CHAPTER XVIII

Gulf and Rockwell

Q: General, since we have now looked at your career from around 1918 to the time you retired in 1962, I thought we should continue and look at your second career with Gulf Research and then talk about your third career in which you are now engaged as Assistant to the Chairman of the Board of North American Rockwell, Mr. Al Rockwell. At the time of your retirement what were your feelings, what were the opportunities, and what actually led you to take up your new career with the Gulf Oil Corporation?

A: Needless to say, I had known that retirement would arrive at age 60; incidentally, for my own satisfaction, I retired voluntarily a month before I reached age 60. As I told you before, for certain reasons, I had known from its beginning that this (OCRD) would be my last assignment. While I might have made a couple of people unhappy, including Secretary McNamara, I don't think anyone wanted to take it on to ask me to retire early; we were moving in OCRD. At least none of my Army friends on the staff would have, because our associations were always very satisfactory, including mine with the then-Chief of Staff, General George Decker, a lifelong friend of mine. In any event, as a man approaches that time in life where he is going to make a major change, many things come to mind as to where to go, and opportunities begin to present themselves; if they don't, retiring people should seek opportunities themselves.

In my particular case I was fortunate in having a strong technical background and was being retired from a job for which there was very considerable demand for my experience or services on the outside, particularly in defense and/or space-oriented industries. This was an easy decision on my part. I made up my mind that under no circumstances would I go with a heavily oriented defense or aerospace agency where my brains and contacts would be picked on for a few years to capitalize on my experience and contacts. This wasn't what I chose to do. I had a fair number of opportunities. As a matter of fact I'd had them off and on for a period of more than 15 years, as I told you about IBM's offer in 1946. In any event, I looked them all over carefully. I was to some degree interested in the presidency of a college; that

fascinated me in many respects. But the one definite offer I had as the President of Norwich University did not attract me because of the isolation of the university and the question of what I would do with myself outside of normal student hours. My interests, in other words, had gotten too broad. My interests then and today are in the international and the security field as far as my country is concerned. I've never had an overwhelming . . . Let me put it the other way. This type of interest has always superseded my interest in things domestic, although I in no way disparage the importance of civil rights, better employment, better living conditions for our people, better working conditions, and all those factors that go into making a better America. The industrial area interested me. I had a pretty fair number of opportunities to select from. Let me just say as a base figure more than 25. I thought this over carefully and when I was approached and asked about taking over the Presidency of Gulf Research I was intrigued for two reasons, maybe more than two reasons. First, Gulf Oil is a great corporation; I knew that they had a substantial research establishment and that intrigued me. Secondly, they were not a defense-oriented industry, although they do their part when called upon. Thirdly, because of my intense interest, as indicated back as early as 1950, in the importance of oil as a key element in world strategy, then and now. I talked this over with a number of very senior people, people who retired from top positions in industry, and almost to a man they said yes, this is for you. That helped me to make up my mind. On the other hand, as I told you, I had to hold off because there was indication that I might be wanted in another agency of government, namely the CIA. While I felt in my own heart that that was not about to be, for reasons that came up earlier in my career and blocked me in certain respects, nevertheless I felt that if there was real demand and it was service to the country, I would do it. But that didn't come about. So, when it didn't, I finally made a decision and I went with Gulf. This was a decision that I never regretted.

There were difficulties in some respects because, to be very frank about it, as President of Gulf Research, I reported primarily through an executive vice president who was, and still is, known as the corporation's hatchet man. When you try to advance real research and development through a person of this brilliant but difficult type of mentality, it is not

easy to do. The establishment I found had grown gradually over the years; they were pretty set in their way. Most of the people in it were rather senior in experience and, let's say, not too aware of the latest technology as it was developing so rapidly in the late 1950s and early 1960s. They were really more devoted to product improvement than to really getting in on research and development. Furthermore, engineering had, to a great degree, been discarded by the corporation. Certainly it had been discarded as far as being a major element or group anywhere. More attention was being given to turnkey jobs where the contractor provided all the engineering and Gulf paid the bill. They finally realized that perhaps they were paying too much of the bill and not getting the quality and reliability their new plants should have, with the result that during my time I was able to re-establish an engineering department.

I was also able to bring a number of ideas in new fields of technology that hadn't simmered down to that level yet. This involved work with the laser, which was becoming terribly important; work in magnetohydrodynamics and plasmas; and just a number of things of that sort. Also I brought a greater appreciation of what the advent of the computer could do in improving efficiency and in the general application of the term of what we refer to as systems engineering and value analysis. It gave me great satisfaction in many of these fields. For instance, the application of the computer to the control and scheduling of the fleet of tankers that Gulf used; some owned, some leased -- long-term leases -- and some on what we call spot charter for a period of time or voyage or voyages as it may be. We were able to take this. Of course, we were dealing with ports all over the world, with ships of different size, with ships of different speed, with ships carrying anything from crude oil to various kinds of distillate or gasoline or lubricants or packaged goods all over the world. By cranking this information in and programming these variables of maritime transport, it appeared that we were able to get a gain in efficiency of at least seven percent. That is a good profit in any business, and if you can put it on top of other profits it is even better.

Then there were interesting problems in programming such things as the flow of different types of fuel to the markets from the sources. Let's say the source in this particular case is the Texas-Louisiana oil

field. After processing, this has to be distributed to all various areas of the country, and the requirements change with respect to climate and season. For instance, Gulf has a modification in its formulas, 13 modifications depending on the particular area and the climate involved. Furthermore, you can imagine the problem in scheduling the build-up of, say, gasoline in New England for the summer trade as against heating oils for the winter trade. All these matters are subject to programming and the time of flow. For instance, take the Colonial Pipeline which we use and in which Gulf is principal owner; that pipeline, running from the Gulf Coast to New York, holds some 15 million barrels of oil which even today is about one and a half days' supply for the entire United States. You have to schedule very carefully what product you want to put into that pipeline in order to have it delivered at a certain point at a certain time. Without getting into too much detail, these are some of the areas where the computer and systems engineering have really paid their way.

With respect to a refinery, there was no reason why there had to be work by-guess-and-by-God at the conference table in Pittsburgh when, through either recording real-time or periodic information, you could have right before you exactly the data that you needed to tell you what the picture was. Knowing the demand, let's say for fuel in the Northeast, you could work right on back from that demand to your refineries and through each of the steps at the refinery to decide what you needed to do with your crude oil way back at the input stage. It also told you the rate of flow you needed from your storage fields, wherever they were, into the refinery for the initial processing of your crude. There were naturally a great many things here that were quite fascinating to me.

Another point about Gulf was the importance to me . . . I don't take the credit for their decision at all; I had nothing to do with their final decision. I was not a Director although I had an ear to the Chairman, the President and, as I say, the people in power. One of the earliest ideas that I lent my small shoulder to was in getting them to think of themselves more as an energy corporation and not just an oil corporation. This resolved itself in several ways. First, they bought in Spencer Chemical Company in Kansas City and I acquired their research establishment at this time. This was one move to get us into agriculture chemicals, plastics, and petrochemicals,

which has now become real big business. I understand that Gulf is not going to stay in the agriculture chemical field, but it certainly will in petrochemicals and in plastics. This is real big business. In the field of biodegradable detergents, for instance, we did very advanced work in that connection and are one of the principal suppliers in this country to various soap companies that put out detergents under their name, not ours.

Another angle, of course, was in the field of nuclear power. The attention of Gulf on nuclear power was brought into focus by me after I had had an initial dinner meeting with Dr. Fredrick DeHoffman, who is one of Dr. Edward Teller's proteges. Dr. Teller was a friend of mine. I met with DeHoffman in California one night for dinner. He was the President of General Atomics, which was part of the General Dynamics Corporation. We decided then that General Dynamics probably, first, was not interested in pushing in this field and secondly, General Dynamics was faced with some very serious problems that put limits on their capital structure or capital funds for further investment. As a result, this was brought to the attention of our board at Gulf. They bought General Atomics, which was then renamed Gulf General Atomics, and now it has been expanded into Gulf Energy and Environmental Systems, which gets into this whole field of atomic power. They are dealing with the high-temperature, gas-cooled type of reactor rather than the boiling water or the pressurized water systems that we know today. Incidentally, it's in contrast to the fast breeder reactor that we are now developing in the North American Rockwell Corporation.

Another field that interested me greatly was in our marketing efforts; it seemed to me in many cases that people who were doing our selling were not sufficiently equipped with technical knowledge to satisfy the consumer. This applied not so much to service stations where it is rather obvious that the type of fuels used are suitable to most U. S. cars, although we constantly had to study that problem every month. This applied to where we used cutting oils and lubricating oils involving heavy machinery, machine tools, and equipment of this sort. I was able to start a course for marketing technical training for many of our people, particularly young engineers who we brought in. Instead of a salesman going out and having to come back and say they need an engineer, the engineer would be there. Consequently, he was a much

better salesman from the fact that he did know what he was talking about technically. These were some of the actions that were very satisfying.

We got an increased acceptance of the importance of research and development at the corporation level. You can't price these actions out because of the inflationary effects, but due to the acquisition and expansion of our work in the chemical field, in establishing the engineering department, and later in the field of atomics (although that was really operated as a separate R&D establishment), my own Gulf Research and Development Company did increase during the six years that I was with it by as much as 100 percent as far as funding and expenditures were concerned. While some of this was inflation, much of it was in additional and new types of effort.

At the same time, the corporation was very generous to me in its support. I made numerous trips throughout the United States (our domestic establishments) and overseas; we were then building refineries and lubricating plants in the Far East in such places as Korea and later Okinawa and Taiwan. I was able to build a small research laboratory in Holland to take care of the special needs in Europe which are caused by perhaps even greater extremes of climatic conditions than we have here, plus these very small, high-speed motors and cars that are always running at their limit. Whereas our motors are normally operating at maybe 25 or 30 percent capacity, over there, in Volkswagens and other cars, they race their little motors up to 5,000 or 5,500 RPMs. This gave us some unique problems with respect to lubricants. This was also true in our expanding field in marine fuels and lubricants where we made a lot of headway.

In addition, the corporation was very generous, very receptive to my taking on certain outside activities in the overall interest of the company and of technology. I was the President of the American Ordnance Association for a couple of years. I was a member and Director of the Industrial Research Institute all of that time. I served on the American Petroleum Institute committees; I continued to be a member of the Army Scientific Advisory Panel reporting to the Secretary on military problems, and was a trustee or regent for three universities. Between these activities I managed to keep fairly busy.

When my five years were up in 1965, which is the normal and pretty well established retirement age in Gulf (as a matter of fact, they are dropping it to 62 now), they asked me to stay on an additional year, which I did. By that time my first wife had passed on and I had remarried a widow from Washington. While living in Pittsburgh, we kept this house we are sitting in now. I built the home in Pittsburgh myself. I designed it along certain Japanese lines that appealed to me and my first wife; our children were gone and married, so we designed a small home which became inadequate when I acquired three teenagers by my second marriage. When vacation came, the family all raced back to this house you're in here now in Chevy Chase, Maryland, in order to have room for our three teenagers. After I left Gulf, I decided that we would retire here and this is where we have lived ever since.

Q: When you went to Gulf did you feel that there was an enhancement of rapport as a result of your coming out of the military? Was there a breaking-in period? Did you feel any resistance to you?

A: Well, there is bound to be some degree -- if you don't say resistance, at least resentment -- when a person entirely from the outside is brought in to head a company of 2,000 people. Gulf Research consisted of nearly 2,000 people then. It went above that figure later. We had 700 professional men, of whom I recall 160 were Ph.D.s, and something over half the total had masters degrees. There is bound to be some resistance. They weren't used to this kind of change. Nevertheless, I found that I was highly respected because of my position as Army Chief of R&D. I'll tell you what I did. In one week I made 20, 45-minute talks with 100 people at a time in the theatre so I could give them my philosophy of life and what the job meant so that they could see the kind of guy that they had to put up with. I must say that I ended up with a lot of friends. I got wonderful support. A couple of people might have been initially jealous, but one of them turned out to be probably the best friend I have in the whole company.

Q: Since this was really the first civilian or total civilian contact or task that you were performing in many, many years, did you feel this to be a harder, more disciplined organization versus the military, or vice versa?

A: I don't know quite how to answer that. It was not different materially from our own Army laboratories. From my standpoint, having been an Engineer officer, I was used to civilian contractors and civilian contacts in civilian work since I had been a young officer. This wasn't like feeling peculiar because I didn't have a uniform on; that didn't bother me at all. Furthermore, I adjust to things readily so that my enthusiasm, my objectives on the day that I took over, were for that company -- just like that. I never moaned or groaned or felt sorry for myself that I wasn't still in the Army or anything of the sort. I had a new job, an interesting one, and I did the best I could with it.

Q: If you ran into an obstacle, an incompetent, did you find that you could correct that situation more easily in the civilian organization than perhaps you had been able to in the military?

A: No, I could correct it more easily in the military, particularly after I got to the point where I had authority, because I just removed the individual. I had him reassigned if I had that degree of trouble with him. It wasn't quite that easy in civilian life. These people were staid; they were fixed. They'd probably been in the same house for 30 years. They weren't used -- like we are in the military -- to packing up and moving this year and next year and every second or third year. So there was more difficulty in that regard.

Q: You have told us that you have come back to Chevy Chase to retire. I know that you didn't retire and I know in the four months that we have been working together I don't think you probably ever will retire because you are involved in so many things. How did you get involved with North American Rockwell?

A: Well, of course, the Rockwells, both father and son, are very prominent people in Pittsburgh, and nationally, for that matter. The father, Colonel Rockwell, is older than I but Al Junior, who is W. F. Rockwell, Jr., and Chairman of North American Rockwell, is a younger man than I am. I'm about halfway between the ages of the father and the son. They were both my good friends. Of course, the colonel is still a strong Army supporter, a wonderful patriotic American and a great supporter of the military.

The year I retired was the year after the merger of North American Aviation with the Rockwell Standard Corporation, which largely dealt with automotive components and other devices. As a matter of fact, if you turn any big truck over on its side in this country, about everything that you are looking at, such as the power train and all the rest -- axles, transmissions and brakes -- are made by the Rockwell Standard Corporation as it was then known. This is a very big business. The two of them joined and Al Rockwell, who was then Chairman, talked to me and said that he had problems in trying to merge these two very diverse industries, one hard-nose business (automotive), the other largely defense-aerospace (aircraft-oriented), both quite different in their approach to the problems of business. He offered me an opportunity to go to the West Coast and take over a corporate position.

Well, I didn't want to take over a corporate position because I didn't want full-time employment. I wanted some freedom to do things that perhaps I had never been able to do before. I really wanted something that involved part-time employment but something challenging. He had something challenging, so an agreement was made. A letter agreement was made between Mr. Rockwell and myself whereby I gave a certain amount of time to North American Rockwell each year, so many days a year, in return for which I was generously compensated. What he wanted me to do was two things: first, to assist in exploiting (and I guess that is the word to use) the new technology that was being and had been developed in the aerospace industry into the hard-nosed side of our business. This was a big corporate problem; it is a major problem in American industry today. I agreed that this was an interesting one to take on and not an easy one. The second thing he wanted me to do, because of my extensive acquaintances in the United States and in many other countries of the world, was to assist in new acquisitions, joint ventures, and other business opportunities in order to expand and diversify the North American Rockwell Corporation.

This was a fascinating one. With respect to that one I can only say that at that time -- and remember, this was within one year after the two corporations had merged -- there was really only one person designated with a primary responsibility for new acquisitions and joint ventures, although many others were assisting. At the present time there are probably 15 people with

a primary function for doing this sort of thing. Consequently, my efforts have not been used greatly in that field although when any opportunities come to my attention I forward it to those people who are interested in this section which deals with new corporate developments. I would make the observation here, though, that while this is one of the things that industry as a whole proclaims -- the great desire to diversify, when you get down to what we call the profit centers -- in other words the subordinate elements, the smaller companies, the subsidiary companies or divisions -- that this isn't necessarily so. The president of this company has got profit and loss statements to live with, and if he is going to diversify or take on something involving a new risk, then it is at the risk of decreased profits. Presidents are hired and fired based on their profit picture, you know. So, by and large, you find great resistance to diversification -- great care, let's say, in taking risks of this sort.

The same thing is true in the field of technology. The scientist and the engineer, you may think, are always willing to change. They are not always willing to change. They get certain ideas in their heads and you have to prove that something is better before you can effect change.

Change isn't this easy to come by. Believe me, it isn't, even in the technical field. When you realize this, you realize that you are dealing to a large extent with tangible things, with something that is available or that you can make available. If you've got this resistance to change in the hard disciplines, in the physical sciences, then how much more resistance you've got to expect from people where it comes from effecting social changes about which no true measurement is possible and no real reaction is possible as to the expected response of people as a whole. This is one of the problems we're having, and this is why we're in a position where in the physical sciences we've advanced our knowledge and its application so much further than we have in the social sciences that man is now in a position to destroy himself. These are simple facts.

You find people who are on relief today who have lived in the same village for 30 years. You can tell them that in the next state or in the next city 100 miles away there is a job they could get. For the most part they want to stay right put. The man may have some

degree of willingness to investigate, but the wife says, "Oh, we can't leave this community where our kids were brought up. They're all here; they are all living around us." Social change is really something hard to effect. This is why Congress, in its unwisdom, has had so much trouble thinking that they can adopt these civil rights programs and change things overnight. You can't change them; no country in the world has ever been able to change them, particularly when you are talking about a racial problem. They can't even settle a religious problem in Ireland. The same is true in other parts of the world. You've got these cleavages between the two Vietnams, the two Koreas, the two Germanys. How in the world the reformers think that we can just absorb the great difference in the social structure here between white and black overnight is something that I can't fathom. I think we just left ourselves open to real trouble. It is a greater problem than we've ever had with the Chinese, the Japanese, or with the Hebrews, if you want to look at it. No other group ever caused such severe problems trying to adjust to an American way of life; and the Blacks have been here the longest.

Q: I think that is probably due to the fact that these people have actually lived in their own separate culture apart from ours.

A: I think that is true to a very great degree. Yes, no question about it. But here we are; these are still the great problems of our age.

Q: General, when I first started talking with you today, although we didn't put it on tape, I said that there was a question that I'd like to discuss and I think that we've led right to it. There are many people who feel that the world is going downhill, that things are not improving, that everything is getting worse, that individually we can talk about better areas of social activity, living standards and so forth. But in general across the board we don't seem to be going up as a nation, as a world. You said that change is resisted, and we use the term evolution rather than the term revolution because that is a peaceful way of bringing about change. I was wondering, in your wisdom do you see any possibility of a breakthrough, from a revolutionary point of view, that perhaps something will occur that will get us moving upward again, not just this country, but the world?

A: I don't think that will occur from a revolutionary point of view if you are talking about resort to violence. Things can be almost revolutionary, short of violence, and something of this sort could occur. For instance, while I have been generally opposed to the recognition of Red China (and I'm not ready to say yet that I'm for it), nevertheless, if there were three poles in this world around which people gather, instead of two, the likelihood of any two of them or any one of them daring to initiate or be aggressive about war would be greatly reduced. This might lead to more in the way of evolution in the future.

There is no question but that man's problems are becoming more broadly recognized and more complex. They can't be quickly solved, though; there is no easy solution to the problems including the famine in Asia and Africa and the health problems in all the Third World. I don't know how we can change that. As a matter of fact, being a Christian I always think of the Lord having established this life as a struggle; he said it was a struggle and he left a Cross to prove it. Those people who think that they can exchange the Cross for the couch of the psychiatrist have got another guess coming. Things aren't going to be that easy. Life is a struggle and it is going to continue to be that way for man; it was intended that way. But I don't think the situation of some living in complete comfort and others living in dire poverty and starvation and malnutrition can go on. Where is the man wise enough to know how to alleviate it most rapidly? Certainly war won't do it.

Q: General, do you see a rapprochment -- a coming together of the two great clashing ideologies of communism and democracy, perhaps because of the requirement of an ecological revolution or from some greater threat to both of us?

A: Well, I suppose there will be some modification; I think it is a matter of degree. I'm not one of those "one-worlders" who believe that since the other extreme to capitalism is communism and the other extreme to communism is capitalism that socialism in between is the answer. I don't believe that, although I do believe that the natural resources, the God-given resources of the land, probably are going to be more carefully controlled by governments than exploited by particular individuals or interests in that area. Our

type of democracy is showing many cracks at the seams; it may be inadequate in the third millennium of our world.

I think one of the great things that has happened, almost God-given perhaps, is the cleavage that has arisen between Russia and China. I didn't believe it could happen. I didn't accept it for four or five years; I thought that this was a game that they were playing to trap us. But I now think that cleavage really does exist, and it may be one of the most helpful signs on the horizon. That's why I must say that I'm behind the President's efforts to feel out this situation with China and see if there is a better accommodation that can be arrived at, because we all need each other.

Q: General, there are many questions that I would like to ask you. Inasmuch as you have spent so much thought on the Middle East, I would be interested in getting your view at the present time on the situation; where do you think they're going?

A: By "they're," I guess you mean either Egypt or Israel. I don't know; I think to a degree we have created an impasse. I think something that has happened has been helpful in this regard and, since I am entirely unaware of either the State Department or petroleum industry plans or actions, I can just state it as a personal observation. I think the agreement just made between the major oil companies and the countries of the Middle East to increase their take but at the same time to insure the flow of oil to Western Europe and Japan for the next five years has had a somewhat quieting effect on the situation. It is true that the Arab countries could break their word like Russia does, but I don't believe they will. At the same time this must be a very inhibiting fact as far as the Russians are concerned if they are thinking about seizing it, because it puts them right on the spot as far as world opinion is concerned. As far as the Arabs are concerned, they're not communistically inclined; they neither like nor trust Russia and they know that if Russia takes over the oil in the Middle East they won't get paid for it; it will be just taken from them. That's what is going to happen. Now, at the same time, I share the concern you do that there appears to be a continued military build up in Egypt. This is one of the important way-points that the Russians are using to advance their interests not only in Egypt and the Middle East but particularly in

moving to the West, to Algeria and Gibraltar. They can outflank us and then do the same thing to France in reverse that we did when we secured Algeria almost 30 years ago.

The immediate item that bothers many of us, of course, is the Suez Canal, which will be a big gain for the Russians if they reopen that canal. It will give them immediate access to the Gulf and the Indian Ocean that they don't have and can't exercise if they have to go all the way around Africa each time they want to get there. Of course with their expanded holdings in Somaliland and Yemen down toward Aden, the Seychelles, Mauritius -- you name it -- the advent of Russia into the Indian Ocean is a very, very disturbing thing. I don't know that I have anything more that I should say on it at this time. I don't really look for open warfare on the Suez front. I don't think it is going to occur; I think there are too many inhibiting factors at the present time. I don't say that it will never occur; I don't mean that.

My major concern is the growing inferiority we have with respect to nuclear power, both offensive and defensive, as far as the Russians are concerned. I share the concern. I've said it for ten years, and others are saying it now, that the Russians can get to a point of dominance with their SS-9s, their SS-11s, and such defensive power as they have that they can really give us an ultimatum, "Do this or else," and I don't really know what the response would be. I'm glad I'm not the President to have to make it. But I think that if he appreciates this point -- and I hope he does -- then it seems to me that the only answer is to continue to strengthen our military position, our military posture. I doubt if this can be done within eight percent of the GNP; it never has been before.

Q: General, do you think if we are able to terminate the Vietnam War on the terms we would like to see it terminate, that the will of the people, the mood of the people, the understanding of the people will be receptive to more intelligently understanding the true problems that we face in the world.

A: I think so; I hope so. Southeast Asia is an area that our people do not understand. They do not understand the importance of it at all. They never have and they still don't, and we've done a poor job of explaining it to them. We've never told them what it meant to have 110 million Indonesians back on our side,

Singapore available for use, the passages into the Indian Ocean open for the movement of commerce and trade and oil for Japan, and Australia and New Zealand safe for the moment. They don't seem to get it and if they don't it is because we've done a poor job of salesmanship. Just the same as we've done a poor job as far as our military operations are concerned. By that I go back to the same token that once having decided that we were going to engage in land combat, we should have gone all the way to seal off the port of Haiphong and Hanoi and give them the works fast. You can't temporize on this sort of thing.

Q: Limited objectives but not limited power.

A: No. Except not nuclear power either. The difference in the attitude of the country between immediately pulling out of Southeast Asia but being willing to rearm to protect the Middle East and Western Europe is like night and day. An Iron Curtain, yes. A Bamboo Curtain? They can see through that one. They don't go for it.

We talk too much about this graduated response. Another term, of course, is the discrete use of force. In other words, if you don't hit me any harder than that, I won't hit you any harder than that; this is really escalation and you are asking for it. But I think we have absolutely discredited this idea of graduated response or discrete use of force. I think if you decide to use force, then use it fast, all of it. If you don't call our action a graduated response, then it was something less than that; this is fighting with one hand behind your back. We've seen generals -- good generals -- put on the shelf for mentioning the fact that the enemy was really falling back into Laos and using it for a sanctuary; we've seen the denial on Cambodia; we've seen all the limitations and restrictions that have been put on us as far as military operations are concerned at a terrible price.

Q: I spoke with General Larson about just that particular situation just a few weeks ago. Do you know he has moved to Chief of Staff and Deputy USARPAC Commander just in the last week?

A: All right. Then Westmoreland got him off the hook as far as the administration is concerned. I'm delighted to hear that, even if they don't promote him any further (and they may not, the way those things happen). Nevertheless, they've put him where he can

be of maximum use instead of riding herd on a domestic Army here in the U. S. A.

These sessions have been very satisfying to me. I've gotten a lot of fun out of thinking back about things that had slipped my mind, that I had probably thought of only occasionally over the past decades but not in any sequence like we've attacked them here. I think that the final step whenever we quit -- it is 11:20 now -- you ought to go over with me to the 19th hole at the Chevy Chase Club and grab a drink or a beer and a sandwich before you take off.

Q: Right.

You have certainly made a tremendous contribution to the collection, first with your papers and now with this excellent series of recordings and transcripts.

A: Well, it is not voluminous, I don't imagine, compared to some people's volumes and trunk-loads of records.

Q: Well, I would consider it one of our outstanding collections.