

Chron Ref: CF/RAI/USAA/DB01/HS/2001-00035

File Sub: CF/HST/INT/PAN-002/M

Helenka Pantaleoni

Interview No. 2  
by Richard Polsky  
April 14, 1977

Oral History Research Office  
Columbia University  
1977



UNICEF Alternate Inventory Label



Item # **CF/RAD/USAA/DB01/2001-00131**

ExR/Code: **CF/HST/INT/PAN-002/M**

Interview Helenka Pantaleoni by Richard Polsky: Herbert Hx  
Date Label Printed 4/23/2001

Cover + 21.ppt.1b



Chron Ref: CF/RAI/USAA/DBOI/HS/2001-00035

File Sub: CF/HST/INT/PAN-002/M

VA

Interview with Mrs. Guido Pantaleoni  
in New York, New York

Interview No. 2  
by Richard Polsky  
April 14, 1977

Q: This is the second meeting with Mrs. Pantaleoni and Richard Polsky, on April 14, 1977 and we were talking a little bit about some of the problems that UNICEF encounters as it tries to deal with the various governments from whom it's trying to get money, pledges of money, for the annual UNICEF projects. And, Mrs. Pantaleoni, you mentioned several incidents that relate to the United States government that you thought were worth getting down.

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Yes, because they illustrate the kind of thing that we're up against. One, for instance - early in the game, I think it was in the early fifties, there was a resolution coming up. First in Lake Success in the Third Committee, where UNICEF was then meeting in the Social and Humanitarian Committee, eventually the items dealt with in the Third Committee would go to the Plenary Session of the General Assembly, which were then meeting in Flushing.

I remember, at that time, the U.S. delegate to the Assembly - I think her name was Edith Sampson. She was a lady lawyer, a black lawyer from Chicago, an absolutely scrumptious person, a delightful person. She didn't follow the UNICEF discussion in the Third Committee, she had other responsibilities, but when the resolution came to the Plenary, she was entrusted with it.

We didn't know what attitude our government was going to take. I think the resolution had to do with the continuation of UNICEF, because that was what was in the wind in those days, and of course, almost all the governments were coming out affirmatively for the continuation of UNICEF on an unlimited basis, but we didn't know what our government was going to pull.

The "developed" countries, in principle, opted for a reorganized UNICEF, because "the emergency was over" in Europe. So we didn't know whether the U.S. was going to abstain. We hoped to goodness they weren't going to vote against it, because that would have been catastrophic for the contribution.

Well, suddenly, word came that the thing was coming up in Plenary. We were all at Lake Success in the Third Committee, and word got around that Mrs.

Sampson was on her way to Flushing to cast a vote. We didn't know what the vote was going to be, so we all grabbed our hats and our briefcases and tore over to Flushing. Mrs. Sampson told us, alas, she had to cast a negative vote, but as she was going down the aisle, this long aisle, in Flushing, a State Department aide rushed down after her, pulled her by the dress and whispered in her ear, just as she was about to mount the steps to the platform. The final word was not to vote against it, because it would have made the American face quite red, but to abstain. So she abstained. And we were all in a state of absolute panic. It just goes to prove that up to the last moment we didn't know whether the U.S. would be for or against or abstain. And, of course, it's extremely hard on the delegates themselves.

One of our Delegates, who was the Alternate Delegate on the UNICEF Executive Board, was an officer in the State Department, Frances Kernohan - I remember her saying that when she was in Paris, or in Geneva, for various meetings of the UNICEF Board, telegrams would come streaming in, until a pile would accumulate on her desk, first establishing one position, then amending that position.

There was quite a funny incident, because after one of these meetings, the Programme Committee of UNICEF was taken by plane to Yugoslavia to observe UNICEF-aided projects. She was walking down the aisle to speak to one of the delegates. She was a very tall woman, Miss Kernohan, and very thin. As she was walking down, the plane gave a lurch and she measured her length right on the floor of the plane. As she lay there, like Madame Récamier, cupping her chin in her hands, she said in her deep voice, "I wish to announce the seventh position of the United States Government". This created much mirth. Again, this is revealing, but it was the kind of thing our delegates were up against continually.

Q: Yes. Well, how does UNICEF keep in touch with the various national governments to see that everything is done that is possible to get a good allocation?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: That's really the primary concern of the Executive Director. First it was Mr. Pate, and now it's Mr. Labouisse. And he goes to see all the governments. He sees the delegates on the Ambassadorial level here at the U.N.

Q: The national Ambassador to the United Nations?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: To the United Nations, exactly. And when he travels, which he does a great deal, he goes to the Foreign Office, to the Finance Minister, in this country - the Secretary of State, if he can see him, or the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs.

And that brings me to another thing I'd like to describe to you. The Assistant Secretary of State at one time was the well-known Harlan Cleveland, who was a very able person. Maurice Pate had great confidence in him. While Cleveland was in office, we ran into very stormy waters over the Congo situation, which was quite a complex one: the U.S. Government had pledged ten million dollars, which would be available to UNICEF when and if the matching funds from other governments became available. In other words, if other governments fulfilled the matching formula, the ten million would be released by the U.S.

Q: A total of all other governments?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: A total? Yes. I think the matching formula then was about sixty/fifty or fifty-eight/fifty-two or something like that. Sixty percent from other governments, forty percent from the U.S., whatever it was. That money was there, but could not be drawn on because the other governments hadn't matched it.

The government needed some money for the operation in the Congo - incidentally, Harlan Cleveland was absolutely obsessed with the Congo operation. He supported the Secretary-General, Hammarskjold, who was also obsessed by it. It was a great test of the operational ability of the U.N. to come in at a critical time: thus, that ten million earmarked for UNICEF was loaned to the U.N. for use in the Congo.

Well, this got into the papers and absolutely played havoc. This turned into a major crisis. Calls from individuals from civic and church groups all over the country, saying, what goes on? UNICEF money, UNICEF funds being used for a Congo operation? How outrageous! It got so bad that I had to call Mr. Cleveland in Washington and say, we have some very urgent things for me to discuss with you, and we need to talk to you. The answer yes, and we were invited for lunch.

So we made a date for the following week, and we trooped down. Myself, of course. Robert Thrun, who's our counsel and vice-president. He's one of the absolutely vital forces in our whole committee life. Connie Anderson, who is also a vice-president. She's another one. She has been with us from the

early fifties, almost from the beginning of the Committee. Lloyd Bailey naturally, who was Executive Director of our committee. And one or two others. Oh, Fred Atkinson, the treasurer. He is a very intelligent, attractive person, who became vice-chairman in charge of personnel at R.H. Macy, and was treasurer, an effective treasurer of our committee for a good many years.

With Mr. Cleveland as host, we sat around the long lunch table. There were State Department people present including Richard Gardner, who's so prominent now. He was one of Cleveland's assistants at the time. I think there were more State Department people than us. That generally is the case when one goes down to Washington.

Halfway through our canned tomato soup, Mr. Cleveland put down his spoon, and said, "Now can we begin". And without as much as asking what the deuce it was we had in mind to talk about, he said, "Now, I wish to tell you people that you're the only national committee I know of in this country which has branches all over the country. And we need your help, frankly. We need you to explain, elucidate the Congo policy of the State Department to the American public."

Well, he went on in that vein, and I must say I was in a state of shock, because the one thing we cannot do is to get into politics. First of all, it isn't our concern or our particular responsibility. It was difficult to say, "You're a little bit out of order" to the Assistant Secretary of State. However, I did say, "Mr. Cleveland, we have two matters here. What you've just requested us to do and the object of our trip, which is to come down and get assurance from you that the ten million dollars, which is really due UNICEF, will be available to UNICEF." and he replies, "Just as soon as it's matched by other governments".

We talked around about that and back and forth, back and forth. He kept coming back to what he wanted us to do, you know. It was the first time, incidentally, and I think the only time we've ever been invited to lunch at the State Department. I think we got our point pretty strongly across. But we did say it was absolutely impossible for us to take initiative in this, to write our various representatives what the U.S. government policy was in the Congo. What we could say is that if they wished information about what our government's policy was, for those who wished to write directly to the State Department. We'd go that far.

At the very end - and this is a little bit off the record because it involves one of our people - one of our most respected officers, for reasons I

can never understand to this day, most of us can't -- suddenly made a little eloquent speech to Mr. Cleveland, saying that he quite sympathized with Mr. Cleveland's concern about the Congo, and that Mr. Cleveland could be assured that we would do everything possible to see to it that -- he was almost promising that we'd go farther than we had any intention of doing. I thought later how they must have laughed as soon as we left, because one of our own officers had contradicted what we'd been trying to get over at this lunch. However, no damage came from it, and we finally cleared up the situation to the satisfaction of our disturbed associates.

Q: Well, now, when the people started complaining about UNICEF being involved in the Congo operation, what was the main complaint about that?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Just that the funds were being used for a political purpose.

Q: They weren't, were they?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: No, they were not. That ten million that had been earmarked for UNICEF, sure, that was advanced for the Congo operation, but, as I say, it was not - the Fund couldn't draw on it, because the other governments had not matched it, so UNICEF couldn't use it anyway. It was just lying there. As soon as the other governments matched, UNICEF got hold of its ten million dollars.

Q: Well, when you say it was available for the Congo operation, you mean for the children in the Congo?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: No. No, no. For the U.N. action in the Congo. Whether it was for the troops in the Congo or - whatever it was - it was a political use of that money.

Q: Oh, I see.

Mrs. Pantaleoni: But the money was not good to UNICEF. In other words, UNICEF did not suffer from this transaction.

Q: Because it had not been matched?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: It had not been matched, so it couldn't be used for UNICEF.

But the public didn't understand that. They thought it was money that UNICEF could have used, you see.

Q: So, was that cleared up?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: That was cleared up. Well, yes, in most cases. But it was just another hurdle that we were always having to take, you know. This kind of thing confuses the public.

Q: So the Executive Director of UNICEF has to be a very skilled politician?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Yes. Absolutely. A diplomat and a politician. He does, indeed.

Q: And does he try and bend the arm of the national representatives?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Oh, in a very subtle way. This is interesting, the technique. I'm glad you brought it up, because Maurice Pate's technique was using a quite personal approach. He would befriend various delegates and have them out to his house in the country on Cape Cod, or have dinner parties for them. Do nice things. He did that not only with the various governmental representatives, but he did it with his own staff here at UNICEF Headquarters. And with everybody. He really gave everything he had. His own energies, his wisdom, his talents, and his money. He spent money in all directions.

Q: His own money?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: His own money. Yes. All the time, doing things that might benefit the cause. Mr. Labouisse, he's more professional about it and more official. He's more like an ambassador, which he was, of course. He does not do that kind of thing. He entertains, sure, and when he goes to see government officials, it's done with great dignity and grace, but as far as I know, he does not use any of his own personal money to advance UNICEF interests.

Q: Well, is it generally - in your understanding, is it generally a struggle for the chairman to get the nations who are members of UNICEF to make a generous contribution?



Mrs. Pantaleoni: You mean the Chairman of the Executive Board of UNICEF?

Q: Well, Mr. Pate or Mr. Labouisse?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Oh, the Executive Director? Yes.

Q: Is it a - ?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: A chore.

Q: Has it always been a struggle?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Sure. In all those so-called extra-budgetary organizations, like the United Nations Development Programme, the International Refugee Organization, because the governments are not assessed, you see, regularly, the way they are for the U.N. Paul Hoffman used to go - well, he used to go a great deal more to Washington than, for instance, than the present Executive Director of UNICEF does, and Bradford Morse, who's the head of the U.N.D.P. now, is continually in Washington. He has people located there watching the thing very carefully. There's a good deal of not exactly lobbying, but - well, it's close to it, because they do button-hole Senators and Congressmen.

Q: But, for example, what was America's contribution last year to UNICEF?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: It was seventeen million.

Q: Yes. Which is really not much in the greater scheme of things?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: No, it isn't.

Q: You said earlier that it was a drop in the bucket. But isn't it conceivable that if we got a President in who was very interested in children, that a much larger contribution could be made?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Oh, sure. If he put his heart into it, certainly. Of course, that's what I was trying to say the other day about Auriol in France. Whether it's too small potatoes, or whether it's subconsciously that the Children's Fund is still regarded as sort of a Lady Bountiful thing, you know,

"all these nice women being interested in children". Very few of us have really penetrated to the high-ups in our government, those who are insufficiently aware that UNICEF is a very strong arm of development. It is being increasingly accepted as part of the development process. I don't know whether I mentioned that UNICEF used to be discussed in the Third Committee, the Social and Humanitarian Committee. Recently, in the last few years, it comes up in the Second Committee, which is the Economic and Financial Committee, where the development plans of countries are discussed. So UNICEF has reached another stage. It is now considered by all the governments as a vital factor in --

Q: Natural resource?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Natural resource and a vital factor in the economic development of a country. That pleased us all very much, because it proves its basic importance.

Q: Well, would you say that America's attitude reflects - I'm not trying to put words in your mouth, but is it possible that America's rather meager contribution of seventeen million dollars reflects a general attitude towards children that our government has?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Our government wouldn't say that. What they'd say is that they don't think it's fair in a multi-national agency like UNICEF for one government to be carrying more than a certain share, of the load. And there is, there's a logic in that. The governments at the U.N. are assessed according to their ability to pay. We pay much less than that, because we now pay about twenty-five percent of the entire bill, and if we'd pay according to what we're able to pay, we'd pay about forty-three percent.

In UNICEF, we're down to - oh, I think, less than twenty-five percent, and now that Sweden's gone way up and other governments have gone way up, it will be about nineteen percent of what all the other governments - of the total. So we're well under what we think is fair for the U.S. to pay. You see, we try to prove that. We make that case with the State Department, - the lobby group in Washington, the Citizens' Committee, not ours but the Citizens Committee for UNICEF, they make that point with the Congressmen.

Q: But there's no idea that America would get a lot of prestige from being a leader and giving much more than its share, just because it's - ?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: We like to say that. It just doesn't happen. And it doesn't happen - I think there are just too many cooks in that broth. There's the State Department. There's the Congress. There are all these various appropriations committees and authorization committees. Then there's the Bureau of the Budget, which is a toughie, and they're completely icy in their approach. They just -

Q: Dollars and cents?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Yes, dollars and cents, and it's done in packages. For instance, all international aid is in one package. So they dole it out, according to how they justify the needs and what they consider a share for the U.S. Government, while the other U. S. agencies watch us like hawks - because, for instance, if they up the UNICEF, if the Executive Branch asks for a bigger contribution for UNICEF, it means it comes out of one of the other pockets, either out of the Development Programme, Refugees, or whatever.

Q: Something else?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Yes. So, you see, this is the difficulty.

Q: Does that situation exist in other countries, too, or not, or is it done differently in each - ?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: It'd done differently in each country. Very differently. In Sweden, of course, they're enormously international-minded - now there's a rumor around that they're being so generous because their candidate for the Executive Director's job is a Swede, and that they want to match our contribution so that - because, naturally, the more a country pays, the more it says it's entitled to have its people be hired in the Secretariat. But that I don't think it's strictly fair because Sweden gives a great deal to the Development Programme and to most international programmes, so I don't think they can be accused quite fairly -

Q: So that - I mean, it comes as no surprise to me what you're saying, but the fact is, money talks, even though it's a humanitarian project, money talks there the same as anywhere else?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Sure, sure, sure. Absolutely. No question about it. And

I'm afraid the motives of people are mixed. It certainly isn't just idealism - I think, the way they talk. They say, will the other countries buy that? You know, it's always in terms of money. Or can we sell this? It's the market kind of lingo that the governments use.

Q: The last time we spoke, we talked about the very beginning, the International Children's Emergency Fund that was the predecessor of - and we talked a little bit about sending clothing, milk, to Europe primarily. And when that relief work began, there was a certain spirit probably, I would guess, among the people who were doing the collecting of the material and the funds?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Oh, tremendous spirit.

Q: Sort of a pioneer spirit?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Exactly. Yes. That's well put, yes.

Q: Now, the spirit, I would guess, is quite different. It's much more businesslike, is that - ?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: It's more professional, yes. There's still the same amount, I think, of deep concern and caring. But you're right. It isn't breaking new fields. There isn't that novelty and since the emergency's eased off, of course, there isn't that pressure. The continuing emergency of children hasn't got the same appeal that -- well, the spirit comes to the fore if there's a flood or if there's an earthquake or if there's a war, the way there was in, say Bangladesh or in the Congo, and in Nigeria. Then the spirit comes up. Then you quickly cash in with the public's responsiveness. And the governments, too. You try to cash in on it quickly to get all the maximum benefits you can from it.

Q: But the people who are now running the organization are much more -  
(Telephone interruption)

Q: We were talking about the people who now are in charge of administering UNICEF. They're more a managerial type today?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: No, just more varied. The quality of the personnel, on the whole, is extremely high - first-rate.

Q: Is is a different kind of personnel?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: No, they always were technically qualified. In the beginning, Maurice brought in his people, leftovers from the Hoover days: food engineers, nutritionists, that kind of thing, milk engineers. Since the emphasis isn't just on emergency feeding now, but on health, education, on social welfare - accordingly, that kind of technically equipped, qualified personnel is being engaged.

Q: Does the Executive Director bring in - when a new Executive Director comes in, does he bring in a new group of people?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Yes, he does. The transition was delicately done here, but Mr. Labouisse brought in his own assistant and his own secretary. There was a very gentle sort of shifting of gears. Sherwood Moe, his right-hand man, is on the director level. There's a man who has been sort of an éminence grise in UNICEF and has been running the operations of the organization from the beginning. He is E.J.R. Heyward.

Q: We mentioned him last time.

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Oh, yes. Did we?

Q: Yes, and you said we ought to talk about him.

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Yes. Well, he's a very remarkable man. He was an economist who was the Australian delegate on the Second Committee, the economic committee of the U.N., and he was one of the men that Maurice Pate had gotten to know in the United Nations.

Q: From Australia?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: From Australia. And Maurice was so impressed with his grasp of the situation and the bigness of his point of view about UNICEF, that he offered him the job of Deputy Director. He became Deputy Director in Charge

of Operations way back, the very beginning, 1948 or 1949. And he's got a tremendous grasp of detail, of problems. He has an infinite capacity for taking pains. That's his genius. Also, he has an encyclopedic knowledge about a great variety of subjects - botany, nutrition, health. He has a very retentive memory. What he reads, he remembers.

Q: Is he still active?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Oh, rather. Yes. He - I really don't know what would happen to - when Maurice Pate's health began to fail, he took more and more responsibility, and for the last three years of Maurice's life I would say, he ran the organization pretty completely. And ran it very well. Like everyone, he has weaknesses. He's difficult sometimes to work with. He's very - he's a very strong person and he has strong opinions. He's not very - "persona grata" in Washington, for instance. He's dour. I know some of his close colleagues have felt that they were not sure how much they could completely rely on him.

I've always had a close relationship with him, especially in the very beginning. We did run into some heavy waters later. As our committee got stronger and more independent, and we wanted complete independence, I think some of us felt that he wanted to control it too much. It made it difficult for our administrative officers. And there was a lack of harmony on some of the basic issues. Well, I can give you an instance. Shall I?

Q: Sure.

Mrs. Pantaleoni: There was one very attractive proposition. We had a proposal from TIME-LIFE Books to publish a series of children's books on a monthly basis, like a book club. It had great possibilities, as you know. TIME does those things very well. Like Walt Disney, they are great perfectionists.

Well, the TIME people wanted to call them UNICEF books. This is where the rub came. As soon as you call them UNICEF books, that involves the UNICEF Administration. They're very possessive about the title. They're always afraid there will be something that they don't approve of. Especially Mr. Heyward is extremely suspicious of American public relations methods. And I think it took, I don't know, two or three years of drafting constant agreements, going back and forth, contracts between us, the U.S. Committee,

UNICEF itself, and TIME-LIFE. And the contract kept going back and back and back, and finally TIME-LIFE became so disgusted .

Q: They said the heck with it?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: The heck with it. This was one of the few real fiascoes. If Mr. Labouisse had been in New York at the time, I think the situation might have been salvaged - he might have provided - the oil was needed to pour on troubled waters. But he wasn't. He was traveling. Mr. Heyward has not been known for his tact and diplomacy, and -

Q: So he didn't really want it?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: No, he basically, I don't think, wanted it, and I think our people felt that and it made for an awful lot of bad blood. Now, we're friendly, but it's not been quite the same trusting relationship as it was before that.

Q: Between the committee, the U.S. Committee and UNICEF?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: And the Administration. With Mr. Labouisse, as it was with Mr. Pate, it's very good, extremely harmonious, but not on the second level, not on the deputy level. Just because a few of their people, and a few of ours are a little bit suspicious of each other. And basically, let's face it, who's going to have the authority to make decisions? One reason I got the U.S. Committee out of the State Department was because we didn't want to have the U.S. Government breathe down our necks. Neither do we want the UNICEF Administration to tell us what to do. We feel that we're an independent, absolutely pure and pristine organization, which is beholden only to our volunteer Board, you see. Now, they question that. I think they think that perhaps the final decision should be theirs, because we use the word UNICEF in our title. We're the United States Committee for UNICEF. And this - I would like some time to do a thesis on the importance of the preposition. It's not the United States Committee of UNICEF. We were not set up by UNICEF. We are recognized by UNICEF. But it's for UNICEF.

Now, there's another committee, composed of international organizations, non-governmental organizations, about a hundred of them. That's the NGO Committee on UNICEF. Now the on has a little bit of a censorious inference,

hasn't it? And these prepositions are very important. We're for UNICEF - this means that we interpret UNICEF, we educate about UNICEF, and we raise money for UNICEF. But it is not on UNICEF or of UNICEF. And this is a distinction that is very important in our life. We'd lose some of our best and strongest people if they felt that we didn't have the final say on our programmes.

Q: Let's go on with that a little bit. Mr. Heyward, his ideas were what? That the U.S. Committee would give its money to projects that he felt needed the money? Or what did he really want?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: No. No, I think he knew that money goes to the central account, and that's the determining body that -

(Side two of tape)

Q: When the tape stopped, we were just trying to clarify Mr. Heyward's original desires for the U.S. Committee and what he wanted the relationship to be between the U.S. Committee and UNICEF itself, and you started to talk about that.

Mrs. Pantaleoni: I think that basically - of course, it's easier for them to deal with committees if they have the final word and tell them what to do. Another great rub came in, when we had not yet signed an agreement as some other committees have, between U.S. Committee and UNICEF, because they insisted on a certain percentage of the returns. Let me go back just a second.

The first agreement, I think, was in 1953, that I personally made with Maurice Pate, Executive Director of UNICEF, with me as President of the U.S. Committee and with Maurice Pate as Executive Director. We discussed the matter at great length. Pate knew that I couldn't operate without a staff. He knew that we'd need money for a staff, that nothing would happen until we sort of professionalized our efforts. I said to him, look here, if we have to raise money for our U.S. Committee, it's going to be terribly hard on UNICEF. Instead of saying, this money goes to UNICEF, we say, no, we need it for our own operation. People will give it to us, but then they won't give to UNICEF, and we'll be in competition with you. We'll be raising money for administration when we'd like to use money for the relief of the children.

So he very broadmindedly, we all think, said, well, you're quite right, you be the determining factor of how much money you need for your operation.



Q: To get started?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: To get started. If it's ten percent, for every hundred dollars you raise for UNICEF, keep ten dollars. And that was the agreement that I signed and he signed. It was an exchange of letters, just a very simple exchange of letters. We have been operating on that agreement ever since. For a long time, we could operate on ten percent because our costs weren't prohibitive the way they are now. Some years we even retained less than 10%: we withheld eight or nine percent, whether it was Trick or Treat, or greeting cards, or whatever.

But after a while, as costs escalated, we found that we could not run the greeting card programme on twenty-five percent, which was the sum recommended by UNICEF. Now, there's a subtlety here. We did not want to hold more than ten, or at the most fifteen percent from the Halloween project, because this was funds collected by children, pennies and dimes, and we thought it was very bad public relations to say to them, we're holding - we're allowed by the UNICEF formula to retain twenty-five percent of our receipts.

Q: Now, why does there have to be any kind of negotiations between the U.S. Committee and UNICEF itself? Why can't you just - ?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: That's a most logical question. Because the UNICEF people say, if they make an exception with our committee, then they will have to deal on an individual basis with the others - which I'm afraid is what they're going to have to do anyway with all the other committees. You see, it's a question of who has the say. In the last analysis, who has the say about the money we raise in UNICEF's name? Do we decide how much we turn over? Or do they say no, you can raise only, you can turn over, you can retain only such-and-such a percentage.

Q: Well, what's their argument for even -

Mrs. Pantaleoni: They say because we raise funds in the UNICEF name, they should be the ones to determine how much we can keep for our expenses. For

our part, we think our Board is just as objective - in fact, more so, because our Directors have no axe to grind at all. We believe our Board should determine that, not the UNICEF Administration. This matter is unresolved.

Q: Because you use the name UNICEF?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Because we're the U.S. Committee for UNICEF explicitly. We don't raise it for the Save The Children or any other organization.

Q: The fact that UNICEF appears in your letterhead, or title -

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Exactly.

Q: That is the thing that they feel entitles them - ?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Yes. They feel they're the guardian of that name. We say we're just as good a guardian of that name, and we're equipped to defend it. And now, the so-called - the terms of recognition, the agreement, is ready to be signed, after these many years. The relationship item came up in the Executive Board of UNICEF last year, and the National Committees, all of them, the European ones and ourselves, said we would not sign any agreement in which there was a specific mention of the retention percentage, that the percentage would have to be hammered out and negotiated directly between each committee and UNICEF. The Administration is going along with that.

So the basic agreement, in principle, of recognition of each other is ready to be signed now, as soon as Mr. Labouisse comes back.

Q: I would think that they want to cut off their nose to spite their face?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: I'm glad you said that, because this is what we think.

Q: I mean, if these national committees said, well, you're just too difficult to deal with?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Well, then there won't be any national committees.

Q: And then they'll lose tremendous amounts of money.

Mrs. Pantaleoni: I suppose so. Well, you mentioned Mr. Heyward. If he insisted, and his word were final, I don't think the U.S. Committee could operate, because it is not fair to our Executive Director to say, when costs skyrocket - rent, print, labor, everything - that he must hold let us say, thirty-one percent or whatever, of the greeting cards for expenses. Our Executive Director would not tolerate inflexibility in this area. We have political problems, too. Let's face it, UNICEF has political connotations. As long as you've got those letters "UN" in our title - as long as UNICEF itself is part of the U.N. family, as they call it, then, of course, it's bound to sound political to the public. You can't get away from it. And this is the burden really that we are under. Save the Children Federation, CARE, don't have that. They're non-governmental entirely. We're in an in-between situation, see what I mean. We have the U.S. Government on one side and UNICEF on the other and, of course, there are politics involved. Children are non-political, but the set-up has political angles. And we don't want them.

Q: So that the U.S. Committee, although it's dedicated to furthering the interests of UNICEF, it really can't be thought of in the same way at all. It has different goals, in a sense, different pressures on it, different --

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Different methodology, certainly, of raising funds.

Q: And a different division of how things ought to be done, in a sense. Right?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Yes. On practical things, it certainly has. It makes it a little bit difficult if we think one way, the parent organization another. It's not insoluble, certainly. We're mature human beings - we're working for the same goal, as Mr. Labouisse always assures us. He being an American, too, I think understands our problems better than some of his colleagues.

Q: Well, now, does UNICEF they must have come to count very heavily on the contributions collected by the National Committee?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Sure. Especially ours. Over the life of this committee, we've raised over a hundred and one million dollars. You can't sneeze at that. And more than that. If it weren't for the U.S. Committee, I don't know

really - perhaps this is a little extravagant - but there was a time when I wondered if there'd be any UNICEF without public support.

Many voices were heard in the halls of Congress, saying "we want UNICEF to continue - be generous, come on, boys". Without popular support, it was very possible that the U.S. contribution might have gone by the boards. It almost did, as I told you yesterday. So that this support is vital from every point of view.

Now, let me take an example of Canada. They're so much more, in many ways, enlightened than we are. In at least one province of Canada, the Provincial government thinks so well of the private efforts of the Canadian UNICEF National Committee that for every dollar they raise from the public, the Provincial government matches their contributions, which is almost the opposite of what our government has been doing. Our Government follows closely our fund-raising. We say to them, listen, the fact that these people are giving money means that they're interested in children. You ought to raise the government contribution. The more we make, the more you should raise.

Of course, you know, as in all complicated, rich democracies, there's a lack of agreement. I have listened to many intra-mural arguments. We've had some excellent people working for us in the State Department. The trouble is they don't last. They're sent off somewhere else after a while, and then we have to start "educating" all over again. You get in some negative character, a small-town bureaucrat, you know, and that gets to be a real struggle again.

Q: How are the decisions actually made in the U.S. government about how much our government gives to UNICEF?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Oh, it's a whole complicated process. It starts in the State Department and --

Q: They're the first ones?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Yes. The Executive Branch - the Department eventually sends its recommendation to the Hill. First comes the Bureau of the Budget: they work out their formulas, and as I say, in a budget the size of ours, the total for international aid is a small sum in itself. It's a tiny percentage. Comparisons are odious, and we're always bringing up the defense budget, but

whereas the defense budget is something like forty-three percent of the entire U.S. budget, all the international aid is about two percent of the budget. Tiny. And of that percentage, UNICEF is not even mentioned in the papers, it's so small. We would like to see it grow, and it should, especially in relationship to the present programme, which we think is a splendid development: what we call basic services, which is this new programme that's been worked out between the World Health Organization and UNICEF, of getting the local communities of developing countries all over the world, deciding themselves what they want to do: voting on their own projects, determining who of the population should be trained to administer the aid. Though the expression is cliché, it's a grass roots effort. It will involve thousands and thousands of communities, and it's going to take millions and millions of dollars. So Mr. Labouisse's goal, two hundred million by 1979, International Children's Year - we think should be realized. And doubled. But try and get the governments to go along! There are too many steps, there are too many people, there are too many things involved. It isn't easy, but we're trying.

Q: Well, now, you've given some ideas of the problems that confront UNICEF representatives, or the U.S. Committee's representatives, when they go to Washington to claim that more money be allocated. What about a country like Russia, for example, which is the big competitor, I suppose, on the international scene?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Recently, the U.S.S.R. was responsible for fourteen percent of the budget. Of the U.N. budget, I mean. According to what they're supposed to be able to pay - they're way under. In our special area - I think they paid in half a million dollars to UNICEF's central account. I think they're now up to seven hundred and fifty thousand. Maybe it's up to a million.

Q: What does that indicate to you?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Well, token - tokenism.

Q: That they feel they feel they can't get much mileage out of it?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Yes, chiefly. But they're quite sincerely interested. I

must say, in justice to them, that they've never been very obstructionist. In all the Executive Board meetings, the U.S.S.R. delegate would always open up by saying that he doesn't recognize the "Chinese imperialist dogs", you know, with Nationalist China sitting there. But he'd say it for the record, then he'd never refer to it again, and they were not too obstructionist. They're often in very violent disagreement about UNICEF policy, but generally, it's on technical grounds, not political.

Yes, sometimes politics come into it. In discussing the UNICEF appropriation for Viet Nam, of course they went all out politically on that, but never to the extent of trying to do something against UNICEF as such.

Q: Well, why do you think they don't make this a major -- ?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Because they don't control it enough, I imagine. I think I mentioned to you that that "first welfare conference on behalf of children" that they tried to set up. If UNICEF had disappeared, they probably would have set something up, entirely U.S.S.R. oriented. I think they're genuinely interested in this thing. I know some of the other Communist governments - Poland, for example, is extremely interested in UNICEF. It makes contributions to it, and is always supportive. They take the Communist line naturally, but sometimes, of late, they've disagreed with some of the U.S.S.R. positions; small things, but it shows a certain independence.

Q: Well, when aid arrives in a country that is selected for a UNICEF project, there's no way of the people living in that country to know that ninety percent of the aid came from Western European - I mean - ?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Our Government sees to it. We're pretty clever about that. I think I mentioned yesterday the dry skimmed milk.

Q: The milk sacks, yes.

Mrs. Pantaleoni: A "Gift of the United States People".

Q: Well, could Russia do the same thing?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Of course, it's comparative bidding on these products.

Whoever has the supplies and offers the best terms, those are then accepted by the Supply Division of UNICEF. So if Russia should furnish DDT for instance, or tools or something, sure, you can say it's a U.S.S.R. product.

Q: Well, I would think it would be a very clever technique. Apparently, the people who make those decisions don't agree, but it would be very --

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Well, they probably haven't given either as good a product or as cheap rates. Sometimes, their aid is attached. For instance, I heard the U.S.S.R. at one time wanted personnel to accompany the aid, and that was not accepted by the Executive Board of UNICEF. Their rules are very strict. Aid has to be completely non-political.

Q: So even though you made a major contribution, that doesn't mean that you would get your name on - ?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: Not necessarily. No.

Q: So it's too chancy to - ?

Mrs. Pantaleoni: It's pretty chancy. It is known the U.S.S.R. is interested in getting their people into Africa or into Asia. But UNICEF doesn't work that way. Into a controversial place like Viet Nam, for instance, they'd send a Netherlands member of the staff, a Swede, Swiss, that kind of thing. Not U.S. and not U.S.S.R. That is as near a guarantee as you can get that the aid will be objectively distributed.

Q: I see.

(end of interview)