

August 25

Dear Will,

I'm glad to have your two notes of August 22, because they will force me to plunk out the letter to you that I've had in mind for many days.

1. First, as to the proposed legislature, well you might wonder about my "consultations with Micronesian leaders", for heavens sakes. That radio was sent out without my either signing it or knowing of it (a violation of one of my few ultimatata to date) and, as I pointed out to the author when I came upon it in the reading file, it was misleading to the point of deception. I did talk with "Micronesian leaders", in the sense that I sought an opportunity to learn some of the views of Amata Kabua and Dwight Heine, but this largely thru Pete Coëman, during our hours of relative inactivity in Kwajalein.

Whatever, I am strongly of the view that the Legislature must be bicameral and that compensation should, at least at the outset, be at the lower level, following either the Guam or the Virgin Islands pattern. Happily everyone about seems to agree, most particularly including John Carver, and I've thus no doubt that the final order will contain both of these aspects.

As for the timing, I've had a promise for the last four weeks running that the final documents would be on my desk by the close of business on Friday. This week I've promised hysteria, tears, and other unsuitable carryings on if they're not. I foresee no serious lapse of time once they're (I refer to a Sec. order and covering memo) out of the typewriter in the Office of Territories, for, as noted above, John Carver is both prepared to act in a hurry and convinced of the major points at issue. It's my plan to send you, as soon as they're typed, copies of what we're sending forward, with the hope that you can react speedily to let us know if anything strikes you as awful. I do hope to have these documents in the mail to you this week. I can promise nothing, regrettably, because my nagging is obviously insufficient to cause my colleagues to move. If many more days pass, however, I shall myself churn out the necessary words on my own typewriter, for I'm enormously conscious of your need for these actions soonest.

2. About three weeks ago I sent back the position descriptions on Messrs. Spivey and de Young, on the ground that they weren't written in the English language, and was told yesterday that our personnel people were "working on them". I had no problem with the substance, only with sentences that wouldn't parse. The Hawkins one was redone promptly and has gone forward to Newell Terry. (I realize that the heat is off now, but earlier I thought we ought to pull that one out, fix up the grammar, and get it going in a special hurry. So we did it that way.) I shall start nagging now to get the others out. I shall, I think, stop reading job descriptions. I'm assured that no one else ever does, and you see what it leads to.

3. Roughly the same status applies to the Trace appointment. I've not seen the papers on this, but know them to be lodged elsewhere in the Office of Territories. I shall prod on this one.

4. I too was pleased with Mr. Baggs. I'll undertake to find suitable channels for checking him out and will let you know what I can on this soon.

5. With respect to the economic development contract, I'd composed a wire to you before going home last night, but refrained from signing it when your letters greeted me this morning. Apart from being highly amused at your taking a "side trip" from Honolulu to Washington, I see no reason why we can't put off the selection until late September. It occurs to me, however, that maybe we can do something useful by long distance before that, and that we could turn to the actual negotiation when you arrive. Frankly I don't quite visualize the timing here: I don't know how long a selection committee would take to make its ratings, and I don't know how long after that it'd take to negotiate with the number 1 company. But I'm inclined to believe the second step is more important than the first, from the standpoint of your physical presence here. The seven companies from whom we expect proposals (all on our list except for Stanford Research, which says it's too busy on other things) are all good, in the sense of technical competence. We'd probably have no difficulty giving good marks to any one, on the basis of the submission. But I rather think the actual negotiation, when we will probably turn rather specially to who's going to be where doing what when, could be the more crucial step.

This musing gets us ~~nowhere~~ nowhere. For sure I think you should come to Washington toward the end of Septm. What occurs to me as possible, and this we can't know for sure til we open the envelopes next week, is that we might send copies of everything to you for your views. A committee might be mulling over the proposals and your views concerning them and be poised to act shortly after you arrive. If everyone is in agreement, the first choice might be made before you arrive. Then we might immediately sit down and start to negotiate.

There are obviously a wide ranges of choices, and I'd suggest that for now you simply plan to come in, and next week I'll be in further touch with you, after we've opened the proposals and had a look at both their form and substance. I've clearly no real view as to the best procedure.

Two subjects of my own:

1. How are things with Dick? Has he said anything pertinent to you on the subject of his future? Have you had any recent exchanges with Manuel on the subject? I agreed, you'll recall, to be in touch about this in early September.

2. We've had a couple of low-keyed Congressional letters on the subject of Dr. Gibson's departure, essentially inquiries asking the circumstances. And we've replied saying he resigned, having found

the proposed TT administrative arrangements not much to his liking. But last week we had a bit of a fulmination from Senator Inouye, saying that Dr. G. had lots of good friends in Hawaii, and what did we think of his (Dr. G's) letter to the President concerning his (Dr. G's) departure from the TT. Unfortunately I've not got the incoming, for it went forward in a hurry with our proposed reply. They included a longish letter from Gibson to the President, saying he's worked hard and long and John Carver had finally gotten rid of him. (Much invective against Carver.) A covering letter from Gibson to Inouye, saying roughly the same, and the Senator's letter to Udall. We needed to respond in a hurry, what with everyone tootling off to Atlantic City this week, so sent up the enclosed, a letter (drafted by Marty Mangan, from which I extracted some of the polemics) and a covering memo (drafter by me). Carver told Marty he thought these were splendid, so I suppose they've gone forward, but we have no word of that. Copies are enclosed for your info.

I'd appreciate your ~~burning~~ burning them, and this, after reading. I can write freely only if I'm sure no eyes but yours see these things.

I'll hope to be in touch in about a week on the contract proposals.

Cheers,