm in these questions and couldn't really be swayed.

He had, incidentally, considerable admiration for Dean Acheson, as certainly all of us did have, and turned to him very early for advice and certainly on European matters. There was a bridge of generations, gulf of generations which Mr. Acheson has testified to more perceptively than anyone else. I think this is true. I also saw this in his relations with Mr. McCloy [John J. McCloy]. Of course, he was glad to call on him, admired tremendously, but the business of establishing a rapport there, I think, that the difference in age or historical experience or something prevented it, not that the President seemed intimidated or brash in the presence of older men, either way. But there is just something in the formation of people here where men who, here was Mr. McCloy who was running the War Department, the war effort, when Mr. Kennedy was a lieutenant JG. I don't know what it is, I suppose it's an inevitable kind of thing. Well, I'm rambling along.

He did ask me on that occasion if I'd go around and talk to the editors of the *Washington Post*, and he made the appointment himself for me to go see them or caused it to be made, and I thought that a wild one, and if there was no chance of persuading Mr. Acheson of anything I thought there was much less chance of persuading the *Washington*—did I say *Post*? I'm very sorry, I meant the *Washington Star*—'cause I had lunch with members of the *Post* staff, but I didn't think there was much chance of having an effect on the *Star*'s views, but this was the President's own idea that we should do this. He was very relaxed, I remember, on this occasion. We were up before his fireplace, up in the Oval Room. I remember congratulating him about—I think it was at this time, it may have been a later meeting—about his message on space and what we were going to do about it and being rather struck, and the reason I remember it was because the detached way in which he said that it did not get the response that he hoped for from Congress or the people. To me, of course, my own frame of mind, and, I think, his also, I think what really was important, that transcended everything else that you could not really afford to be outpaced in a thing of this kind. You couldn't lose the race. I know that a great case can be made for the necessity of allocating money for human welfare, the sort of aspects of what you get out of putting something on the moon doesn't seem to be proportionate to what you put into it, but I certainly think a man of the President's tendency would have been impressed by the race aspect. Well, he was very detached about that, and this leads me to observe something else about him, is this apparent detachment that he had on matters of great concern to him. I always thought that he was probably a very

intense person underneath who kept himself under very close control, but he could accept a reverse or a check with great equanimity and speak about it philosophically, phrases that he used about the rising tide lifts all the boats or about the ebb and flow and success of policies. This bespoke something in his character, and I suppose that no man can really be a President without being resilient. But I always somehow think that this was something that he trained into himself because he was a great striver, achiever and competitor. It must have been very hard for him really to accept any breakdown of his hopes.

I'm going back to this meeting. We went down, he showed me around the White House a bit, and there was a room down below where a number of furniture and art objects, pieces of furniture and art objects had been assembled. I think they were to go into the redecoration of the White House later on. He showed me some of that stuff. And he showed me out the back, the south side of the White House, and he said at that time that he thought that he would like to go to the Congo. And, of course, I was much impressed with this. This happened because we'd been talking about the fact that so few leading American statesmen had been in the Congo, in Africa, leading people in the State Department. I think one of the only few that had been out there was Mr. Harriman [William Averell Harriman]. Mr. Stevenson [Adlai E. Stevenson] had visited it, and, of course, Governor Williams [G. Mennen Williams] frequently, but the idea of Secretary Rusk [Dean Rusk] or Mr. Ball [George W. Ball] or leading people should visit the continent, and I suppose this stemmed from something that we used to discuss quite a lot is the Euro-centricity of American foreign policy concern. It's, of course, in the sense we are Europeans. We are European in orientation, but in the stress of building up the alliance and the fact that we have never really been deeply represented in countries like Africa, even in investment ways. It seems to me that more ought to be known about it. And then he surprised me by saying that he would like to go to the Congo and wondered how it could be done. He said that the problem was how he could go out to the Congo and wondered how it could be done. He said that the problem was how he could go out to the Congo without having to visit all the other African countries or something of that sort. I said well perhaps you could do that by visiting, going somewhere else if you were going to India or some other place. Maybe this would be a routing that could make the Congo a logical kind of a way stop so that you wouldn't have to make the full tour.

I saw the President when there was a question of trying to, not an order of trying to, that is not in a sequence, but of trying to secure prolongation of the UN stay in this country. I saw him with others at the time of the Tshombe visa problem when that came up. But in putting him.... I saw him not so often, and I do want to correct any impression that may exist that we were such close confidants as some people have assumed. For one thing, it would not have been proper for me to have done that as a member of the Foreign Service and the State Department. It would have been a very impractical way of operating, trying to play a channel to the White House and also the President would have been the last to go for that sort of thing with his own sense of discipline as well as he would think it wouldn't be doing me any good.

[-36-]

He would ask you, and he had a trick of asking people what you thought of other people. I imagine he would do this both ways. He would ask me what I thought of my superiors and colleagues, and I'm sure he would.... I know as a matter of fact that he would

ask them what they thought of me. I suppose that lots of people can remember this kind of thing. He'd ask Mr. McCloy or he'd ask Soapy Williams [G. Mennen Williams]. He asked me what I thought of Soapy. I was glad to have the opportunity because I just had a feeling that Governor Williams' contributions on the African thing were not being assessed as their really high value. The visits that he made to Africa have gotten the U.S. a hearing and a standing and he has a personal standing as the best known man after President Kennedy, and I wanted to tell him that and did. And then Governor Williams learned, I think later, to stay home, too, and fight some Congo battles. This was a little later on. I need ask you about, I mean I don't think it was a very, very rewarding excursion for him because in spite of the fact that I've been in the opposition or in the minority on some matters of public policy I really think that I've been a fair subordinate, and I was brought up that way, and I never gave him much grist when he tried to ask me what I thought of senior people. I much preferred to talk about it in terms of situations. And he would express himself very often very forcefully on some personalities. I suppose that he liked to feel that he had someone he could do that with and would keep it to oneself. I'm afraid what I really must promise you, Sam, is to try to get a chronology, get my telegraphic file and then with that I can build up what was said on each of these occasions with much more accuracy.

BELK: This has been very interesting the way you have outlined it, but if you could do that it would be a great help.

GULLION: Take a lot of your time, but I will.

BELK: Let's go on to another question. Ambassador Gullion, during the period from September 1960 to August 1961 you were Deputy Director of the United States Disarmament Administration. In your discussions with President Kennedy, what did you perceive to be his attitude toward disarmament? Did he really believe we could achieve it over a long period of time?

GULLION: Yes, I would say that one of the paramount interests of the President, of course, was in disarmament. You recall that so many of his advisors from the academic communities around Cambridge, from Harvard and MIT, were intensely interested in disarmament. As he came into office the rest were faced with a great many questions in the field: the organization of the United States government for research and for negotiating disarmament, the actual bureaucratic side of it, the development of a new position, a new policy over the whole field of general and complete disarmament, in fact whether we were going to include that as a goal in our policy or not and the question of the nuclear test ban. I first saw the President after his election in connection with disarmament. He indicated, I can't remember, I was certainly

[-37-]

wanting to see him, but there was a sort of a general stop on people from.... The Department didn't want people beating a door to the new President's, beating a path to the new President's door while the Administration was still in existence, and for understandable

reasons. He indicated that he wanted to talk about this, so I went to see him on the matter, and I took with me a paper on how I thought the Disarmament Administration should be organized. Remember I want it to have a close connection with the Department of State. I thought that you could gain a lot by autonomous organization, you could attract more people, you could do better on the research side, put more into it. But I thought that it was unrealistic to think that you could cut the thing apart from the State Department. It ought to be closely coordinated with policy, and I had a paper, I think, along these lines. He read this with great interest and talked about it a bit, but he talked a good deal more on this occasion about the Foreign Service, about Indochina and about personalities. This was before he had taken office. I remember it was at the smaller house in Georgetown. It was a bitterly cold day, and people who were being tapped for this and that public office were going down to see him and then being interviewed on the doorstep by the TV cameramen shivering in the cold. I remember when I left there being very much daunted by facing them. I said to the President, "What'll I say?" "Oh, you just speak to them of my long interest in disarmament matters and that you've reviewed the situation at my request." So this was what I said to them.

As I say, the two of the first big tests that confronted the President, of course, there was the Bay of Pigs along there, too, but two of the first big tests that confronted him were the revision of U.S. disarmament overall disarmament policy, the preparation of a nuclear test ban policy, and the crisis in the Congo. These faced him right at the outset of his office. On the nuclear test ban, the issues seemed to be to bring our policy into line with what the scientific capabilities were, and this revision of the policy would tend to make it look like a liberalization. There were a number of onsite inspections, a number of fixed posts and that kind of thing, and, of course, this had to be very closely argued and discussed with research bodies, with members of Congress, with the Defense Department, with the Atomic Energy Commission. And the views had to be harmonized, and it was, of course, not easy as the President took a direct and very close interest in this. And the man hours that were put on the test ban position were very great. I think that the atmosphere everywhere and very definitely in the White House that this was going to be, the Administration was going to really make a mark on this effort at that time. And we did come through with a much liberalized policy. And, of course, you may recall that the Soviet Union completely frustrated us at this time because what they were really preparing was for the great big series of tests, and whereas we thought we'd moved in a considerable direction they, as if they'd seen us approaching, turned around and went the other way. In fact, they stiffened their position very markedly, and they got absolutely nowhere on that particular series of negotiations.

In the general disarmament field, the President, of course, was very much exposed to the doctrines, which were comparatively new at that time, of balanced reciprocal strategic deterrence, of measures that would keep the imbalance of power between us and the Soviet

[-38-]

bloc, deter moves that would upset it. This is a very sophisticated concept because it envisages, for example, the keeping elements of power in being, rather than progressively getting rid of them. It even contributes, envisages letting the Russians have certain advantages, have some things that they don't have now, if by having them this might stabilize the situation. There are all sorts of, the worst there did seem to be all sorts of new

byways in that policy. Up to that time, it seemed that, I think it can be said, and I've had some four, five years of experience in this thing that our negotiations with the Russians had degraded into a kind of formalistic affair. I'd like parenthetically to say that I thought Harold Stassen [Harold E. Stassen] really gave it a college try, and I don't know how much that was appreciated, but he really did explore the thing. Where I think, under his, Mr. Stassen's, efforts in greatly widening the consultation with the scientific and other communities, I think, carried on through into the next Administration. Where our policies, as I say, had really not really taken account of all of the newest scientific thinking as well as overall thinking about U.S./Soviet relations so that the President with the Charles River community, as we call these people, really went into it very thoroughly, and we did do a complete overhaul of disarmament policy. It requires some intellectual courage, too, because both these concepts in the early strategic deterrence were new at that time as well as the new test ban position, and it took some courage, and the President had a chance, as I say this was early in the game, I think, to feel out the strengths and the positions and the firmness of the various government departments. I think that the exercise on disarmament, while it could not have been of great public interest, was very, very important for the President in making acquaintance with the people who worked for him all through the government, and with the attitudes of Defense and of the Atomic Energy Commission, the CIA and all the rest of it. It was quite an interesting laboratory exercise.

The idea of strategic deterrence, without having at the end of the avenue the possibility of general and complete disarmament, is a difficult one. The people of the world, I always felt at that time, don't merely want this sword of Damocles in balance above their heads. They want it removed. So that for psychological reasons and negotiating reasons and also because of certain challenges or reservations about the balanced deterrence theory of a more scientific and objective character, it would be very difficult to repose your entire disarmament policy on just balanced strategic deterrence alone. This is an issue of which the President was aware also. We must have one that appeals to the aspirations of people everywhere if it's going to be supported, so that our policy came out with the right combination of these things. And, of course, I didn't see much of disarmament in the last three or four years after I went to the Congo, but this is one of the great things of the President's Administration and sort of leads up to the line of the American University speech. His whole interest in disarmament had been a real key. It has as always been a very significant arena for contact with the Soviet Union. Whether you make progress on the objective or not, I know of nothing that gives you a continuous cross section contact with Russian policies. I mean, there are German policies, there are European policies or internal stresses in the Soviet Union to those who know how to read the signs are all visible in the disarmament contact. And I don't know of anybody who

[-39-]

made more effective use of this contact and including the correspondence with the President, with the Soviet Union, with Khrushchev [Nikita S. Khrushchev], than did President Kennedy.

BELK: How about his view toward a test ban, Ambassador Gullion? Was that

pretty far along in development here in your period?

GULLION: I don't think that.... At first I think he.... I'd like to refer to the fact that he did give a powerful impetus to U.S. work in this field by setting up, first, the disarmament administration. I'd started with this thing before, just shortly before the change in Administrations, and this is why I wanted to see him during this interval. But he picked this thing up, and the Administration did. At first we were existing under executive order, but then the President put through, really, the legislation giving a statutory basis for what is now the Arms Control and Disarmament agency. And, of course, you remember he had his negotiators and original advisers on this, Mr. McCloy, and Mr. Dean [John W. Dean, Jr.] and Mr. Foster [Clifford S. Foster, Jr.]. Not accidental that these men, besides being men of tremendous probity and integrity and ability, stature, are Republicans. It's, of course, a good thing that you can have an effort of this kind, bipartisan, and I think that this was a consideration that the President had close to heart.

I think I did say on the test ban or what we did put forth at Geneva to encounter this disappointment with the Soviet Union was really audaciously a liberalized position. Perhaps audaciously is a precarious word because it sounds as if we were running a chance, but I meant it to run counter to the highly conservative fears of members of, certain members of Congress and certain military elements, not all, to do anything that smacks of scaling down the rigidity of our demands for an inspection, for control, and to argue against the fact that our scientific capabilities that enable us to reduce the requirements on paper. That part is audacious to me, to try to argue that through and to win your case on it, especially since one of the things that confused the issue right at this time was the scientific community or part of it had been obliged to reverse itself on the feasibility of detecting underground tests. It seemed that it was possible to hid underground tests more effectively at one point than at first inquiry pertinent to the scientist involved had thought, and they changed their view. Well, this change of view is known to some in the Congress, of course, and the joint committee, and this made it more difficult to say, well, what we're proposing to do is soundly rooted in scientific, proved capabilities. If you could say, well, scientific proved capabilities are not always hard and fast and sure because look at this reversal, of course, on the muffling of test ban explosions underground.

But I do think that the role of the President on disarmament and the retrospect of history will become tremendously important. I think that what the President, the Administration did in this was to make possible the step by step pragmatic approach to disarmament which are bearing fruit now, the hotline, the cutback in nuclear production, the test ban and all the rest of it. It took an act of strong policy, determination, to break out

[-40-]

separate packages. There used to be, in the old days, in the disarmament field, some worries about trying small pragmatic steps of this kind that you might be giving away advantages that you couldn't get back, to hold out for the whole package.

It's hard to say whether these things, these first steps, small steps became possible because détente in relations with the Soviet Union and whether that in turn was influenced by the frictions between the Soviet and China or whether these small steps produced, procured

something in the nature of a détente or whether the showdown on Cuba—which is, of course, the great thing of the President's, in my opinion—did not in turn dispose the Soviet Union to contemplate small steps by convincing them that we were...

[TAPE TWO, SIDE TWO]

GULLION: ... the Soviet Union to contemplate small steps by convincing them that we were, by God, strong.

BELK: Ambassador Gullion, I'm now going to ask you a sort of catch-all question having to do with the attitudes, the views of President Kennedy on certain things. We'll talk first about culture and taste and then his view of the presidency, the ways of handling his job, family, friends and enemies. That sort of thing. Why don't we begin with his attitude toward culture and taste.

GULLION: Of course, one of the distinguishing marks of the President's Administration was the great concern for elevating the public taste, the government taste, making the White House a haven for artists, a center of inspiration for artists of all kinds. When the President had a small dinner it was not only with businessmen; he was a man of great interest in history, arts, and literature. As I say, I think that there is some danger, and we would be doing a disservice to the President's memory to make him a mycenaues of the arts or, as himself, a man of primarily an artistic interest. It may be by contrast with the usual occupant of the presidency that the President may seem like that. I think that he was naturally a man who illustrated the advantages that he had in education. He was of the arts, and I include history as an art. I think that the one in which he was more nearly a practitioner was of course in literature and in history. I think his marriage disposed him to a great deal more interest in the plastic arts. I don't know about music. Certainly he wasn't a man who would want Lawrence Welk's music in the White House when he could get Picasso [Pablo Picasso], but this is not.... When you consider the President as an educated and cultivated man, this interest was not revolutionary or extraordinary. It only looks so in contrast with the way the presidency is usually run, and how little the presidency considers it to be the duty of the presidency. I think that this is a significant part, not the President's interest in art per se but the fact that he considered it a great necessity that the presidency is a pulpit in the Rooseveltian sense but it's also an arbiter of taste or inspirer of taste. Now his own taste was, I think, very conservative in many ways. I think that the house that he had run up in Leesburg,

[-41-]

I've never seen it, I've only seen pictures of it, might be the despair of architectural innovators. It looks like a sort of straight Georgian affair.

The President was tremendously interested in achievement in the arts, and he honored achievement in the arts. This was, I think, part of his whole general cult of excellence, this sort of revulsion against the uniformity of many forms of expression in America. But I also think that it appealed to his competitive sense. You remember the people who came, were

called to the Administration. If you'd written a book you had a big call, something like advancement in the academic world. He honored people who wrote, who could speak. In this way he was very much of a... He thought of himself as a literary man. He was, of course, a literary man.

But I said that he seemed to me that he was a man who was continuously striving to improve his performance in this field. I can remember the difference in his speaking, the timbre of the President's voice and its range, was something that would always keep him from being a great orator. But it seemed to me that he tremendously improved as a speaker from the time he was a congressman, and once or twice I have heard him talk on this subject. I've seen or heard him make a lot of speeches over the years and saw the improvement, but I've heard him in conversation refer to speaking, and I remember some conversations, overhearing some conversations, between him and Bobby [Robert F. Kennedy] on this bit, and as I remember it, I think that Bobby was trying to recommend to him the virtues of a little more warmth and the idea of being a raconteur and so on. Well, the idea of President Kennedy's producing kind of an old-shoe warmth in a speech, I mean that kind of old South line, ham bone, corn pone warmth, is rather ridiculous. But he had, of course, a priceless sense of humor and wit, and he gradually got to have confidence in it and used it in his speeches. He used to watch his protégées perform in this way. I remember asking him if, when I'd had an invitation to appear on "Meet the Press" whether he thought I should do it. He thought I should do it by all means. What I didn't find out until later, I don't know whether it was Mr. Stevenson or Mr. McCloy who happened to be visiting him and said that President and Mrs. Kennedy [Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy Onassis] had watched this grilling that I had received on "Meet the Press," and he was quite interested in how that went. And I think he used to watch what was done in this field by lots of people. So I can remember some televised appearances by Mr. Dean which we followed with some approval, too. Well, we could talk all day about what his preferences were in literature and what his preferences were in art. I think that the important thing was that his interest in city building and architecture.... I think that he rescued Washington, the city, from going the way of the State Department building which was completed, these horribly blank things and recommended a little artistic innovation and expense. What was your next catalog there?

BELK: How about, well, his view of the presidency.

GULLION: Well, it seems to me we've talked a great deal about this. Of course, he had a very definite philosophy on the presidency, and he wanted to be and he was

[-42-]

among the strong Presidents, the Presidents who are not merely arbiters but the originators, the articulators, the people who can sense public policy, in fact, public policy in a kind of a mystical way identify with what the people want, perhaps can articulate it without the people knowing what it is that they want or feel. Again, the idea of the President as mystic is one that looks very strange. Of course, he was no mystic, but he was one who did have this feeling of the presidency, of a kind of a prophet role as well as a preacher role, as well as an

arbiter of taste role, as well as a man strong with the Congress, I mean a man to put his program through. I think that one of the great ironies of history was that he didn't come into office equipped with the congressional mandate to let him do this. I think that what I might have expected was a kind of a hundred days of the early New Deal pattern, but after winning by just such a narrow margin it was, I think what he was really building for, was his second term. And, of course, it's interesting that his sacrificial death is one of the things that makes it possible, together with President Johnson's [Lyndon B. Johnson] extraordinary merits as a leader, to get through the program that he did devise.

The President believed in shaking up the line of command by manifesting an interest without warning anywhere down the chain. You know he'd call up people and say what about this or that problem, and the desk officer could hear this thing. He was not, I don't think, as people would say, as is sometime said, his own Secretary of State. It's just the fact that when any President is closely concerned and has a foreign affairs background and is closely interested in it, this means one thing for relationships to the State Department as compared to that kind of relationship in which the President has a more passive concept of the presidency and without a direct foreign affairs interest. But I don't think that he in any way believed that the presidency and he, with his very high powered advisers, could or should supplant the State Department. In fact he was at great pains to build up the Department of State and the Secretary of State in the conduct of foreign policy, and we did discuss these things from time to time.

He, as you know, cleared away a big undergrowth of committees, the staff system which had been developed to quite an extent under President Eisenhower [Dwight D. Eisenhower]. He tried to, I mean the operations coordinations board and all the bodies that went under that, he conceived that the Department of State should be the coordinating board for foreign policy and for the interests of other agencies involved in foreign policy. And he had this same concept of his Ambassadors in the field, that they were an extension of his personality, an extension of his purposes, and he wanted to have very close personal contact with them. He did, I mean this curious detachment sometimes about what he could or couldn't do with the Congress would be manifest. I think I mentioned this in an answer to an earlier question. Again, I think that he looked forward to the second term as a period of real accomplishment. It seemed to me—this is not him—it always seemed to me that he was bound.... I don't know what the race issue would have done to it, but people would not be voting against in the second term because he was a Catholic, so it seems to me that his majority would have been great and that he could have acted more positively. I think that in answer to

[-43-]

your final question we probably would get on to this kind of thing. I don't think that he ever saw the presidency as a hair shirt. Many sensitive people in that office have so felt it. What I don't know—and I was not an intimate of the President—what I don't know is how many indecisions, how many self doubts he may have had, especially at his age. Certainly, externally you never saw them. And my contact with him had always been on occasions and with respect to issues in which he was challenging constituted ways of doing things or thinking about things. But he was doing these without wearing the expression or the

costuming of a fellow who likes just to challenge authority in order to be an *enfant terrible*. There was nothing, I think that that sort of thing he had a horror of. But he, say in Indochina when I saw him, he did not accept the given view of what was happening in Indochina. In the disarmament field he came in to be an innovator in this matter. I know that I myself never thought of him as being in the very liberal element of this country and in talking about getting the country moving again and building and increasing our rate of national growth, his approach to these things was of a more conservative character than many people would have done, but in the event it looks to have been widely chosen, the tax cut lever, measures of that kind. I think that his concept of the presidency, while he did have a pattern about it, a pattern in respect to his program also, was a pragmatic one. It's curious that the great issue of civil rights was one in which he ostensibly preserved a kind of coolness. It seems to me that his brother, Bobby Kennedy, was the one who manifested the heat and fervor that I think that they both felt. Well, you could see, as I say that he was pragmatic but also bold when he was challenging the accepted way of doing things, the way he measured up to the Cuban crisis could not surprise me because I always thought he was a go-for-broke man, although through a somewhat conventional exterior, from the time he was a PT boat captain till the time he had the showdown with the Soviet Union on Cuba, it seems to me that you saw the same man in action, the man who very coolly accepted very, very great risks.

BELK: This is the fourth tape of an interview with Ambassador Edmund A. Gullion, former United States Ambassador to the Republic of the Congo, Leopoldville. The interviewer was Samuel E. Belk, National Security Council staff.

[END OF INTERVIEW]

[-44-]

Edmund A. Gullion Oral History Transcript – JFK #4
Name List

A

Acheson, Dean G., 35
Adoula, Cyrille, 34

B

Ball, George W., 36

D

Dean, John W., Jr., 40, 42

E

Eisenhower, Dwight D., 43

F

Foster, Clifford S., Jr., 40

H

Harriman, William Averell, 36

J

Johnson, Lyndon B., 43

K

Kennedy, John F., 34-44
Kennedy, Robert F., 42, 44
Khrushchev, Nikita S., 40

M

McCloy, John J., 35, 37, 40, 42

O

Onassis, Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, 42

P

Picasso, Pablo, 41

R

Rusk, Dean, 36

S

Stassen, Harold E., 39
Stevenson, Adlai E., 36, 42

T

Tshombe, Moise Kapenda, 34, 36

W

Welk, Lawrence, 41
Williams, G. Mennen, 36, 37