The John H. Glenn, Jr.
Oral History Project

Oral History Interview 3

with
Senator John Glenn, Jr.

in his home
Potomac, Maryland

December 6, 1996

Brien R. Williams
Interviewer

[Begin Interview 3, Tape 1, Side A]

WILLIAMS: This is the third interview with Senator John Glenn. It's occurring at his home in Potomac, Maryland, on the sixth of December, 1996, and this is Brien Williams.

Since we're here between the 104th and the 105th Congress and with President [Bill] Clinton re-elected, could you describe a little bit what participation you had in the campaign?

SEN. GLENN: Well, just a little bit of history, going back before the campaign, when President Clinton came in at the beginning of his first term. I was impressed with him and with some of his ideas, but it was a blank sheet of paper at that point as to what he was going to do. I think I was impressed with what he did his first term. I think the most far-reaching thing that he did was in August of '93, when he proposed

budget changes and tax changes and changes in our whole approach to the economy that he felt we had to do to lead us toward a balanced budget.

Now, those were tough votes during that first period, the first four years of his presidency, and in August '93, we put through the Clinton economic proposals, which included some tax increases as well as some massive budget cuts, and we put those through without a single Republican vote in the whole Congress. There was not a vote in the House, and in the Senate we had a tie vote. Al [Albert] Gore [Jr.], as the presiding officer, broke the tie, and that's how close it was and that's how partisan it was. There were all sorts of predictions from [Senator] Phil Gramm and others about how this was going to create millions of jobless people and all of that.

What did happen was quite remarkable in the other direction. The budget deficit was running over $290 billion a year when we passed that legislation. It went down to where the figure for final Congressional Budget Office estimate for 1996, I think, is winding up at the end of this year at about $106 billion for the year, and I think maybe that was figured to October, beginning of a new fiscal year. So it was remarkably successful. Republicans haven't wanted to talk about that, and they haven't wanted to admit that they were that wrong.

Along with that, some of the other dire predictions of things that were going to supposedly occur if we passed the President's program were that we were going to have increased inflation, we're going to have a lot of things like that, and just the opposite happened. We've had probably the most stable period with our economy of any period in modern times. And this isn't going through

the [Ronald] Reagan years, where Reagan and [George] Bush used to like to say what a great economy we had, but we were doing it all on credit cards at that time. Anybody can have a good economy. I can have a good economy in this household if I want to just go out and charge things for a while, but there comes a day of reckoning, and the day of reckoning that the President, President Clinton, saw and that I saw, too, and that all of us on the Democratic side saw, was that at the beginning of the Reagan years, the total indebtedness of the United States was right at $1 trillion. That's the accumulation of everything from George Washington through Jimmy Carter. What we had was about $3.9 trillion additional debt added in that time period through the Reagan and Bush years. So that's what really sustained the economy, was the borrowing we were doing through that time period.

Clinton saw that as a danger, and I think it's a danger, too, and that's the reason I supported his program in the summer of '93. He put it through, and it was a successful program. Now, along with that, he took a more moderate view in a lot of areas that were traditionally Democratic views. In some respects, and I don't want to make any over-claims here, when I ran, myself, back in 1983 and I was running in the '84 election, when I ran for presidency, many of my views were ones that I think were very close to what Clinton's views were when he came in. I took a very center-of-the-road—in fact, at that time we talked about it, and I used as a sort of a standard part of my campaign speech when I was out there all over the country, that I wanted to appeal to the sensible center. We had fringes on both sides of the political spectrum. However you define liberal and

conservative, which is another subject, but whether you're far-left liberal or far-right conservative, those aren't the people who I think should be shaping national policies. We should be reflecting the views of the two-thirds or more of the people of this country who are just solid working people trying to get along and what's going to help them the most, and that was my view of where we should be going. Well, the problem is that the sensible center did not prevail when I was running.

But I always saw many of President Clinton's proposals and his programs as being ones that I could almost claim were an outgrowth out of my efforts back in the mid-eighties or early eighties. I'm sure that he didn't sit down and go through my campaign speeches and then decide what his program was going to be, but there was a kinship I felt there, anyway, with our views on specific issues.

I think the idea that we had to reform welfare was one that we had to do, although I had some criticism of the way Clinton went about the welfare thing. I think we have to address Medicare, Medicaid. We've had a lot of people become dependent on that and not dependent in a bad way, because those programs, I think, have been very, very good programs, but they're running out of money. We have to make sure we handle them right. Social Security—how are we going to handle that on into the future? I think his expressed views on that have been very good.

I've had lots of interests around the world, international interests that I have followed with regard to nuclear proliferation, our foreign policy in other areas also around the world. I've traveled a lot around the world, and I was glad

to see in his first four years that he'd taken a very active role, a leadership role, in getting together with these leaders and sponsoring meetings, whether bilateral meetings or multilateral meetings with these people, and trying to take a lead, as I think the United States should. We are a world leader. We're the world leading economic power, and as such, we can use that power and our military presence sometimes for good around the world.

I'm not one that thinks we should just sit within our own borders and never risk anybody being hurt and play it super safe as the world's leader. I think we have, very properly, through the years used our presence around the world to further freedom and democracy, and we have seen a number of nations in our own hemisphere here and other places have trends toward more democratic government, more freedom for their people, and under our basic leadership and pressure. We have not had territorial designs on places. We don't move in, take them over, or try to occupy a lot of countries after World War II or anything like that. What we've done is use our pressure, use our presence, use our economic power to try and move people into a more democratic frame of mind, and I think we've been reasonably successful with that.

So, President Clinton, when he came in, instead of just sitting back and saying, well, he didn't want to look at that area at all, he took an active role in trying to further our U.S. presence around the world and follow up on things that had already been started, like Somalia and some of those places. Now, we can debate all day about how wise some of those were, but I think, by and large, I have been very proud of a United States of America that was willing to get

involved, not with territorial designs, but with the idea that we believe our form of government does the best job for the greatest number of people, and we want to see that idea spread. We haven't just sat back and said, "Well, let the rest of the world go." We couldn't do that if we wanted to.

We are not an isolationist American anymore. We're going into a world economy. How we do that and what our relationships are, are going determine not just our foreign policy, but our economic welfare for the indefinite future. I think President Clinton feels that very strongly, and so I share those views with him.

That's all sort of preface as to his deciding to run again and the campaign of '96. President Clinton asked me to be involved in Ohio and with him in other places if I would, and I told him personally that I would be glad to do that, and if they would let me know, and whatever my schedule was, I would make every effort to be with him whenever he was in Ohio or other places, too, as far as that goes.

As it turned out this year, in 1996, Ohio was one of the main focal points of the whole presidential campaign; both for the Republicans and Democrats, and the President put a lot of emphasis on Ohio. I believe he made six trips into Ohio, and I was able to be with him on all but one of those. I was on another trip of my own out West when he went to Dayton, for just a stop into Dayton for one appearance during an afternoon and out again that evening, and I was not there for that. Outside of that, though, I was with him on every trip he made into Ohio and

gave him my views on what was important for Ohio and for the rest of the country.

One reason why I think Ohio was such a focal point of the campaign; Ohio truly is a microcosm of almost the whole rest of the country. If you took the whole United States and you put big squeezers or forceps or something on the West Coast and the East Coast, and you started squeezing, and you sort of distilled the United States down, or you squeezed the whole United States down into one little area that represented the whole country, I think you'd find a state like Ohio, and I think that we in Ohio are truly representative of the whole country more than almost any other state.

It's no accident that many of the big corporations and the marketing people come in and do test marketing in Ohio, because we are such a diverse state. We run the whole gamut of political thought, from super-conservative to super-liberal groups in Ohio, from, say, the northeast down into southern Ohio, southwest Ohio. We run from hard-scrabble rocky hill country where there used to be small farms that no longer are that productive down in southern and southeastern Ohio, down in the area where I grew up. While there are still farms in that area and some agriculture in that area, it's coal-mining area, is one of the main industries there. We run from that sort of hard-scrabble hill country, which are the foothills of the Appalachians, beautiful country, but not too good economically outside of the mines that are in that area now, both strip mines and deep mines. We run from that kind of country out into some of the very finest farmland in the whole world in western and northwestern Ohio, where the

production of corn and soybeans, the major crops, are among the highest per acreage in the whole world. So, we are really a diverse state as far as our economy goes, and the economy of Ohio is pretty well split between agriculture and industry.

In industry, we have practically every old – what are thought of now as Rust Belt industries that were the belching smokestacks of the past through that Midwest area, the steel, chemical, and those industries – as well as having gone over now to many of the most modern, high-tech, robotic-type production facilities. So we represent, all across industry, the whole gamut of the old and the new, the Rust Belt to the new high-tech things of the future.

Our people run the whole gamut of political thought and religious thought and ethnic groups. In northeast Ohio, in particular, where a lot of the people that came over from Europe and from other countries came to that area to work in the steel mills and the industrial plants. In Cleveland, in particular, and around that area, on any given day in the summertime you almost have your choice of which nationalistic festival you want to go to, and they're great. I think we have every ethnic group represented that ever started getting two or more people together and calling themselves some ethnic grouping. We have all the Slovenians and the Poles and Hungarians and Czechs and all the people out of Eastern Europe, Russia.

I remember once when I was first running for office, there had been a study out at Cleveland State University about the ethnic diversity of the area, and what I was surprised at, they had an American Indian community in Cleveland. I

thought these were probably some of the Mohawks out of New York that were known for their high steel work, and still are to this day around New York City, and had come to Cleveland for some of that. I presumed that was the group. When I looked into it, it was not that. It was Sioux Indians off the plains, and some families had come back, a small group of families of Sioux Indian heritage.

There was a government program some years ago that was attempting to get the Indians to move off the reservation and sort of be assimilated. A lot of families had moved off the reservation and came to join the others that were already in Cleveland. So we even had a Sioux Indian community in Cleveland, in addition to all the international types that I guess the Sioux Indians could look at as interlopers into their country from the old days.

In other words, the makeup of Ohio is a makeup that represents the whole United States of America, is the point. And so when the President came into Ohio, we talked about this. What message sells in Ohio is the message that's going to sell across this country, because we're as diverse as the whole nation. And so they've seen Ohio as being critical.

Another fact of history, the reason for it I can't really state, but there has never been a Republican President elected unless he carried Ohio. A fact of history. It may be trivia, but it is true, nevertheless. And so they put a lot of emphasis on taking Ohio. The Republican party in Ohio is a very strong party, and the Republican Governor of Ohio, George [V.] Voinovich, was very active and was the honorary campaign chairman for [Robert] Dole for Ohio. He started out being on the list of Dole's potential vice presidential selections. Once the

campaign for Dole started taking somewhat of a downturn in Ohio, though, the Governor wasn't nearly as obvious when Dole came to Ohio as he'd been in the early stages of the campaign, but why he wasn't I'll leave up to your own speculation.

When the President asked me to be with him, I said that I would, and I did. He had some meetings in Ohio early on where I introduced him at those meetings and would give the introduction. We had one night at the Ohio State Fairgrounds where there was a big Democratic rally that was sort of kicking off events of the year. First I flew out of Washington here on that particular trip with the President on Air Force One. We went to Cincinnati and were there for several events during a luncheon and afternoon at Xavier University, in which he talked some about education and training and job training. One meeting that was particularly memorable on the Xavier campus had some people from Proctor and Gamble with him, who were sponsoring some job training programs there, some very, very successful mentoring programs, working with Xavier and some of the local community groups. He was extremely interested in that particular activity, the community activity there and the corporate responsibility that he talked about that he wished that other corporations would do the same thing that P&G was doing in that area, and I agreed with him completely.

We flew up then to Columbus, and he was there for several private meetings there with different people at a press conference we had there where they had Ohio press people in from all over the state. He spent about an hour and a half with them out at a place that had been set up at Port Columbus Airport. We

had a giant rally as sort of a kickoff for the year. This was in March, as I recall, and that was out at the Ohio State Fairgrounds. The party there was strictly a Democratic function; it wasn't bipartisan at all there. But that was sort of to be a kickoff for the campaign for the year, and it was, and there was a lot of enthusiasm.

I introduced him and had some things to say on that. I remember he got a particular kick out of one of the things that he said he was going to steal from my lines that night when I introduced him, and use it in his campaign, and he did. I heard him later use it a number of times. That was on some of the cutbacks in education that the Republicans had tried to make in the last couple of years, that he thought this was so short-sighted, where you're trying to cut back on things for young people. We literally have programs that try to help out on education, and whether they're all perfect or not we can argue all the time, but when you just try and lob off from programs that are being productive and have helped a lot of our younger people, then he thought that was a mistake.

The lines, as I recall, that I had used that referred to some of our kindergarten-age people when I said that you don't move our country ahead by taking Big Bird away from five-year-olds, by taking school lunches away from ten-year-olds, by taking summer jobs away from fifteen-year-olds, and student loans away from twenty-year-olds. Obviously, in the context of a campaign speech, you can build those lines up one by one, and that brought the house down that night in Columbus. I went ahead after that with some other remarks and introduced the President, and he was still laughing about that when he came up

then to make his remarks and shook hands on the way up, and he said, "I'm going to steal that one. I'm going to steal that one," and I said, "You're welcome." But I just happened to recall that out of that particular stop. I used that same thing a few times later on introducing him at different places. Then I heard him use it on his own, too, so I got a kick out of that.

We were at several events like that and at the City Club up in Cleveland with him when he was in there once. He asked me to go with him on the train when they really opened the campaign on the way to the convention in Chicago. That swing was a very major one, and that was where the campaign really got under way in full twenty-four-hour-a-day campaigning, just about, for the President. They had had such success back in their previous campaign in '92 with the bus trip they made to different parts of the country, and that bus trip, out of the convention in New York, the bus trip went across Pennsylvania and then across Ohio, and we were with he and Al Gore on that bus trip for part of it back in those days. They stopped on a farm out east of Columbus back then.

Our Democratic state chairman at that time was a farmer from east of Columbus named Gene Branstool, and Gene has about 700 acres of land that he farms and another 180 acres, I think, under lease, and then some of his relatives around that area have major farming interests in that area, and that was one of their stops on the bus trip. We were with him out there and into Columbus and there was a lot of excitement back in '92.

They repeated that, then, by train this time, in '96, and I joined them at Chillicothe, Ohio. They had come across part of Kentucky and came across down

by Cincinnati into Ohio, and I joined the train at their first campaign stop, then, in Chillicothe, Ohio. They'd stopped the train out in what was sort of an open field area, and they had it set up with floodlights and all because they knew it was going to be right at dusk in the evening. It was a crowd of about twice the size that I thought it would be. Chillicothe is pretty evenly divided between Republican and Democratic numbers there.

The next stops where the train was going to go were up across basically western and northwestern Ohio. At the time, I was not sure that was a good selection, because what they're doing is they're making stops basically in as rock-ribbed Republican areas as they could, and I was not at all sure what kind of turnout they would get and how excited people would be. The train, of course, had several cars with national press along, and that's what you're aiming for on something like this, is the coverage that national press gives the campaign. But the Chillicothe stop was a big success.

We went on into Columbus that night. There was not a rally that evening in Columbus, but the next day, then, he wanted to put forth some of his views on crime prevention and some of his proposals on 100,000 new police and the whole crime package that he was putting together, and he wanted to have that with a law enforcement background, so they met at Columbus Police Academy. The Columbus Police Academy happened to be right along the edge of the railroad, so the train pulled up right there, so that after we had stayed in Columbus that night and came out and had the rally, we then climbed right on the train and then went on.

That rally was a big success, also, which I expected it to be there in Columbus, where a lot of people could be turned out. The next stop I wasn't too sure of. What was the town? I can't think of the name of the town right at the moment, but it's in west central Ohio, and it was absolutely in the heart of rock-ribbed Republican country. We joked about it at the time, it hasn't been too many years since they probably hunted down Democrats with dogs out in that area. [Laughter] We made light of it, but it's a predominantly Republican area, anyway, although the Democratic party has been making inroads in that area and picking up strength in that area.

The stop was at a place, and I can't recall the name of the town yet, but they called themselves "the Flag City." We came in there, and there were some giant flags strung between some poles over on one side of the area, not where this rally was, and instead of having a few hundred people of maybe a thousand or so, which I would not have been at all surprised to call a pretty good crowd in that area – it was a bright, brilliant, sunny, hot summer day – and there were probably seven or eight thousand people out there, and all excited and jumping up and down and a lot of excitement, and the President was sort of overwhelmed with it all.

One other little vignette, too, on that one. The President is one person who, when he says he enjoys campaigning, I think he really means it. I've seen him give his speech and then go down and work the line, as they call it, or work the ropes, where there usually is a little rope barrier or something set up around to keep people from getting right up to the podium. It's maybe twenty or twenty-

five feet out away from the podium, and it's customary after a speech to go down and go around and shake hands with people down there in the crowd and comment and give some autographs and things like that that people want. I swear, I think the President really looks forward to that more than anything else, because I've just seen him almost draw strength from the crowd as he does that. The staff is always trying to move him along. He'll stop, and he'll talk to people, and he really enjoys that.

In my own case, when people in the past have said, "Oh, don't you enjoy campaigning?" and I say, "Wait a minute. I've got to tell you the truth," and the truth in my case and, I think, for almost all politicians is, I say that if I'm someplace and I'm sharing ideas with people, and I'm hearing their views on things, and we're sharing views, and we're talking about things, the pros and cons of a particular issue, that's exhilarating, and that's what politics is all about, and that's the reason I'm in it, is to see what's best for this country for the future and try and move us in that direction. That truly is exciting when you're doing something like that, and you enjoy it, and you hate to break it off.

But most people, when they talk about, "Do you enjoy campaigning?" are talking about the tenth event of the day at eleven or twelve o'clock at night, having to shake another two hundred hands before you can go home dead tired and go to bed and get up at six o'clock in the morning and start all over again. "Do you enjoy that kind of campaigning?" and I always tell them, if that's what they're talking about and somebody tells you that they enjoy that kind of

campaigning, watch out for them, because they'll lie about other things, too, is my view. But the President is one person, he just—

WILLIAMS: Let me stop you there.

[Begin Interview 3, Tape 1, Side B]

SEN. GLENN: I think the President truly is a person who really enjoys that personal absolute skin-to-skin contact of shaking hands with people. I've seen him do it so many times now that I think he really just draws strength from that, and that's good. I don't mean this as a criticism at all. That's great. He loves these little sort of impromptu things. I was thinking back at this Flag Village, and I'll get the name of that later, but at the Flag Village, he was going around the rope line, and it was hot that day, it was up in the mid to upper nineties, rather humid, everybody was sweating. He came to this lady, little, short woman. She couldn't have been more than about—well, she had to be five feet, I think. She wasn't very big at all, a little gray-haired elderly lady, and she was all excited. She was smiling and laughing, and the President stopped to talk to her. Well, it turned out that this was her ninety-second or ninety-fourth—I think it was ninety-fourth—birthday was that day. By this time the President had been working the line long enough that part of the crowd in the back had started to sort of disperse a little bit, going home. The President wouldn't have anything but they took the line down enough that she could get through, and he helped her and took her over and took her back up on the stage, got up to the microphone and called everybody back that was leaving, "Come on back. We've got something important we have to do here."

And he had that whole crowd of about seven or eight thousand people sing "Happy Birthday" to whatever her name was, I don't recall now, and she was just beaming, and the crowd loved it. He loves to get in and do things like that during a campaign.

We went to Bowling Green, Ohio, which is where Bowling Green University is, Bowling Green State University, and stopped in the middle of town there with the train, and this was just at dusk in the evening, again, and there was a huge turnout, and this was before school had really started there. It was the weekend that school was beginning, I think. Students were just coming back in. But there was a big crowd there, and they were so responsive.

Then we went on up to Toledo that night and got in there, and along the waterfront, along the Maumee River they had provided for where it was going to be, and the estimates, I think, in the paper the nest day were something like—I think it was twenty thousand or twenty-five thousand. I'm not sure, something like that. I don't know that there were quite that many, but it was a big, big crowd, all excited about things. Toledo is a little more on the Democratic side.

But that was his trip across Ohio, and it took two days, and I stayed with him on that. We stayed in Columbus all night that first night and then Toledo the second night, and then they went on into Michigan, and I left the campaign there. The next morning before they left, we had a big rally out at the Jeep plant, and he was there and went through part of the Jeep plant. Jeep is starting to market back in the Far East, now, with right-hand-drive Jeeps, which they hadn't made yet. So he wanted to talk about that and how American companies had to be more

competitive by doing things like that that would make their product more acceptable to people overseas. So that was a memorable trip across Ohio.

Then he was back in several times after the convention, then, to come back into Cleveland and several different places within the state, and I was with him on all except that one. I thought the way the campaign went this year was rather surprising in that, for some reason, the Republicans really never got going. I know Bob Dole from having spent all these years in the Senate. I guess he was in the Senate when I got there, and I've been there twenty-two years now, so I got to know Bob Dole very well and consider Bob Dole a good friend. We worked together on different things, and while our general political philosophy may vary somewhat, he's a fine man. Wherever I went with the President, wherever I campaigned for the President on my own, which I did in Ohio some, you never heard me say a bad word about Bob Dole. I may disagree with policies and disagree with proposals, but he's a fine person, and I admire him very much. He had a background in World War II that maybe gives me a little feeling of camaraderie with him, and he did suffer a lot. He was in the hospital for over three years getting over his wounds in the war and is lucky to be alive. I've always had a very fair shake from him in the Senate, whatever I wanted to propose to him.

I think Bob Dole's forte, his strong points, did not really come across in the campaign; they just never got it going. They shifted gears too many times on what they were emphasizing. His strength around the Senate was not in great oratorical flourish out on the floor; it was in getting people together in his office,

people that were trying to work out some compromise on a particular piece of legislation and work this out in his office and try and suggest different things, and that's been his forte and the reason that he assumed a leadership role over on the Republican side. But I don't think his strong points came across as well out on the campaign trail, so they just never really got going.

Quite apart from the way I felt about Bob Dole personally, though, I think President Clinton's policies for the economy, his views on our relationships around the world, the general thrust of his proposals, whether with Medicare of medical help for our people, whatever, I have agreed with.

I might address the medical thing. I think their medical reform program that they put forward in the first two years, I think they would be the first to say now, took too big a bite of the apple. People were concerned that they were going to make such great changes in our medical delivery system that each individual thought, "Wait a minute, now. This might upset my own situation." That got very personal, and they finally pulled back.

At the end of '96, of course, before we went out of session, we did pass the Kennedy-Kassenbaum Bill, which took a nibble at the medical situation. I think that's what we'll see into the future now, are more incremental changes like this leading towards some changes in our medical delivery system. I think they would be the first to say that they really did take too big a bite out of this thing and what they were proposing was revolution of the system when we should have been going for evolution of the system.

So I was happy to back the President. I was glad he won. I think some of the things that came out at the very last of the campaign, some of the things about campaign finance reform and the need for campaign finance reform and some of the illicit or illegal money that got into the campaign at the last is something we have to look into now in '97 and probably into '98. I think it's going to pass something there. My view is, while I'm certainly not one that is going to excuse what happened that was wrong on the Democratic side, I think the whole system has become so rotten for such a long period of time that problems with campaign finances are endemic on both sides.

The Democrats are under scrutiny now in the post-election time of 1996, and should be. I don't question that we ought to look into these things, but I think they're just as much on the Republican side. My hopes are that as we look into this, it will not become just a finger-pointing back and forth, but we'll really use whatever hearings or whatever attention is given to this on a bipartisan basis in a true spirit of trying to correct what's wrong with the system. We haven't really done that yet.

We had some proposals made in the last Congress, proposals by Senator [John] McCain and Senator [Russell D.] Feingold [Jr.], that I think were good. Once again, they were incremental. They weren't steps that were going to solve the whole campaign finance problem, but they were proposals that would start us on the road in the right direction. It's a big problem. It's always been a problem in this country, money and politics. My own view for a long time, and I've had a lot of experience in this area, raising money, or I wouldn't have made it through

being elected four times to the U.S. Senate, but I think we would save money in the long run and correct more in our whole political system if we went to federal financing. Anything else we could do, it would probably be cheaper. It would mean that you give so much, a certain amount, to each candidate. This would be in the general election. I don't think you could make a federal financing arrangement that would be satisfactory that would cover primaries, because you'd have too many people jumping in just to get some subsidy to go out and campaign so their name would become known for their law firm or doctor or teacher or whatever. So in a primary, I don't think it would work very well, but I do think that we would do more to clean up this country if we gave a certain amount, as we do in the presidential race.

The President and the Republican, Bob Dole, got their amount of whatever it was, 60-some million dollars, I think it is now, to run a whole national campaign. They received it when the results of the convention were officially certified. That money comes from a check-off on the income tax statement of people who are willing to check it off and say, "I want (whatever it is now) five dollars of my income tax to go to this political fund that funds our presidential campaigns, post convention." I think that's good, and I think we could do almost an identical system with regard to the congressional and Senate races, and I think that would do more to clean up politics, it would do more to bring good government back into line than almost anything we could do.

People say, "Well, this would be $400 million," or $500 million or whatever it is. If we could clean up our political system with that kind of

expenditure that's going to be made anyway, it just depends on whether you bring it in by having to go out hat in hand and solicit it from corporations and unions and individuals and spend two-thirds of your time raising money rather than addressing the issues of the country, if you could replace all that, where is the money coming from? It's either coming from private sources that are going to extract their pound of flesh later in whatever they want, or is it going to come from all of us speaking together as a nation to say, "Yes, we want our money to be used for this purpose," and put in there as clean campaign money, and there wouldn't be any doubt about it. So I think we'll come to that one of these days.

I think some of the abuses that came out of this '96 campaign on both the Democrat and Republican side are things that we have to look at so we know the extent of the problem before we make our judgments. As we sit here talking now, all the emphasis is on this Mr. Huang, who brought in money from abroad, apparently, and the questions about what influence he had when he worked at the Department of Commerce for Secretary Ron Brown, what the President's role was in this, the Vice President's role, different things. I'm sure, from what's come out so far, there's enough there that needs to be corrected. But over on the Republican side, to balance this out, the only person who has been, in effect, convicted so far was the vice chairman of the Dole campaign, the vice chairman of finance, I believe he was—I forget the name—who was fined a million dollars by the Federal Election Commission and spent six months under house arrest. So we have enough to correct on both sides of the political fence here, and we haven't even looked into what may have occurred in campaigns like [H.] Ross

Perot's or [Ralph] Nader or other people that were out there, too. Maybe things should be looked into there also.

WILLIAMS: Tell me a little bit about what it was like being on the train with Clinton, between stops.

SEN. GLENN: We didn't have a lot of time, because he was busy being briefed. His White House staff, some of them were there to keep him appraised of other things going on in the world. He wasn't just divorced from being President, of course, while he was on the train. So most of his time in between stops was spent in briefings with some of those people, but we had time to talk some.

He was exhilarated at the reception he was getting, and I kept telling him that I know Ohio pretty well, but I was surprised at some of the reaction, too, and how great it was, and that I was very pleasantly surprised by the turnout of the crowds, and we talked about that some. At each stop on that trip I introduced him, I guess, at each stop, maybe, except in Toledo, I think I introduced the person that introduced him. They used that technique a lot during this campaign, and that happened some, too, where while some of us were there to introduce him, they wanted some local student or local civic leader or local somebody to be the final person. So there would be several people on the platform, and we'd make our little introductory speeches, turn it over to the next one, and then the student would introduce the program or something like that or introduce the President, which I thought was fine. That was a good way to do it.

On the train, I would go up sometimes where some of the staff people were, and he had several other people that were with him on the train, that he had

asked to be on the train across Ohio, too. Gene Brandstool, who I mentioned, had been a friend of the President, who went in and spent a couple of years in Washington in the Department of Agriculture after the president was elected in '92, Gene was on the train. Mary Ellen Withrow [phonetic], who had been our state treasurer in Ohio and who the President had asked to be Treasurer of the United States, it's her name you see on all the money, Mary Ellen Withrow. We all get asked to sign money, autograph money, occasionally. She's the one person you travel with who can legally do it. When the rest of us sign a dollar bill or something, it's technically illegal and we probably shouldn't do it, but I don't know of anybody that's ever refused it. I always get a kick out of Mary Ellen, because when somebody asks her for an autograph, she's the one person who legally can sign her name in addition to her printed name that's on the dollars. I've gotten a couple of dollar bills for my grandsons signed by Mary Ellen, with her original signature on there. So that's something for them to keep into the future.

So, people like Gene Branstool, Mary Ellen, our state Democratic chairman Dave Leland [phonetic], several people, Pat Sweeney [phonetic] out of our state legislature, those kinds of people were on the train, too. So we had a lot of people to talk to about different things going on. Press people were there. I did several interviews with the press, some when we were at a particular stop and some while we were rolling along.

Part of the time you just spent enjoying looking out the window. Let me remark about that, too, because it was one of the things that I pointed out to the

President that showed some kind of excitement, even at the early stage of the campaign, that I had not really expected. When the train was going up across just open farm country and we'd come across a road crossing, here would be people who'd driven out with the kids and had some lawn chairs, and they were sitting out there with the car, just out there where the train was going to go by, and they had flags, and they're waving their flags out there and waving as we'd go by, waving to the President. I liked that. I think that's great, and I think if we ever lose that kind of spirit in this country, we've lost a good part of what makes us tick, because when people get that kind of excitement about government of whatever political stripe, they want to come out to see the President when he comes to their area, that's a very healthy thing, and I was glad to see that.

There was a lot of that, people on both sides of the track you'd see just out there at a place where the train was going to go by, maybe a road crossing out in the middle of a cornfield someplace. There wasn't a town. They had to drive out to get there, and there they'd be with their kids, sitting out there in their lawn chairs or whatever, folding chairs, just to see the train go by, and they wanted their kids to have experienced that little bit of history that came to that part of Ohio. I think that was great, and the President loved that.

WILLIAMS: Would he be at the window?

SEN. GLENN: Yes, sometimes. Sometimes he'd wave. And in the car, the limo, you know, when you're going from the train to the event, you're in the back seat of the limo with the President. To be seen from outside, you really have to sort of lean forward and get up a little close to the window and wave back at people who are

waving at the car. He would do that quite a lot, which I think is good. People want to come out, and they bring their kids out, and they just want to be in a little tiny bit of history in their own area, and that's a very healthy thing. I hope we never lose that attitude.

WILLIAMS: So your read would be that some of the members of this crowd were not there for any partisan reason, but more to see a President.

SEN. GLENN: I think it was a lot of that, yes. I think the crowds were made up primarily of Democrats. I had no doubt about that, but I think a good chunk of those crowds, too, was Republican, Independents, people that just wanted to be there to see that part of the campaign as it came to their part of the country.

WILLIAMS: I don't know if your grandsons have met the President or not, but if they were to ask, "What was President Clinton like?" what would you say?

SEN. GLENN: Well, they have met him on several occasions, and they've seen him, as I have, as a very friendly, affable, pleasant-type person, and he's that way. I don't think that's something he puts on as a campaign thing. It's just the way he is, and that's good. He doesn't fake it. His interest in people is evident when he's campaigning. I don't have any doubt about his sincerity in wanting to do the best job he can. There may be variations on what different blocks of people around the country think is best for the country, but I have no doubt that, in his view, he's doing the very best he knows how to reflect his own views of what he thinks is best for the future of this country.

I think his general thing, rather than being over on some fringe political effort of some kind or another, I think he really is trying to get back to what I

termed earlier were my views when I ran, trying to appeal to the views when I ran, trying to appeal to the views of the sensible center. That's the way it should be. I think in times past there may have been times where some of the more liberal or more conservative thought lead the country off in a certain direction. There may have been reasons for it at the time, but I think this time now our economy is running along in amazingly good shape, surprisingly good shape. We're not at war. It's a time when we can do a lot of these things with regard to sort of doing things that are going to affect a lot of lives into the future, whether it's medical or whether it's help for students in college and things like that.

At the same time, I think the excesses of the previous twelve years before he came in, some of the excesses of spending, we have to correct. We can't just keep on that way. I might put this in an international context, too. I think there were some comparisons between the Reagan and Bush years that you could make. Maggie [Margaret] Thatcher, Prime Minister in England, felt they had to get their budget under control, too, and they went at it in a little different way. They said they will cut the programs and get things under control, "Then when our requirements for taxes are not quite so great, then we'll reduce taxes." That's basically the track she followed.

Reagan, in particular, though, went the other route, and Reagan said, "We'll cut taxes. This will force us into less revenue, and so we'll have to cut programs." Plus they had the supply-side economics theory that said that if we cut taxes, then the money was going to be available for other investing, and this would create enough new jobs and new business activity that the resulting

revenue would more than make up what had been lost. To make a short statement, it didn't work.

I think most of the major economists feel that you do get something back when you do that in new revenue, but it's only about 30 percent or 35 percent normally of the amount you have cut. Nobody questions that there is a curve and you can't tax everything, nor can you go without taxation. Somewhere the curve has a break point on it in here where there's an optimum, but the optimum was not that 30 percent tax cut or the 25 percent reduction in revenue. Originally it was proposed as 30 percent—10, 10, 10—three years in a row. We wound up, after arguing and debating it out in those early Reagan years, was that we went three years in a row 5, 10, 10, which made it 25 percent reduction in taxes.

What we did, then, because the new revenue did not come in as they had forecast to the extent they had forecast, so we wound up running the nation by more borrowing, and that's what put us in this area where we're somewhere, five and a half trillion dollars in debt—trillion. I think people have to remember what a trillion is from your grade-school arithmetic. It's a thousand billions, and then a billion is a thousand millions. We get so used to talking about billions and trillions around here, we lose sight of how much money that is sometimes.

WILLIAMS: Any other incidents from the campaign trail in Ohio this year that come to mind?

SEN. GLENN: No. I might comment, the only other thing would be that there's sort of a routine that occurs on each stop on this. If you're going to a meeting, when you arrive, you have to give the press time to go and get set up, so there's a delay. Usually that delay is taken up by one or two small private meetings with groups

or interest groups that have a particular message they want to give the president. Then there will be the event itself, and then afterwards you have to give the press, once again, time to file their story if they're going to file one, and time to get back on the buses or trains or planes or whatever the transportation is.

During that time period, there will be another couple of meetings. I was just thinking at a place where if the emphasis was on crime control, speech of the day and so on, well, afterwards you'd have a number of the police officials there who would like to meet with the president, and he'll take that time, then, to meet with them, shake hands with the group, talk to them. At every stop and every one of those meeting rooms, wherever you are, there always is a telephone, and usually somebody has food there, so there's some refreshment or the opportunity to have something, a bite to eat if you haven't had lunch or whatever, but there's always the telephone. There's always communication, because the presidents is never out of communication with what's going on. That's a big effort, and it's a big effort at every campaign stop.

Someone could do a great story, as I'm sure they have already but I don't remember seeing it, of just the logistics of a campaign stop, of what it requires to put on a rally and how many people have to come in how many days in advance. The Secret Service has to some in and screen everything and contact the local officials and put their stamp of approval on it. Communications for the press. How many press are you going to have with you, fifty? Well, you're probably going to have to have twenty-five telephones, then, installed temporarily at the site to permit them to have their contacts out, because, after all, campaign stops

like that are not like they used to be back in the old days, just an entity unto themselves. They are now, you hope, something that will be covered by the press and run nationally on TV.

So you have to have all the telephones installed, and you have to have security, and you have to have rooms to meet people in, and there's always the decoration and who's going to do this, and who puts it up, and will it be up on time? Presidential limousines with their bullet-proof glass and doors have to be brought in for every stop where he's going to be transported someplace, and those are usually flown in, in advance. And there has to be somebody to clean up and put all this away after it's over.

If a President is coming in and making half a dozen stops a day, there are half a dozen different teams that have to be out doing all that in advance, and they'll be working maybe a couple of weeks in advance to get this set up. You have things like how many portable toilets do you require, practical things like that, that you have to have at an event like that. It's just an enormous logistical thing that most people go to an event and don't think about. "Yeah, here's the President. Okay. Now I'm going home." There was a small army of people putting that thing together at that stop that prepared all that and prepared them—

[Begin Interview 3, Tape 2, Side A]

SEN. GLENN: And there seem to be a cadre of people who just love to do that and love to supervise that, and you see some of the same faces from one campaign to another. I ran into some of the same people that I hadn't seen since four years ago, when

the President was campaigning the last time, and there are people who drop what they're doing and come in because they enjoy this, they enjoy going around the country and setting up these advances, and they're good at it, they're pros at it, and they're directed out of the White House and the campaign committees. I'm glad we have people like that. To me, that would be an absolute—I'd hate to do something like that, wouldn't enjoy it, anyway, but there are people who just love to do that, and they seem to surface every four years in both political parties.

WILLIAMS: How were you—I hesitate to use to use this word—managed in terms of your participation on these campaign swings through Ohio?

SEN. GLENN: Well, say I was going to be a certain place with the President and they knew that and I'd be on the list of people that either went with him on Air Force One out of Washington here going out there or, if he was coming into Ohio from someplace else, maybe I was arriving from a different spot to be with him, but my name would be on their list. Of course, in the entourage of cars that they have, they have assigned spots of everybody that's in the official party, and they'll have the cars' numbers in the windshields of the cars in addition to those of the presidential limousine. Quite often, if the President's coming in, there will be somebody, a local mayor of someone he wants to ride with and talk to, and in that case they're in the limo, and I would be off in one of the other cars with some of the staff or other, I guess, dignitaries is the common word that would be used. I don't consider myself much of a dignitary.

So you're put on the list, and, of course, then if there's a luncheon involved where he's speaking, that's all taken care of by somebody. Sometimes I

would have some of my staff in Ohio pick me up and get me to the event. Other times, if I was going to be with him someplace, they'd provide transportation to get me there or something like that. So it varies from one stop to another. Sometimes, then, I would be with him, just the two of us in the presidential limo riding from the airport to the event, whatever, where we had a chance to talk about all kinds of things.

WILLIAMS: Like what?

SEN. GLENN: Oh, things that were going on, just things that were of interest to the day. At a time like that, always how is the campaign going, what does the polling look like, polls I had heard about in Ohio or knew about in Ohio as opposed to what their presidential polling showed what their figures were. So, conversation like that. And there are always comments about a particular event and who was who and who was active and who wasn't, and who was going to play a major role in the campaign, and my opinions on things like that.

WILLIAMS: What about the introductory remarks that you make, did you create those yourself?

SEN. GLENN: Yes.

WILLIAMS: Were there instructions that went along with him?

SEN. GLENN: No. That varies somewhat, but usually I had sort of a standard pitch after a while, almost standard, although you vary it at each stop, depending on what the major interests are of the group that you're talking to or where you are. If the President was stressing crime as the issue of the day, whatever it was, they would probably send over or fax to me, before I went up, some of the statistics on what

the President was going to be talking about, what his proposal was going to be so I could refer to it if I wanted to, which I did sometimes, and other times I didn't. But no one ever said, "Hey, I want to see your remarks before you go on." They were my own.

WILLIAMS: Were you given time limitations?

SEN. GLENN: You want to keep it reasonably short. If I was the person actually introducing the President, turn to him, I might take another very few minutes, as opposed to if I was introducing somebody else who was going to introduce the President. But at an event like that, I think you can pretty easily wear out your welcome with the crowd. The crowd doesn't come to see me, and they don't come to see the mayors and the people like that. They're coming for one reason: they're there to see the President of the United States. Now, I know I have a good following of people all around Ohio or I wouldn't have been elected four times in Ohio. So at each one of these stops, there would be people who would be enthusiastic about my being there. But I usually tried to keep my remarks short, because they came to see the President, and I know that, and so the best thing I can do is give a good, fast introduction, make the points I make without deliberating on them any further and get on to introducing the President. That's who they came to see, and that's who you should focus on.

WILLAIMS: What about interaction with the press in events like that? I'm particularly thinking if you're giving pretty much the same introductory speech a number of times in the same day, do you just sort of say they're going to have to listen to this

again, or do you try to fashion things to keep them interesting? How does that work?

SEN. GLENN: No, you usually just go ahead and give it. The news of the day is not going to be John Glenn's introduction of the President, unless I came out with some bombast that just demanded attention. What they're there for it to cover the President and his proposals. Now I can add to that by what I say in advance of his proposals, "The President is against crime, and he's doing this," and I've got the facts and figures, and I may give some of those stats to sort of whip up a little advanced interest in it for the President, and I would do that. Anybody campaigning can't have a new campaign speech at every stop that is memorable. The presidential press people will let the press know that there's going to be some brand-new proposal in the speech he's going to give at a certain spot today, "So tune in, fellas, and listen." So you don't try to spring surprises on them. You try and help them cover what the President is doing.

But as far as my trying to make something different at every stop, no, I use a lot of the same things at most stops, although you tailor it. If it's going to be a crime speech, if you want an agriculture speech, well, you want a little different emphasis and things like that, but you come back to the economy and things like that as a standard part of the speech.

WILLIAMS: I'm curious. On that train, was one car Clinton's car and then another car would be staff's car and then a press car or something like that?

SEN. GLENN: It looked pretty much like a regular Amtrak train going by until you came to the last couple of cars, and those were cars that were old cars. They were ones that

had been used by, I think, Harry Truman, that they got out of some railroad museum someplace and used on this. I believe that that was the story, was that they were used by Harry Truman back in the whistle stop days. They had the platform on the back of the train set up with loudspeakers on it so you could stand on that back platform and address a whole great big crowd. They even had a whistle cord on the back of the train where the President would toot the whistle as they pulled out sometimes. So they had modified things a little bit, but those cars on the back of the train were pretty much furnished like they had been way back fifty years ago or whatever, longer than that. So they were sort of old style, but they were hooked on.

Then you went out of those last couple of cars up into the more modern cars, which is where they had the staff meetings and the meetings for VIPs that were along for a short part of the trip or something like that. Then the press cars were on up front, and they were modern train cars up there. When you saw the train go by, you saw the modern part of the train with the regular modern engine up front and then here are these couple of cars on the back that were old-style cars from back in the old days. The President gave speeches off the back of the train, and it was well received.

WILLIAMS: When did you first meet Clinton?

SEN. GLENN: I had met him a long time ago when he was still Governor of Arkansas. I guess it was at the national convention, maybe, in Atlanta. I think I had met him before that, maybe when I had been to a Governors' meeting. I think that's when I first met him. I don't recall the actual first time, but I think it was back when he was

Governor of Arkansas and probably here in Washington when he came to one of the Governors' meetings here, I believe.

WILLIAMS: Did you have a sense that he was going to go places?

SEN. GLENN: Oh, no. I liked him. He was a very pleasant and friendly type. I remember that. But I don't remember having any more sense of destiny for him than I did for a lot of people.

WILLIAMS: And can you get a read of how he sees you?

SEN. GLENN: I think as a friend. We talked about that some. One thing that happened back in the '92 campaign, I was up for election then myself. I guess it was three or four weeks, about three weeks out in the campaign, the numbers in Ohio at that time were very tight on the presidential race. Their polling, I think, had indicated that they were going down and they had limited resources and they might have to pull the plug on Ohio and save their money for other places. I had heard this.

We had what was called a unified campaign at that time. A lot of the advertising had been combined into one pot—my Senate campaign, the presidential campaign. They coordinated so that on posters and things you had all the candidates' names on this thing along with the President, coordinated things like that. And some effort had been put into that. We heard, sort of via the grapevine, that they might possibly be pulling out and putting their resources into someplace else, out of the unified campaign.

My figures showed that the President was probably going to win Ohio, out of the polling I had, and I was running myself. We were doing polling on a fairly regular basis. Plus I thought if they pulled out, this was going to affect my

campaign also. So I felt very strongly about this, and I felt very strongly that they could win Ohio if they stuck with it. There was a rally in Springfield, Ohio, and this was maybe, I guess, two and a half or three weeks before the end of the campaign, and I was to introduce the then-candidate. He wasn't President yet. He was the candidate Clinton at that rally, which I did. It was open air, in the evening.

I asked to have fifteen or twenty minutes with the President alone, just the two of us so I could talk to him. They set that up for me to ride with him in the limousine, just the two of us, back out to the airport, which was about a fifteen-minute ride, after the thing was over. So we rode back out to the airport, which was about a fifteen-minute ride, after the thing was over. So we rode back out to the airport, and I leaned on him pretty heavily about what my figures showed and that I knew, or I knew at that time, they were considering pulling out of Ohio. I let him have it on what I thought about this and how crazy I thought it was, and my figures showed him winning Ohio. I thought, if anything, a little more effort instead of less and we were going to carry Ohio for him. Obviously I had my own self-interest in this. And I really went at it. I talked to him like a Dutch uncle. I couldn't talk to him now like that, as the President.

We got out to the airport, and instead of just getting out and getting on the airplane, he wanted to talk more about this and asked me to come on the airplane so we could talk and we did. We sat there and delayed the departure of his airplane for maybe fifteen or twenty minutes while we talked some more about this. I never knew what impact I had, but we got word a few days later that they

had decided they were going to stick in Ohio and make more of an effort, and they did and carried Ohio. I was reelected, of course, with a good margin. So what impact I had on that, I didn't know.

After the election, then, there's one of the pictures of the President and me doing something and shaking hands at some event, and they sent this over, as they did to all the offices after the campaign. It was a courtesy to send these pictures around. He inscribed this thing, and it's on my office wall at the Senate now, and I don't have it exactly memorized, but it says something like, "To Senator Glenn, whose efforts kept us involved in Ohio and we won. Now we must do what's right for the nation," or something like that and signed "Bill Clinton." So that's on my office wall, and I was rather proud of that, because I think we did have an impact on that time.

It's always dangerous to take full credit for reversing anything of a decision like that, I know, but I think I did have an impact on that, and we joked about it later. When he was nominated in New York in '92, it was Ohio that put him over the top that night, and when it came to Ohio, as it turned out, on election night in '92, when the Ohio returns came in is when the networks said, "That's it." They called it for Clinton as winning when they got the Ohio results in the '92 election. So I reminded him of that, of course, this time around and used that some in my introductions of him in this campaign— was that we put him over at the convention in '92 and on election night Ohio was the state that put him over the top, and we're going to do it again this time. He got a kick out of that, and we laughed about it some.

WILLIAMS: That meeting in ’92 on the way to the airport probably established a kind of rapport and working relationship.

SEN. GLENN: Yes. Probably at that time, that’s probably the most I had—I had been with groups that met with him and talked about things and what the campaign was going to be like, but that would be groups of six or eight or ten Senators or something like that, that met with him to talk about their plans for the campaign and what we could do to help him in our individual states. But I guess that may have been the first time I really sat and talked just one-on-one with him. Him being President, I probably would have a hard time talking to him like that today. It was a pretty blunt conversation, I remember that.

WILLIAMS: Have you had other opportunities to explore an issue one-on-one like that, or is that just not possible?

SEN. GLENN: Oh, yes, we’ve talked, about different things like that in the campaign this time when I’d be with him in the car, just the two of us, and he’d have time. He’d have fifteen or twenty minutes or a half hour getting back to an airport or something like that.

WILLIAMS: The other thing that happened in November was your trip to the Far East. I was wondering if you would do a little review of that, too.

SEN. GLENN: This came just after the election. [Senator] Tom [Thomas A.] Daschle had set up a congressional delegation trip and included me on the trip. There were five of us, five Senators that were on the trip, and it was a fast trip. We were only gone out of Washington for nine days, but we left the Friday after the election, I guess,

and we were back in Washington by the following Sunday, a week later. So it was a very fast trip.

Tom had had it set up to meet with some of the heads of state out in the Far East, which is one of the fastest developing areas in the world and one that I had followed a lot. My own background in that area goes clear back to 1946, when I was a pilot, a fighter pilot in a Marine fighter squadron and was stationed just out of Peking, China, then. In fact, it was from where you come out of the Forbidden City and head south, straight across what is now Tiananmen Square, which wasn't even there at that time. That was all little narrow streets and little shops and some houses and places where people lived. Tiananmen Square didn't get cleared out and made like it is until later, but this was in '46.

The squadron I was with was there supporting General George Marshall's peace teams that were out there trying to negotiate a peace between Chiang Kai-shek's forces, the Nationalist forces, Kuomintang, and the Chinese communists, the long marches that had come up, all that group that made the four-thousand-mile march or whatever it was. We flew North China patrol every day, which was down low, about five hundred to a thousand feet in the old Corsairs, the F-4U Corsair. We had guns loaded and bombs on, and it was in case we ran into some fighting we'd be prepared to take part in it, but it was mainly to look for road cuts and bridges and to sort of show the flag, that we were there, and show a presence as much as anything else.

So I had started out in China and got very interested in it. That was old China back in those days. I mean, there weren't any big buildings in Peking or

anything like that like you have now. We got to some other places there. We went down to Tsinsin [phonetic], which is the Marine Division headquarters at that time, and we'd go down for gunnery training, down at Tsingtao, which was on the Gulf of China, but we basically flew back and forth on this North China patrol. We were there for about six months, and it was my first experience to really be on the ground in the Far East, and I got a great interest in that area and have followed very closely all the things that have developed since that time.

When we were there, things were tough. There was starvation in some of the villages near Peking. UNRA, the United Nations Relief, people would come out and do drops of flour and rice out in some of these villages, a drop from the air. I remember one thing I found amazing was that they'd do a drop, and within two or three days some of these UNRA food bags would show up on the black market, for sale in the market back behind the Peking Hotel. In other words, there was such control out in the villages, they wouldn't even let the people eat what was dropped. They would bring it back in and sell it. So, anyway, there were lots of things like that, that I didn't like about what was going on in China at that time, but I've kept a big interest all these years and have been back to China a number of times.

I spent three weeks there with Mike Mansfield back when he was still majority leader in the Senate. We were out in Far West China, out in Harumchi [phonetic], out in Tsinjong [phonetic] autonomous region out there where there are thirteen different nationality areas. Fascinating area. I've been back to China many times.

Anyway, this trip to the Far East with Tom Daschle was going to fly straight through and go to Vietnam, to old Saigon, now Ho Chi Minh City, then up to Hanoi, to Beijing, to Hong Kong, Taiwan, and back, which we did in nine days. It was a rather remarkable trip in that we got most of the meetings we wanted with all the top officials. We went first to Japan, stayed overnight there, went with Ambassador "Fritz" Mondale, came out to Yokoda [phonetic] Air Base and met with us to brief us on how he sees Japan now, and he's leaving as our ambassador to Japan. He's coming back on the fifteenth of December, so he's a short-timer out there now.

We flew then down to old Saigon, Ho Chi Minh City, and made a stop there overnight. On the way down, it happened to be the Marine Corps birthday, which is always celebrated in the Marine Corps, and, unknown to me, they'd brought along a big Marine birthday cake. We had a party in the airport on the way from Japan to Saigon, which I got a kick out of. That's a big event in the Marine Corps every year, the annual Marine Corps birthday. Where any two Marines get together, they always have some sort of a birthday cake they cut, so I got a kick out of that.

Saigon, Ho Chi Minh City, we had some briefings there. First time I had been there. I'd been to Hanoi a couple of times, but first time there. One of the reasons for the stop there was to let Senator [Patrick] Leahy and us along with him, go out to a place where they're doing prosthetic limb replacement on people who have gotten their limbs blown off by land mines or whatever, or some that have had polio, but mainly ones who had been hurt by land mines. Pat has had a

big push on the last couple of years to help make land mines illegal around the world and to help correct some of these things. There are a couple of foundations where they now help people who have had limbs blown off by land mines.

We visited the place out there that is right on the edge of Ho Chi Minh City where they're doing some of this work through a foundation and actually manufacturing wheelchairs and these limb replacements right there on the site. We went out there, and actually there were about twenty people there who were getting their wheelchairs for the first time, and they'd practiced in wheelchairs, but they were getting their own wheelchair for the first time. I actually lifted two of there people, no legs. One had one leg and one arm, so he hobbled around some. The other leg was damaged some. But two people I actually lifted into their wheelchairs for the first time, and we each did that. So it was quite a moving experience. I remember saying, when we got back into the van going back to the hotel, driving back into town, if anybody had any gripes and expressed them in the van on the way back to town, they'd get thrown out, as far as I was concerned, because what we had just seen was very, very impressive as to what happens out there. They've been able to service something like five thousand people just in South Vietnam, in that general area around Saigon. They estimate there was another fifty thousand, probably, waiting to have some of these prosthetic devices and wheelchairs.

So that was one of our main stops there, as well as looking around the city a little bit and going by the old U.S. Embassy where I remember seeing the last helicopter flights out of Vietnam, bringing people out. We talked to some of the

people involved with that. On up to Hanoi, and we had a whole list of things there on trade matters, POW-MIA matters. We met with a lot of their top officials, including the Secretary General or the General Secretary of the Communist party, which is still running that area, of course, briefed for their own POW people. They have not been denied access to anywhere they want to go.

I think it's interesting that the Vietnamese keep pointing out they still have some 300,000 people missing of their own that they can't account for, and a lot of their people go and have little religious Buddhist services or some kind of services at the last place they know of where their relative, their family, their father, their brother, whoever it was, the last place where they were seen.

On previous visits to Hanoi, when I was there with [Senator] John McCain and [Senator] John Kerry from Massachusetts to look into some of the POW matters, two trips I'd made over the past years, they had brought this up. We came back and asked our Pentagon people to send out every bit of information they could to help locate some of their people, where they were last seen, or dead, buried, what ever our records showed. It turned out we were able to generate somewhere over three million pieces of paper that went out there, some from the veterans' organizations in this country, to help them somewhat. We are down to the last 2,100-some cases where we don't know what happened, and those have all been investigated, and we're down to only the last fifty-one or fifty-three cases that are being reinvestigated now at least for the second time, some for the third time on what happened to the people.

There's still some 8,000 of our people missing out of Korea and 26,000 out of World War II. So I think that in Vietnam, for all the political reasons as well as for the personal interest of families and veterans' groups, I think we've done a pretty good job of getting about all the information there is to get out of that area.

[Begin Interview 3, Tape 2, Side B]

WILLIAMS: Okay. You were talking about being in Hanoi.

SEN. GLENN: Yes, Hanoi. We talked about trade matters. I'll be making other trip reports on this, so I won't go into too much detail on it, but it's interesting to see some of the trends in Vietnam. Even though it's still Communist and still ruled by the Communist party, they've now elected and the assembly, for the first time, is really debating a few things and making recommendations to the General Secretary, and then the General Secretary is asking them to talk about certain things. So even in Vietnam, Communist Vietnam, where the last full big statue of Lenin, I think, maybe even left in the whole world is out in front of the Assembly Building, even there things are moving in the free enterprise—I won't say democratic way yet—but trade and business and the move toward free enterprise and, as they call it, they say they want free enterprise ,but with a Socialist orientation. Now, I'm not quite sure how you do all that, but things are moving, and we had good meetings there.

We then went on up to Beijing and met with the Vice Foreign Minister. The Foreign Minister was out of the country. We met with the Defense Minister

who now just arrived in this country, this being the sixth of December. He just arrived for about a two-week visit in this country. We met with him out there and expressed a lot of our views on military matters and their sales of weaponry to other countries and nuclear cooperation and things like that, that I particularly was interested in. We had a lengthy meeting with Jiang Zemin, the President of China, about an hour and fifteen minutes or so with him in a regular session, and went out of that into a dinner meeting that went on for another couple of hours, two or two and a half hours, and wound up with him giving us, at the end of the dinner, as we're leaving—this was held in a room outside the Great Hall of the People on Tiananmen Square—and he then gave us a tour of the Great Hall of the People, the big thing that holds eight or ten thousand people, where they have their general party meetings. Some of that comes because of Diane Feinstein, she's a senator now, of course, and she was mayor of San Francisco for a number of years when Jiang Zemin was mayor of Shanghai, and they had a sister-city relationship and used to visit back and forth.

Our discussion with him covered a whole broad array of things. It was nuclear non-proliferation that I'm particularly interested in and trade matters, intellectual property rights that have been a big issue recently, of course, as to whether they control—the Chinese stealing disk-manufacture techniques and things from us, things like that.

About three weeks before we were out there, there had been a meeting of the International Astronautical Federation out there, and the Chinese had taken that occasion to confirm what had been rumored for a long time, that they might

be embarked on a manned space program. They had confirmed that, yes, they are going along that line, and I proposed to Jiang Zemin how I thought this was a wasteful move on their part, in that we have the international space station in our own country going up with the first hardware to be put up in the latter part of '97. In fact, just a couple of weeks before that, I had visited Huntsville, Alabama, and had seen the first sixty tons or so, about 120,000 pounds—all ready to go right now to be launched next year—of some of these modules, and that I thought that since we had had thirty-some different cooperative scientific and technical arrangements, agreements, with them going as far back as '79, that we should be cooperating in this area instead of setting up competitive programs.

We had competitive programs with the Soviets, and now we're working together, and while I had no proposal to make from the President—these were just my own ideas—that I thought we'd do well to get together and work together in space instead of separately. He said, well, he hadn't been briefed on all the details of their program, but it was certainly interesting, and he would pass this along. I sent word over to the White House on what I proposed over there as well as to NASA here, so we'll see where it goes. I don't know whether anything will come of it or not, but I do believe that it's foolish for them to be going through something like this of their own development. I told him I thought there was no point in reinventing history, repeating history for a second time. We spent forty years getting this capability to do what we're going to do on the International Space Station and that I thought we should use our efforts together in the future.

That was a very interesting meeting, because there were a lot of toasts and things like that at the dinner, and he was quite in a good mood that night, so we had quite an exchange. This occurred just before he was going to meet with the President at the economic meeting.

We left there and went down to Hong Kong, and, of course, obviously, there the big issue and area of interest is what's going to happen to Hong Kong when it reverts back to China at the end of June '97. My own view encapsulated is that I think it will go more smoothly than most people think because it's in China's best interest to make it go smoothly. Most of what is not known by people, they have enormous investment in Hong Kong themselves, and a lot of their investment in Hong Kong has gone out of Hong Kong to other investments around the world. If Hong Kong came a cropper and was not viable after this, it would hurt the Chinese. But on the other hand, they're very proud that they're determining their own future now and nobody's going to dictate to them. But I think the whole thing will go smoothly.

Another thing that mitigates in that directly, it seems to me, is the fact that some 60 billion in new investment in China has come in through Hong Kong, and much of the employment in the factories and so on is financed out of Hong Kong in the whole southern region of China, that whole southern area of Guangjo [phonetic] and Old Canton and that area. So I think that's going to go more smoothly than we might think.

We met with some of the so-called opposition leaders, Martin Li [phonetic]. He's more the democracy party program in Hong Kong, who thinks

we should be keeping the Chinese feet to the fire more than we are, maybe. And we met with An Sun Chan [phonetic], who is the Secretary for Hong Kong, who is going to be a most influential lady. She runs the whole civil service setup in Hong Kong, which is looked at as a model for the rest of the world, almost. She's made a number of trips to this country, and I've met her out there before, not only in Hong Kong, but here when she was here last April or May. I met with her and talked about some of the problems involved with this transfer. We also met with Grover Chris [Christopher] Patten. He's the British Governor for Hong Kong, will be leaving at the end of June when the Chinese take over. We had a lengthy meeting with him on his views as well as meetings with our own consul there as to what our official position is, which is one of cooperation, obviously.

We left there then went up to Taiwan, met with a number of people in the Taiwanese government, including the President, Lee Teng-hui, who caused problems a couple of years ago when he came to this country and went to Cornell [University] and made his speech—or, to some people's way of thinking, infamous speech—there that set off the Chinese, the People's Republic of China Chinese, the mainland Chinese, at that time and is still something that they bring up at almost every meeting. So we had a lengthy meeting with him and then flew straight back from out there. To do all that in nine days was a very hurried trip, but it was most productive.

Let me just comment on these trips in general, because we find the press and a lot of people who think these trips are nothing but vacation trips when you

go out on something like this. The press just loves, of course, to put the worst possible light on these trips, the junkets and all of that. And there are some trips that go out of Congress that are like that. I haven't seen many on the Senate side since I've been there, but I have seen some. I have been over in some foreign areas when some of the trips from the House of Representatives came through, and I think that while there are problems with Senate trips also, I think that there's been more flagrant—in my opinion, there has been more flagrant violation of what I view to be ethics and really performing solid work on these trips. I think there's been more abuse of that over in the House perhaps than there has been in the Senate.

I can say without any qualms of conscience whatsoever that every trip I have ever been on since I've been in the Senate—and I've been on a lot of trips—every trip has been a working, working trip where you came back needing a vacation at the end of the trip, and that's true of almost every trip I've been on. I think these are extremely valuable trips. Getting out and contacting you counterparts or meeting heads of state and giving them our views, and we give them quite candidly, gives them a view of what is possible in this country, and it gives them a sense of appreciation for something that most of the rest of the nations of the world do not appreciate, and that is the difference between our democracy and how it operates and other democracies around the world.

Almost every other democracy in the world is a parliamentary democracy, where they have a Prime Minister. The party is in greater control. They determine who runs. In a parliamentary system, the Prime Minister and the party

speak with authority for that government, and if a Prime Minister goes someplace and makes a commitment for his government, that's binding. He backs it up. His party backs it up. They're in every position of authority in the country, and if there is a great hue and cry against what he has committed, then the government falls and they have a new election.

In our country, we don' operate on that basis. We operate on split powers, which is very difficult for other countries to understand, because 90 percent of their dealing in other countries is with democracies that work on a parliamentary basis. And they have trouble grasping this. We had no less a person than, two trips back to China, we met with the Defense Minister, and in his remarks, he was commenting on the criticism of some of the Chinese policies in the Congress, the criticism in Congress, and his statement was, "Why don't you just keep them quiet? Why don't you just tell them not to say what they're saying and take care of it, stop it?" Well, I thought that was too much to let go by, so when it came my time for questions or for comment, I gave him a little mini-lecture on how we have split powers here and how we couldn't shut somebody up if we wanted to, and then went on as to why, and that even a President does not speak with authority for this country unless it has congressional approval, budget approval, and so on, and that we're a different kind of democracy. We're the most free democracy in the world, and these people don't understand this.

So the point is that when we go to some of these places and we let them know and we express our views from the Congress and from the Senate and let them know that nothing goes forward unless the appropriations are there from

our end of the avenue, end of Pennsylvania Avenue, and the President leads, and we hope to work with the President in this kind of leadership role, but nothing is absolutely certain. Nothing is as certain in our policy in this country as it is in a parliamentary situation, unless there is general approval of the Congress, and there always are splits within the Congress. There are splits between the parties. There are splits between the House and the Senate. And so I think these trips, if nothing else, even though we get a tremendous amount out of this ourselves in understanding their viewpoint of things, which can guide us here, they get an understanding of our system that I think is absolutely critical for the future.

So, contrary to what the press may write and the general impression, then, that's left with a lot of people in this country, I think these trips are extremely valuable, and I've advocated to new people coming into the Senate, new Senators, that they go on trips. I think you do your country and yourself good in informing yourself and in representing your constituents about what's best in our dealing with different parts of the world if you go there. It's a working trip, and set up with a schedule like we had on this last trip. Set up with a working schedule. Sure, you're going to take an hour to run through the National Museum or whatever on your way out. You'd be crazy if you didn't, and they appreciate that. That's part of being there, appreciating their culture and their background and being out on the street. What is the impression of the people now of our country?

One thing that just popped to my mind. A shocker to me was in Vietnam, our chargé d'affaires, who is in charge of our representation in Hanoi right now

because our new ambassador hasn't been approved of yet—Pete Peterson, a congressman who was a prisoner of war out there during the war, he's going to be our new ambassador. But the chargé remarked—I said, "What's the general view of the people toward the United States?"

He said, "Oh, it's excellent." He said, "For instance, when I drive out through the countryside in my embassy car, and there's a flag on it, of course, when the people see the American flag, 'Hey!' and they're clapping like this, and the children give a V sign like this, like that, run along and laugh and yell, and I wave back at them."

I said, "Well, is this just a certain area?"

"No," he said, "that's the general attitude."

And I couldn't believe this. And so when we met with the General Secretary of the Communist party, I told him that, about what the chargé had said, and I said, "I find this very hard to believe. Why would this be?" I said, "Here we are less than twenty-one years later after the helicopter pictures coming off the top of the embassy in Saigon, and we were hard at war at that time. You were taking over Saigon." He was one of the generals at that time. And I said, "Here we are twenty-one years later, and your people now think we're the biggest friends they have, even out in the villages. This isn't something that's put on just here in Hanoi. This is something that's put on by the children, and the kids, the people out giving this kind of reception to our chargé."

And he laughed, and he said, through an interpreter, of course, he said, "No, it's not put-on." He said, "We have a history of four thousand years, and

we've been overrun. We've had aggressors and transgressors come in here over all these four thousand years, and we've had to recover, and we get back to working with people as fast as we can."

I said, "Well, does that even apply to the French who were in here and dominated this area and just basically robbed your land for so many years?"

He said, "Yes." He said, "The French get the same kind of reception." He said, "We recover from these things. We've had a history of that, and we look into the future, not the past, and we want to work with Americans and with the French and with everybody." He said, "So that's the general feeling of the people, not just something we put on here in Hanoi."

Well, I thought that was very interesting. I would not have had that kind of understanding of this had I not been on that trip and run into this, and yet that does me a lot of good here when I'm considering things with regard to Vietnam. I'm not for turning over everything to Vietnam, but it puts a little bit different light on it as to whether they're out there just trying to take advantage of us in some way or whether it's truly a relationship we can develop for the future.

So it's just one fact to store in your mind when you're considering some of these things, along with how they've acted on the POW-MIA thing. I think their handling of that has been very, very good. So the point being, you learn a lot of things on these trips. You get a lot of impressions you wouldn't get by other than just being there and by seeing things and knowing what they're up against, and going out in the villages, maybe, and seeing the standard of living and some of their problems as to why they can't do some of the things that we would like to

see them do and why they have to move at a pace that we have gone through in this country maybe a hundred years ago, advances that we made that they're just now coming up to considering. It gives you an understanding of people around the world on these trips that I think is very, very valuable. I encourage these trips, and I don't care what anybody thinks about it, I think they're valuable for helping determine the future of this country and our relationships with all these places around the world.

WILLIAMS: Using this particular trip as an example, you said six Senators selected?

SEN. GLENN: We had five. Oh, they were just selected as people that Tom Daschle knew were interested in these things. Pat Leahy went. He was interested in this thing in Saigon as well as he's headed up the Appropriations Committee and is the ranking minority member on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, so he deals with these matters, what funding we have out to those areas as all times. Tom Daschle, who was leading it as minority leader, had done some travel out in those areas but not extensively, and he wanted to get more established in his own area with all those countries. Byron Dorgan is handling monitoring of the floor of the Senate and works very closely as an assistant to Tom Daschle with regard to debates on the floor. Dirk Kempthorne was the only—he was a Republican. They asked him to go on the trip. He hadn't done any travel out in the Far East and wanted to go in particular to get up to speed himself out in that area, and I think that was good, and it gave a bipartisan flavor to this, too. Diane Feinstein was with us in China, Beijing, and in Hong Kong and then she stayed out there. She was looking at something in Nepal, also, and wanted to go up there, where

there's a lot of problems also. So that was sort of the way the whole thing was put together.

WILLIAMS: And how was the agenda developed?

SEN. GLENN: Tom knew where he wanted to go and asked what we thought of the agenda. I thought the agenda was fine. I thought, if anything, it was too full. But we got them all in, and it was very, very productive. You don't have much time at each spot, and you're in, unpacked, pack again, and get out of a lot of hotels, but it was a very, very productive trip. The only way you can do something like that in the short time period we did was take our own airplane, which we did. We had one of those special air mission airplanes that we went in. So that helped do some of the traveling in the time that we had. We could not have done it had we gone commercial, not in that same time period.

WILLIAMS: Explain what that is, the special air mission.

SEN. GLENN: Out of Andrews [Air Force Base] they have some Air Force airplanes that are set up for travel for the State Department, for Defense travel, for officials to travel abroad in. You have tables, you have a couple of roomettes where you can meet, you can have conferences, you can do a lot of work going back and forth while you're being transported to these things. They're much more convenient, because you don't have to always be checking in and off of airlines, and staff can go with you on these things. On occasion, you can use these for congressional delegations as well as travel that the President uses or President's staff or State Department or Defense Department. So you put in for these things, and if there is an available plane during that period, why, you can get one of those. You can't take it just for

one Senator or something like that, but a group, as we had, and going on this kind of a mission, why, we had our own airplane for this, and that really helps out a lot with getting a lot done in a short time. It's well worth it, I think.

WILLIAMS: Which service operates this?

SEN. GLENN: Air Force operates them out of Andrews, Andrews Air Force Base here in Washington.

WILLIAMS: How large a staff did you take with you?

SEN. GLENN: I didn't take anybody of my own on this. Tom had staff going, and I could work with his staff, and that was fine. You prepare books with voluminous reading material ahead of time on all the issues that we are going to bring up while we're out there, so they know our views on it, and you do an awful lot of reading and an awful lot of study ahead of time and on the trip if you do it right. Now I've seen people go on these trips and never even look in the book, of course, but people who take this on as a responsible mission where you really can accomplish something, really go into some of the background of it, and staff prepares that. Each person has their own notebook ahead of time with all the background as well as State Department briefing papers, suggested questions and suggested answers for things we know that they are interested in.

China always thinks we're trying to contain them, the big word "containment," and I don't blame them for being paranoid after Yangtze River gunboats and spheres of influence and opium wars and all the things they've been through in the past. But when they get into this containment, what's our response? Well, there can be some suggested responses thought out in advance,

as well as what we each individually feel. So you take each issue that they may bring up, and you try and do briefings on that so we'll know what's going on and be prepared to have these discussions with them.

WILLIAMS: These materials are mainly prepared by the State Department?

SEN. GLENN: No, by our own staff here. In this case by Tom Daschle's staff here and in consulting with some of the other staffs also. There would be material from the State Department, some of the country briefings and things like that that the State Department has available.

I might comment just on the meetings themselves. When you're out there they take on sort of a pattern. They're the same about wherever you go. You're ushered into whatever the room is, and it's usually rather a ceremonial room, and there are chairs set around in sort of a big U shape, and there'll be a couple of main chairs where whoever the dignitary is that you're visiting will sit in one, the leader of the CODEL, congressional delegation, will sit in the other, and then the rest of us are lined up down along one side, and the people on the other side, they'll have their experts and interpreters. The interpreter usually sits behind the two people up here at the head.

These are usually ornate rooms with big red velvet chairs and things like that, like you've seen in some of the pictures. It would be typical. And they usually come in, and there usually is an opening statement by each of the two leaders, and sometimes that goes on for a while, and sometimes it doesn't. Sometimes those are very short and you get right into it.

Jiang Zemin, for instance, President of China, gave Tom Daschle, "Thank you for spending time with us," started off with that. He later responded with a rather lengthy statement of how valuable he thought some of these legislative visits were. It gives him a better understanding. And then some of his own background and where he came from, which we already knew pretty much, but it led to his own interest in going back recently, looking at some of the science and technology advances we have made in the world. He started off as an electrical engineer, graduated from Shanghai University back in 1947, which he said at that time was looked at as a Chinese M.I.T. [Massachusetts Institute of Technology], had that ranking in their education system, and many of his colleagues went to work out on Taiwan. He was a secret member of the Communist party then. He didn't want to go to Taiwan, and so he stayed where he was, but he runs into his colleagues occasionally.

He said he'd been reading some about how we'd come through the Industrial Revolution with different advances, how electricity then came into common use. First it was direct current, then we went to alternating current which could be sent greater distances and went through this and how he'd read some books on—nuclear electrical generation wasn't even thought of when he was in school, but he's read books on it since then, one by an American. He named the book, whatever it was, and talked about how he hoped we had fusion power. He finished up by saying that some of these things, long-term trends of the future, are what world leaders should be concentrating on and thinking about, because they're going to determine much of what happens in the world.

Then the typical format for one of these meetings would be that Tom might ask a couple of questions on his own that he wants to ask, and then would turn to each of us, and we'd each have a turn, then, to ask Jiang Zemin questions or make a comment, which is where I made my proposal about the space program, during my time period, and asked a couple of questions. Others would have other questions on trade matters. Byron Dorgan talked a lot about trade matters, how we're running a $38-billion-a-year trade deficit with China right now, can't sustain that for very long, how we're going to solve that and get his views on that personally. So each person would have a time period of their own to ask questions or make comments on what he had said.

By the time you get done with all that, you've used up about and hour and a half, which is about your allotted time. In this case, then we went into dinner and continued some of these discussions at dinner, in addition to having about as good Chinese food as you'll ever have, obviously. So that would be typical of how these things are run. You come in, the opening statements, maybe another statement by the leader, questions by each person. If you're running short on time, somebody may not get to ask a question sometimes.

WILLIAMS: Is there sometimes follow-up from one of these visits?

SEN. GLENN: Yes, there may be follow-up on it. We will maybe say that we'll get some information back to them, and we'll follow up on that with a letter when we get back. Or, something they don't understand, we'll say, "We don't have time to give some of the detail you obviously want. We'll be glad to do a paper on this and send it to you when we get back," and we do that. I plan to follow up

however I can with this space idea. I think that's too good a one to let lie. I'll probably follow up on it first with the ambassador here in Washington. First we'll probably get an official reaction or semi-official reaction out of NASA and the White House to make sure I'm not off doing something they would disagree with, but having done that then, I would probably make a letter on this or formalize it more than I did out there and probably work with the National Security Council staff here on something like that also.

WILLIAMS: Are you running into similar delegations from other countries?

SEN. GLENN: Yes. Sometimes you cross paths with them, and sometimes you cross paths with some of your own delegations. We got to Hong Kong and ran into some of our people that were out there on a separate trip. They weren't on the same itinerary we were, but they came through Hong Kong, because everyone's interested right now in what happens in summer of '97 with Hong Kong. It's going to be one to really watch very closely.

[Begin Interview 3, Tape 3, Side A]

SEN. GLENN: Sometimes spouses are on the trip and sometimes not. Sometimes you judge that by what social functions are going to be on the trip. If you know there's going to be receptions and dinners and things like that where wives of the foreign officials will be there, then spouses almost always go on ones like that. If it's going to be a rush trip like this one was and there will be less of that, sometimes you don't take your spouse. Although when we had our own airplane, it doesn't cost any more in transportation expense to take a spouse along. Where there are

dinners and things like that, where there are expenses where we are hosting them or something, then we pay for that. There's a *pro rata,* and I write a check to them to cover Annie's expenses while we were on the trip, and that goes back into the U.S. Treasury.

I would say that probably since I've been in the Senate, trips abroad I've made, maybe half of them, Annie's been on the trips. I like to have her go along, not just for the company, but I like to have her go along because it helps to have her understand these things, too, in our discussion of the night, and she certainly enjoys it. Hotel expenses, things like that where there's an extra cost because a spouse was along, difference charge, I reimburse that out of my own pocket. Everyone else does, too. It comes out as no additional expenses to the government.

WILLIAMS: As you flew from Hanoi up to Beijing, were you looking out the window of the plane and seeing some things you remember from '46?

SEN. GLENN: Oh, yes, to some extent. Well, we covered North China, mainly, and coming in up there you can see some of the same areas. Well, particularly when you take off out of Beijing now, you go up over the Great Wall area. All that area around Beijing, when I get up in there, I see a lot of things that I recognized in that area and particularly the Great Wall, when you can see it. It's only like, whatever it is, twenty-five miles north of Beijing is where it comes to. But a lot of it has changed in that area, too. Just the land and the way it looks, that's pretty much the same, although they've planted a lot of trees since back in those days, so you see a little bit more greenery around there when you come in now than you used

to. And there are a lot of new roads. Just the road in from the airport, the new airport you go into now in Beijing wasn't even there when I was there in '46. It's new since then. Even when I started going into that new airport back some years ago, the road into town was a little old bumpy two-lane thing. Now they've got a big modern road that goes right into town.

Beijing itself has changed dramatically—high-rise buildings, big, modern hotels and office buildings and things like that that weren't there even ten years ago, twelve years ago. When I was there in '46, you had one spot, one major building in downtown Peking, it was at that time, and that was the old Peking Hotel. It was about six floors, six or seven floors, and that was the tallest building in downtown. Now you have thirty-, forty-, fifty-story office buildings and hotels in downtown Beijing and big wide streets where you used to have people out on the street, thousands upon thousands of bicycles and a few cars, mainly government cars, but thousands upon thousands of bicycles, and now there are automobile traffic jams all over the place that delay you where you're going to go. And still a lot of bicycles, but thousands upon thousands of automobiles. The automobiles, that thing has occurred in just the last six or eight years; it's fairly recent.

WILLIAMS: Today is December sixth, and I was thinking maybe we could transition back now at this point. Do you want to talk about your recollection of December seventh?

SEN. GLENN: December 7, 1941?

WILLIAMS: That's right.

SEN. GLENN: Yes. I was in my junior year in Muskingum College at that time and was pursuing a major in chemistry, and thought perhaps I wanted to go into medicine eventually. Pearl Harbor occurred, and we found it hard to believe that anyone would do something like that, any nation would do that. I already had my private pilot's license at that time. I'd gotten it the previous year. There was a program just before World War II called the Civilian Pilot Training Program, CPT. It was a program the government started to get a bigger cadre of people with their pilot's licenses, and I don't know whether someone in the government had a prediction that World War II was coming or what, but anyway, it was a program that was administered through colleges that wanted to do this.

I had always been interested in flying, never had any idea I would be able to be a pilot myself up to that point, but I had made a lot of model airplanes ever since I was a kid and flew them, they'd crash and I'd put them back together again and try again. Anyway, CPT came along, and you could get college credit for it because you were going to be studying navigation and aerodynamics and thermodynamics and all these things that were worthy of college credit. I thought that was too good to miss, to get your pilot's license and get some college credit for it at the same time. So I signed up for that and got it, and we drove back and forth to the little airport at New Philadelphia, Ohio, during that time, and I got my private pilot's license. When World War II broke out, or at Pearl Harbor, I had probably sixty-five or seventy hours of flight time grand total, something like that, which isn't much, looking back on it, but I was proud of it.

Having grown up in New Concord and having grown up in a very, very patriotic community and family, and my dad had been in World War I and was very proud of his service to the country, and I was proud of him and his service to the country, too. I thought it was my duty, and I still believe it was right that I not stay in school but I do what I could in war, so I applied.

Another fellow and I, Dane Handschy, who's one of my closest friends, he and I signed up at the same time. We had first gone in and signed up to go into the Army Air Corps, as it was at that time. That was prior to it being called the Air Force. I'd actually been sworn in and then went back and didn't get orders, didn't get orders, didn't get orders, and I was getting disgusted with this, and went to the Navy. I was having some second thoughts, anyway, about the Army Air Corps and decided I would rather be in the Navy or Marine Corps anyway, and went in and talked to them. I passed their physical and signed up all over again and got my orders a couple of months later and started training, then, in March of 1942.

Let me back up a minute. I still remember leaving New Concord because I was to go to Iowa for my first training, and left on the train out of the old train station, on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad out of New Concord, which isn't there now; it's torn down. But that was going to be the biggest trip I'd ever made in my life. I was to go to Chicago and transfer to a train and go to Iowa City, Iowa, at the University of Iowa, which is where they had a three-month program of pre-flight training, which was academics and physical conditioning. I went

there then, and it was a very strenuous program of physical training, mainly, and indoctrination.

I was transferred then to Olathe, Kansas, to the primary flight training school at Olathe, Kansas, and it was just opening up. They'd just put the field in, just built the barracks, and we were the first ones in there. In fact, we were about two weeks ahead of when they could let us use the barracks, they were that new, and so we were held at the old reserve base in downtown Kansas City for a couple of weeks, and then went out and started training out there. We flew the old open cockpit, what came to be known as the Yellow Peril. They were Steerman aircraft, two-wing airplanes, open cockpit. We trained there, then, for about three months through primary training and through soloing there, and then down to Corpus Christi [Texas] for basic and advanced training down at Corpus Christi.

I graduated out of Corpus Christi, got my wings and graduated out of Corpus Christi. The types of airplanes down in Corpus Christi, then, the basic trainer, was a single-engine airplane. Some of them were made by Vaultee [phonetic]. We flew those during basic training, which let you get some experience, not just with a two-wing very light airplane, but with heavier airplanes of the combat type you might be flying later on. These were airplanes of comparable weight to combat aircraft, so they were a little different type airplane. And you got some instrument training there, where you flew strictly by reference to instruments.

Then at the end of basic, by that time I had decided I wanted to go in the Marine Corps, and I had applied for the Marine Corps and had been accepted. So

I knew I was going to get my commission in the Marine Corps, which all Marine pilots go through Navy flight training. So, in asking for a Marine commission, I knew I'd still get carrier qualification, all sorts of things like that later on.

The rumor that went around the cadet corps down there at Corpus Christi at that time was that those going into fighters in the Marine Corps were going to get P-38s; the Marine Corps was going to get a whole stable of P-38s. Now, the P-38, you may recall, is that twin-boom, twin-tail, two-engine fighter plane in World War II. It was a very good fighter. I had applied for the Marine Corps, and I wanted to get into fighters. That seemed to be where the action was out in the Pacific, and the thought of the Marine Corps getting P-38s was great.

So, another fellow and I, Tom Miller, who it still one of my very closest friends—he wound up as a lieutenant general in the Marine Corps, finally, in charge of all Marine aviation—but he and I were in training together at Corpus Christi and met each other there. The rumor was that those people that were going to be assigned to fighters in the Marine Corps and assigned to P-38s would be the ones that had multi-engine time, and there was only one multi-engine airplane used in advanced training at Corpus Christi, and that was the old Catalina Flying Boat, the twin-engine flying boat. So we applied for flying boat training for our advanced training and were accepted, so we spent our advanced training days in Corpus Christi out in old Catalina, the PBY, landing on the water and doing night landings on the water and going out on gunnery training where you fired out of the blisters on the back of the airplane. Anyway, it was interesting

training, and I look back on it now with some fondness even now, after the way things have all worked out. Anyway, we both graduated, got our wings.

I went home then and was married. I think I graduated on a Thursday, rode the train back to New Concord from Corpus Christi. Annie and I were married, a church wedding, in the United Presbyterian Church the next Tuesday, I think it was, on April sixth, and went to Columbus, Ohio, for a very short two-day honeymoon, back, and spent the rest of our ten days of leave there in New Concord, and then on to Cherry Point, North Carolina, where, when I checked in, I expected to see out on the flight line my big P-38 out there.

Well, as it turned out, that had been nothing but a rumor back in those days, and the Marine Corps had no plans to get P-38s, so we were assigned to the PBJ squadron, which is the old B-25, the Navy and Marine Corps version of the B-25, the Billy Mitchell-type airplane, the kind that made the first attack on Tokyo.

We were assigned to that squadron, except they had too many people. So then we were transferred out to California, to the West Coast, and were put in the transport outfit. They were going to make transport pilots out of us. Well, Tom and I managed to get transferred into a fighter squadron on the other side of the field, and there's a long story in each one of these steps, but we finally wound up in fighters, the old F-4F Grumman Wildcat, and trained there a little bit. Then over to El Centro, California, for our major training and re-equipping into F-4Us, the Corsairs, before we went overseas then at the end of '43.

WILLIAMS: That's a lot of history there.

SEN. GLENN: Well, I went through a lot of that there, just sort of thumbnail sketch. I don't know how much detail you want on each one of these. There are a thousand stories to be told in each one of those stops.

WILLIAMS: I would like to get some detail. I don't think we have time for all of it today, but let's start with that trip as you left New Concord. That was a major step for you. Can you recreate any part of that train trip?

SEN. GLENN: Well, yes. I remember very well the send-off there at the station, my dad and mother there, of course. Mother had been through this once before, World War I, when she sent my dad off to France, and so she was a little emotional. Mother was a very stable lady, but she was pretty emotional about my leaving to go to war.

I remember when I was in school—and let's go back to that time, when I was in school. I remember shortly after Pearl Harbor, just a few days, I remember sitting at the dinner table one evening, and after we were done, I said, "I've decided what I would like to do. I'd like to go in, and I'd like to go in flying." A lot of the other people at that time were doing everything they could to stay in college. There was this program at that time. What was it called? What is this program where people could put in to finish their four years of college, and a lot of people did it just to avoid going in? I can't think of the name. It was like ROTC, but it wasn't ROTC, but it was a special training program to let people—AFTC or something like that, and I can't think of the name of it. A lot of people were putting in for that. That had been announced, and it was to let people stay in college and be exempt from military service until they completed their college

degree. Well, I could have stayed in at least another two years in that if I'd wanted to, but I didn't want to do that.

My dad and mother said they would support what I wanted to do, but why didn't I finish my college education. My dad probably a little less than my mother, because I think my dad knew how I felt about it. He'd gone through some of the same thing in World War I in his own way. He wasn't drafted; he had volunteered. I felt very strongly about it, and I told them that's what I wanted to do. Well, if that's what I wanted to do, they weren't going to stop me or try to stop me, and they didn't, and they supported me.

In that time period, then, when I was awaiting orders, I thought as soon as I volunteered, that in a couple of days I'd be gone, so I was all prepared to go. Well, it went on until March, from December until March. Well, after a month or so, this friend Dane Handschy that I mentioned a moment ago, he and I were in the same boat. We were just sort of hanging around waiting to go. Well, we decided we'd do some work of some kind. There was a fellow we knew out at the edge of town that had two of these little gray Ford tractors, and he hired people to do plowing in the spring and did custom plowing for farmers in that area. Some of the farmers still farmed by horse, not too many of them, but a few, and most of them had tractors, but for the ones that didn't have tractors of their own, he would do custom plowing, so much per acre. He was looking for somebody to drive these tractors. Well, I'd never plowed any and neither had Dane, but we became the area experts in plowing, I can guarantee you that. So we did a couple of

months of the early spring plowing around New Concord. We literally plowed hundreds of acres for farmers around there.

The two of us would work together, usually, and we'd go out with these little Ford tractors, and we plowed the fields and got to be quite expert. Go out, put the disc harrow on and all the harrows and get them ready for planting in the spring. So that was quite an experience. When the fields were dry, why we'd work from almost sun-up in the morning, and sometimes plowing until maybe midnight at night with the headlights on to get things done. So that was what we did to keep busy during that time until we got out orders. That's an experience I still look back on. I still have fondness for those little gray Ford tractors every time I see one. There's still some of them around.

WILLIAMS: Do you have recollection of hearing about the bombing of Pearl Harbor? Can you recreate that scene?

SEN. GLENN: Well, Yes. I heard it on the radio, and I think my very first hearing of it was on the radio in the car when I heard about it. I was on the way to Annie's organ recital. Annie majored in pipe organ in college, and she was very good. As a matter of fact, she had applied for, and was getting, a scholarship to Julliard in New York. I was driving, and I heard this on the car radio when I was driving up to the college, to Brown Chapel, where she was to give her senior organ recital. I was in the middle of my junior year, she was in the middle of her senior year. She was one year ahead of me. She was to give her organ recital, and it was that day, and that's where I heard it.

I went on up, went to the recital, and then after it was over, why, then she and I were together after it was over, and we talked about this. I went back and talked to my parents and her folks. It was the big issue. We didn't have TV back then, but we all had the radio on wherever you were, to listen to the recounting of all this. I still remember hearing some of the radio interviews of some of the survivors of Pearl Harbor. All we knew for a while was there'd been a big major attack at Pearl Harbor. I don't think we really knew until some hours later the kind of devastation that had been done there at Pearl Harbor. Obviously this wasn't something that the United States could—obviously it wasn't a big, big effort of the Japanese, and it was going to be an effort to take Pearl Harbor and that area, and didn't know what was going to happen on the West Coast. I don't remember when this shelling of the West Coast or when the first ships were sunk out there, but I think that may have been just a few days after Pearl Harbor, and that added some concern also.

When we were in San Francisco this Thanksgiving season, they have just found, in some nine hundred feet of water, the first tanker that was sunk out there, and it's got so many million barrels of oil and stuff on it yet that's on the bottom out there off San Francisco, and they don't know how they're going to get it out. I think it was the first ship out there on the West Coast out of World War II, just off the coast there. I think that occurred not long after Pearl Harbor.

WILLIAMS: That was a military ship?

SEN.GLENN: No, it was a tanker, commercial tanker. It was going up the West Coast to some place, and they sank it. So this war was obviously not just a single attack. It was a big thing.

So, when I was ready to leave New Concord—as a kid, when I was about ten or eleven years old, I'd been to the Chicago World's Fair, in '32, I think it was, and that was the farthest away from home I'd ever been, was Chicago with my dad. We drove there in the car. So when I was going to Iowa, that was the first time I had really gone that far. Leaving there under those circumstances with everybody concerned that I was off to war as my dad had done before was quite an emotional thing, but I was proud of it and glad to go, and that was it. I saw it as my duty, and I did it.

I can remember the train trip. At that time they sent you a TR, as they called it, a Travel Request, and that was just as good as cash once you signed it for your ticket and so on. I got the ticket that way and had my official orders with me. I went through Chicago. Even changing trains in a big station like Chicago was a big thing for me, because I'd never done that.

WILLIAMS: Was the train full of other young men in the same situation?

SEN. GLENN: Well, out of Chicago I think there were several people, but I don't remember talking to them or meeting them at all. I remember getting to Iowa City, and there were several of us got off at Iowa City, and there were people there to meet every train coming in, to direct you to the right place and take you to the university. The University of Iowa is there. They had cleared out what is the quadrangle, which is still there, I would say, now, and it was to be our main barracks as well

as a couple of other places there. It was brand new, the training site there. I think I was the twelfth person there to check into this new training program. We were in one of the rooms right above the main entrance into the quadrangle, which I was back and saw not too many years ago when I was through Iowa City.

The school was set up—Bernie Bierman [phonetic], who had been the coach at Minnesota, famous at that time, he was made a Navy captain, put in charge of all this training program out there, and he, then, in turn, had gotten a lot of people to be naval officers on the basis of their athletic ability, people who had been All-American whatever, All-American football and basketball and track and everything else, and they were to be our instructors, and they were. Then out of that group they had, they formed their own football team off the staff. It was called the Iowa Seahawks. They, then, were national football champions that year, which I always thought was sort of cheating because these people were brought in as a very select group, made naval officers as training instructors there, and then they put themselves together as a football team and were national champions.

But anyway, one of my more memorable experiences, I had been on the football squad in college, didn't play much, but a little bit, and I'd been a regular in high school in football. So I'd played a little bit of football. Every platoon had its own football squad, and you went through different sports. You played football for a certain length of time, then basketball, different sports that you played to get you in condition, as well as just running and long-distance hiking, ten-mile hikes, things like that to get you in shape.

Well, when the Iowa Seahawks and all these All-Americans were getting their team together, as part of our training, out platoon football team had to go scrimmage them a few times, and I still remember that to this day. I don't think I ever got more beat up in my life than I did—I was playing guard. I remember I was playing guard, and the guy across from me was an All-American center, and I can't remember his name now, but that was not a pleasant experience. I wasn't sure I quite understood why getting beat up like that would help me be a good pilot, but that was part of your training, anyway.

So we went through different things. Then you'd do that for half a day or two-thirds of a day, and then you had academics, and you were studying navigation and aerodynamics and all the other things in detail, as well as you had some Navy courses to indoctrinate you just into the Navy, Navy officer training courses of all kind, the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the whole gamut, just as though you were going through an officer training school, which is what it was, in addition to all the other things. So that was our introduction into it, instead of having that later when it would interfere with flight training.

WILLIAMS: The technical aspects of some of these courses, that came easily to you?

SEN. GLENN: Yes, there wasn't any problem with that. I had had flight training before, so I'd been through what math—the types of things we were doing then, any of the formulas and so on, I think if you had basic understanding of algebra and trigonometry, that was about as far as your requirements went. You weren't getting into anything that required a level of calculus or advanced math or

anything like that. Trigonometry, you needed that. Algebra, because of some of the formulas and so on, you needed that. That was about the depth of it.

WILLIAMS: Compare the experience of learning while you were still at the college with the experience of learning in this environment. I would think it would be quite different.

SEN. GLENN: It was different, and the military was far more structured. In college, of course, you were left on your own. Your going to class and your study time and all of that was on your own, what you wanted to do or not do. Out there you had study time, regular—it was run not quite as strict as the military academies are now, but more along that line than college was, that's for sure. You had study time in the evening, you had a certain time for lights out, a certain time to get up, formations, all of that. Much more structured.

WILLIAMS: And there would also be in your mind a direct connection between what you were learning and what you were going to be doing—

[Begin Interview 3, Tape 3, Side B]

SEN. GLENN: Most of the things you were learning or studying were things you'd have a direct application for later on, so there was a lot more impetus to do good and study your navigation, because you could see yourself being lost at sea some day if you didn't. And, of course, the other things on just straight officer training, a course in etiquette or whatever like that, those might have been a little less of interest to us because we saw ourselves going off to war. But, nevertheless, they were part of being a naval officer or, as I decided later on, a Marine officer. But those

courses were easy. They weren't that hard at all. The study of naval tradition or things like that, which was some history, was of interest. So I think everything we did was of interest. You probably had more incentive to study. Because you're concentrating on it more, there was more ability to remember and to assimilate things quickly because of interest in it than there had been in college.

WILLIAMS: And these circumstances would introduce a new seriousness to things in all ways, right?

SEN. GLENN: Yes. Sure. Because you were off to war. There can't be anything much more serious than that. So I think you felt that, look, if the people who had been to war sometime or the people who are preparing us for war think this is important, why, it's important to me. I'm going to learn it. So there was a lot more incentive, I think, than you had in college.

WILLIAMS: I came of age in a different time, and so that prompts the question of whether you saw this just as patriotism or following in you father's footsteps or that you had already acquired a feeling against the Nazis in Europe and the Japanese in the Pacific. How did these things mix?

SEN. GLENN: Oh, I suppose all of the above, I suppose, to different degrees, not necessarily just following in my father's footsteps, although I was proud of that. But you'd seen some things going on in Europe at that time that you thought were awful, and there had been a feeling, maybe among a lot of people, probably me included at that time, that I didn't see how we were going to stay out of that in Europe for very long, although being in the middle of college there, I wasn't a great student of what had been going on in Europe. I had my own problems in school there,

just the academic load to carry. But I guess I, along with a lot of other people, thought we would be drawn into that sometime, and here it was.

I guess the biggest motivation I had was how can they do that to our country, to this nation of ours? We're proud of this country. I'm proud of this country. I have as patriotic feelings toward this country as anybody. I had written patriotic themes in American Legion essay contests and things like that. In New Concord, it was just the attitude, one of patriotism toward your country, and the thought that anybody could do this in our country was almost unbelievable. So I think that motivation, more than anything else, overrode almost everything else.

WILLIAMS: You mentioned that you had originally applied to the Army but then had become disenchanted. What was going on?

SEN. GLENN: Well, it didn't send orders. I was anxious to get going.

WILLIAMS: You also said you seemed to have second thoughts about the Army.

SEN. GLENN: Well, I'd thought about it, after I'd signed up there, that maybe I wished I had gone into the Navy, because, by that time, I was beginning to think a little bit—I guess even back then I was thinking a little bit about the Marine Corps, and you couldn't get into that out of the Army. That's funny. Maybe I'm even AWOL to this day on somebody's list in the Army someplace.

WILLIAMS: What image did the Marine Corps conjure up at that time?

SEN. GLENN: I guess the first people who were tossed into action then were the Marines, and if I was going into the military, I wanted to get in and do something. I didn't want to be sitting at a—I liked to be where the action was. I guess I thought if I went in

the Marine Corps, and that was strengthened as I went through flight training, as more happened then, and by the time I got out and was out of flight training, of course, by the time I was ready to go overseas myself, after having trained in the squadron, we had people back from some of the fighting at Guadalcanal and those places. So I was always glad I applied for the Marine Corps, and I guess I was thinking a little bit about that even back in the early days.

WILLIAMS: You talked about your love of flying when you were first learning in New Philadelphia, which I guess is, what, about twenty miles away from New Concord?

SEN. GLENN: About forty-five or fifty.

WILLIAMS: So that was a sizeable trip.

SEN. GLENN: Yes. It took us something like an hour and forty-five minutes each way on the drive back and forth, maybe not quite that—thirty-five or forty miles, I guess. It took about an hour and a half, I think, each way on the roads we had at that time.

WILLIAMS: As you began to train in these fighter-type planes, how did the experience of flying change, if at all?

SEN. GLENN: Well, you're in the bigger airplanes and heavier airplanes. Even the Steerman, the two-winged plane was different. You're dealing with bigger horsepower. Where I'd been flying something with 65 horsepower, all at once here you are in the Steerman; I think it had maybe 200 or 180, something like that. So you're moving up in the power you're controlling, the size of the airplane, what can be done with it. You could do all sorts of acrobatics with that airplane you could not

do in CPT. That's something I had not experienced in CPT, and here you are out doing loops and inverted flying.

I had an instructor in primary that used to like to get up and roll over upside down, we were hanging on the belt, and you started gliding, and the engine would cut out because the fuel wouldn't feed. So here we are flying a glider, gliding upside down. We'd turn over again, and the engine would kick back in again. You couldn't do that when I was in CPT. So it's a whole different kind of flying, and you're doing a lot more precision flying, too, and you did some formation flying. I hadn't had any formation flying. We were starting that early on. You did all the same things you had done in CPT except an awful lot more and in bigger, more powerful airplanes.

WILLIAMS: You were going up almost every day?

SEN. GLENN: Yes, almost every day. There'd be days when there would be bad weather or something like that, that you didn't go up, but flight scheduling primary was—the flight schedule, I probably flew five days a week, something like that, on an average.

WILLIAMS: What was life like around the base when you were there?

SEN. GLENN: Well, it was very structured there. You had academic program half a day and then flying scheduled half a day, and unless there was weather, you were scheduled. The academics were more of what we'd been doing in pre-flight school, your study of bigger engines and aircraft and aerodynamics and you began to get into ordnance and instruction on .30- and .50-caliber machine guns and things like that. It was a whole progression as you went through flight training.

Brand-new field. In fact, all the sidewalks weren't in yet when we got out there. We walked around through the mud on duckboards, just little temporary sidewalk things made out of wood for a while, until they got the place dried out and got some cement sidewalks in. So we were the first to open up that base at Olathe.

Most of our flying was done off outlying fields. They'd bus us out to outlying Field Six, I think, was the one I soloed in the Steerman off of out there, and it was out—I don't know, five or six miles from the main base at Olathe. So you didn't do everything right there on the base. You got off maybe one day every other week, something like that. You'd go into Kansas City sometimes. That was about, I guess, thirty miles away, twenty-five or thirty miles away.

WILLIAMS: Did you hang out with mechanics a lot, what I'd call support staff?

SEN. GLENN: No, there wasn't much of that at all, because you went out to fly the airplane, you got done with the airplane, you'd get put in the bus and brought back, you had something else scheduled. You either had drill, or you had—something else I didn't mention in pre-flight, too, you got your first experience with drill and platoon and command and drilling other people and things like that you went into there. You were brought back for that, for academics and other things, and you met the mechanics when you were out on the line, whoever the crew chief was of your particular airplane, and you talked to them out there, but you didn't have time to sit around and get acquainted much.

WILLIAMS: Did you feel like you had a mechanical understanding of the engines and whatnot?

SEN. GLENN: Oh, yes. Yes. No, I never had any doubt about that. I'd grown up being sort of mechanically inclined, around my dad's automobiles, and I'd taken engines apart and put them back together and things like that, so I had a pretty good understanding.

So there was no area where I felt I was behind the curve or where I was deficient in being able to keep up with everybody else. If anything, I felt the opposite. I felt, because of my own flying background in CPT and my own mechanical background and the physics I had had in college, if anything, I felt I was well out ahead of a lot of the people who came in, like somebody who came in as a former stockbroker or somebody like that. I remember one guy who was just out of college and was a stockbroker in Chicago. Well, people like that, there were some of those. In fact, some of those people, when we'd get to the study of engines and things like that and we'd get together sometimes to study, I actually helped some of the people out. I won't say I was so hot I was an instructor or anything, but I had a better understanding of some of that stuff than they did. So I felt quite comfortable with the training program. I don't remember my grades now, but I think my grades were exemplary grades all the way through flight training.

WILLIAMS: Meanwhile, you were monitoring what was going on as we got involved in the Pacific?

SEN. GLENN: Sure. You got reports every day. You had newspapers. Wherever you were, there was always a base paper, and that was put out almost every day, I think, and then you had papers around like Kansas City. You had the Kansas City papers

that were available, and radio. Although we didn't sit around and listen to the radio a whole lot, you were in a barracks situation where there was a big barracks, maybe a hundred feet long, and you had twenty-five bunks down one row and twenty-five bunks on the other side, maybe not quite that many. Maybe they were smaller—maybe ten down one side and ten down the other side. You had your footlocker at the bottom of your bunk, two-deck bunk, and you each had your footlocker. That was it.

WILLIAMS: When you were hanging out with the other guys, what was that like?

SEN. GLENN: Well, there wasn't a whole lot of just hanging out with each other. You didn't have that much time. It was pretty structured. At mealtime, that's about the only time you really sat down and had time to talk with somebody across the table. At the end of the meal, you were off to something else, and it was pretty structured all the way through. There were movies, and you could go to movies, or you could have a little time of your own, but I don't recall I went to—I'll bet that whole year, I probably didn't do three or four movies that whole year, because I stuck right with it, stuck with the program and with the study, the outlines of things. There was always more to study than you could possibly—they had certain requirements, but then there were other things if you wanted to study beyond that in certain areas, why, that was available to you if you wanted to do it, and I did that. I did a lot of extra study on navigation and things like that.

WILLIAMS: Did you have the feeling at all that you were being rushed through this training?

SEN. GLENN: Well, we were being rushed through the training. It was not a relaxing course at all. They needed pilots, and we were it. It was a very demanding course, and it

was a little, I guess, like being in the training I did many years later in the space program. It wasn't something that you went into and thought, "Well, I'll study this," or something. You lived the program. You got up each morning, you woke up looking forward to what you were going to study that day, and you went at it. There was always study beyond the formal course if you wanted to do that, and you thought it was important enough that you literally lived the program. You didn't just take it as something casual. And you knew in that situation, like later on in the space program, that your life might well depend on how well you learned certain things. So there wasn't any problem with motivation.

WILLIAMS: Did you have any problem with second thoughts?

SEN. GLENN: In fight school, flight training?

WILLIAMS: Yes.

SEN. GLENN: No. No, I was glad of what I was doing, proud of what I was doing. I remember being kidded at Corpus Christi. I think, in the almost six months we were at Corpus Christi, you had liberty on weekends, and a lot of the guys wanted to head off to town. They'd go into town, and they'd go around in town some. I think they kidded me because I went in town once in that six-month period. But you didn't need to go to town. If I wanted to go to a movie, which I did once in a great while, you could do it on base. You had a PX on the base. If you didn't want to eat in the mess hall, why, you could go over and get something you wanted at the snack bar someplace. I didn't see then a need to go to town. Why go there?

I wasn't rare in this, but a lot of people, like in navigation, they'd give you the required problems you had to work out the navigation. Well, there'd be a lot of sample problems, and a lot of people, including me, I stayed and worked all those sample problems. I wanted to know everything there was to know about it. And a lot of people were the same way. It wasn't just me. I would imagine there were quite a number of people that didn't go into town more than once or twice or three times in that six months we were at Corpus Christi.

The first part of the time at Corpus Christi, you were out at a different base. It was a complex of bases at Corpus Christi. You had Cabaness [phonetic] Field and Cudahy [phonetic] Field, and we were out at Cudahy Field, which is where we did our basic training. You did your flying every day and back in there and into the barracks there. Then, when you got to advanced, you transferred over to what they called Mainside, which was the big main field at Corpus Christi. But out of all that time, I think I was only in town once. They kidded me about that, but I think that was not unusual. I think there were a lot of people probably weren't in town any more than that either. You didn't need to go in. There were things on the base. And when you were interested in what you were doing, I didn't have to go to town.

WILLIAMS: Meanwhile, Annie was back in New Concord?

SEN. GLENN: Yes. Annie was back in New Concord, and we didn't get to talk very often on the telephone, because back in those days, you'd put in a telephone call, it took an hour to put the thing in through an operator. It took her an hour to line up all the things to get somebody at the other end. Plus it was very expensive. It wasn't

like today where you can just pick it up and dial anybody. That was a big operation back then. So, we wrote, not quite every day but almost every day, certainly a number of times a week. So that was the main contact.

I should have said this before, I left to go to training, we had decided to be married. We wanted to be engaged during that year when I was gone and wanted to be married as soon as I was out of flight training, and so she did not go ahead with this scholarship at Julliard. So we were engaged, then, when I left. I got her a ring in Zanesville at a little jewelry store in there, and I think was $125 or $150, something like that, which happened to be all I had at that time. [Laughter] I've offered five hundred times to get her a bigger engagement ring now, which happens sometimes with people, and she won't hear of it. She still has that same engagement ring that I gave her back when I was leaving. Compared to what a lot of the women wear now with these big rocks on their engagement rings, it's a tiny, tiny little thing, and I kid her about it sometimes, and she wouldn't trade it for any of them. But it was all the money I had at that time when I was leaving to go.

Then we planned to be married as soon as I was out of flight training. We finally had a firm date that I would graduate, March 31st, I think, and as soon as we had that date definitely set, then I knew it would take me two or three days, whatever it was, to get home on the train, and so we set the wedding, then, for April 6th, so she could put out announcements and things. It was quite an event in New Concord, because we both were well known among all the townspeople in New Concord. It was a big wedding, and I wasn't there to help do anything with

it except just show up and be there, which I did. I was married in my Marine dress blues, which they hadn't seen too many of those around New Concord at that time. I still remember it very, very well.

One of problems back then was transportation. We think of jumping in the car now, it's nothing to go from Ohio to Cherry Point, North Carolina. But these were war years. You had gas rationing. My dad had some used cars still there, and he had a used car. I didn't have a car. I didn't have anything, and I was going to need one. So he gave me a little car.

WILLIAMS: Was that the '34 Chevy?

SEN. GLENN: Yes. I guess it was the '34 Chevy, and it was in pretty good shape. He had put some tires on it that we thought were pretty good. The tires were bad, and we had changed the tires on it. Well, I left to go to North Carolina, and we had tire problems. I don't know, I had a flat or two on the way to North Carolina. Back then, with wartime being on, and gas what it was, they wanted everybody to drive slower, and I think we drove about 40 miles an hour or something like that all the way to North Carolina.

I reported in. I mentioned that I did not get the fighters I had anticipated. The very first place we lived, we found a place to live, it was a converted sun porch in a house down in Morehead City, North Carolina. People were converting everything they had into places for people to stay at that time, and this was a tiny little sort of efficiency place. It had been built on what had formerly been a sun porch along a main street in Morehead City, and I still remember the

man's name that owned it, Leroy Guthrie, was the place, and we were lucky to find it.

So we were there, and right across the causeway was Morehead Beach, which is one of the nicest beaches on the whole East Coast. Annie and I had both seen the ocean, of course, before that time, but we hadn't lived where we could just go out on the beach like that. I remember one of the first weekends we were there, we went out on the beach and got terribly sunburned, and I'll tell you, we were brand-new newlyweds, we were sunburned bad enough we could hardly touch each other. We really got sunburned.

But we lived there in Morehead City. We were just there for about—I think maybe less than a month before they decided to send us to the West Coast. Well, transportation then became another major problem, and I knew the car we had was not going to be adequate to go to the West Coast. We couldn't drive to the West Coast in that thing. So I looked around there at Morehead City. Leroy Guthrie had some friend who ran a filling station. The guy had a car that he was trying to sell. It was a '39 Chevy coupe. They called it a business coupe. It didn't have a second seat back behind the—a little luggage deck behind the two seats. I went down and looked at it, and the guy wanted $450 for it, and I didn't have $450. So I called my dad back home, and he arranged a $450 loan for me at the bank back home. So they sent the money through, and I bought that little '39 Chevy coupe. It was in good shape and had pretty good tires, and I got a pretty good buy on that at the time, although I thought going $450 in debt was deeper than I ever wanted to be in my life.

Anyway, when we finally left, then, Cherry Point to go to the West Coast, we were given—I don't know, it was two weeks to get there or something like that, whatever the travel time was, a week leave and whatever number of days they'd allot you for travel. And so the '39 was the one I was going to take back, and I decided that I would take the '34, I guess it was, I'd take it back and give it back to my dad and he could sell it there and get a little money out of that, because I couldn't get anything for it in North Carolina. I didn't have the time to do it anyway.

So, Annie drove the '39, and I drove the '34, and we went back, winded our way back to New Concord, and we had—I don't know, we had like three or four more flat tires on that thing going back home. I was just glad that we finally made it back to New Concord. Then we were there a few days, then we left in the coupe to drive to the West Coast. Neither of us had ever been to the West Coast, and that was quite a trip, clear across country, and it was great. Back then, you had to sort of plan where you were going to stay at night or where you were going to be. There weren't all the motels out along the roads then, so you had to plan the trip a little more. We went to the West Coast, and reported in out there at San Diego.

WILLIAMS: Did you initiate the change from Cherry Point to the West Coast?

SEN. GLENN: No, that was something they just decided on their own. We were in this OTS-8, Operational Training Squadron 8, at Cherry Point, and they were the ones that were going to train us in the PPJs, the North American B-25. The Navy version of it was called the PPJ. The just had too many people there and it was their

decision. One day we came in there—you had to report in every morning at eight o'clock, even though there wasn't anything to do, and we reported in, and they said we were going to get orders in two days or something like that to go to the West Coast, and that was it. So we did.

Annie and I had enough—we could pack everything we owned at that time on this luggage deck on the back of this little Chevy coupe, and with what we put in the trunk and what we had on this little deck, it came right out to where I could still see out the rear window. So it was perfect. Everything we owned, our pots and pans, bedding, everything else we could put in there, and that was it. So off we went to the West Coast.

WILLIAMS: It would make a great scene in a movie, wouldn't it, newlyweds and—

SEN. GLENN: That was it. Sunburned. [Laughter] Boy, I still remember that sunburn. We peeled. Both of us just peeled. We were out on a day down there when it wasn't all that bright and it was a hot, warm summer day with a little thin shift of clouds sort of shadowing. We didn't think we were getting that much sun, and, boy, did we get burned.

WILLIAMS: Good. How about stopping here?

SEN. GLENN: All right.

[End of Interview]