

2/5/68

To (Handwritten)

PEACE CORPS / MICRONESIA

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

EYES ONLY

RP (circled)

Headquarters
P.O. Box 392
Saipan, Mariana Islands
96950

MJ (Handwritten)

January 30, 1968

MEMORANDUM

Important (Handwritten)

Kevin/Kee
RP (Handwritten)

TO: Kevin Delaney
Acting Regional Director/EAP

FROM: John Pincetich
Director, PC/Micronesia

SUBJECT: Congressional Visits -- A Review

The first two reports on these visits were essentially reportage, done under some deadline pressures to get them to you -- and suffered the deficiencies of such endeavor. In this I'll try to bring just a bit more balance to the picture, and with the inclusion of reports from various Districts, give a fuller flavor to the whole event.

Norwood, TT/PC Relationships.

Enclosed is a letter sent to Bill Norwood yesterday, which, in essence says PC/Micronesia and TT simply have to bury the hatchet, put the immediate past behind us. I hope to talk this over before I leave here Thursday, enroute Malaysia/Thailand from Guam on Saturday. Bill will be in Washington, D. C. in late February for budget hearings, or review, and most certainly an EAP meeting with him and others in Interior seems to be in order. Enclosed also is a copy of a letter I wrote Ruth Van Cleve re her recent speech on the value of criticism. It seems to me that the way is going to be clear to get old animosities settled and give Roger a chance to really make Micronesia hum.

Media Program Criticism

Enclosed is the Met Poraus article, plus the next issue, which certainly is an improvement, journalistically. You might want to show it to Foley. Enclosed also is a copy of a Star-Bulletin story as picked up by the Guam Daily News, and later by several TT District papers. This story played a role in developing Foley's critical attitude. He seemed to feel the District papers should not have used it as is, but rather checked it first. Which is outside all customary journalistic practice. It is a story by a

16 (Handwritten)

Washington Staff writer, quoting, not by name, members of the Committee concerning what went on in a session. That it apparently was only a highly colored version is beside the point. To expect an editor, anywhere, to do anything but run it as is, goes beyond the realm of usual practice.

The story, in large part, tended to set up the critical attitude of the Committee, of Volunteers. And it made the Volunteer/Committee dialogue a bit tenser than need be, at the outset. After the first several Districts generally Foley would dis-own the story first off, and tell the Volunteers the Committee wasn't out here for drawing and quartering the Peace Corps. Note in the January [REDACTED] issue of Met Poraus, a letter to the Editor from a Volunteer, commenting on the story and, in effect, tossing a bit of a gauntlet down.

Enclosed also you will find copies of letters I've written to all Districts which gives you some material for discussion with any Committee members on what we are doing to follow-up their concerns. (As well as copies of letters written to House members).

Finally, I feel we can bring the [REDACTED] into line -- they really aren't far out. Basically their critical style is only a reflection of Truk. And the oft-transigent Trukese. There was no particular problem in other Districts on this media score.

Volunteer Lawyers with District Legislatures

Very little can be added. Again, the circumstances in which [REDACTED] negative attitude began to take hold were such to give him such a feeling. In other Districts the Volunteer lawyer assistance is solid, unobtrusive. The Committee took back with them copies of the work done by John Farrell in Yap, a huge compilation of Committee Reports, laws, resolutions, all put together in orderly fashion that is a quantum jump forward in putting order into that body's work -- and really a fine contribution by a Volunteer lawyer.

We continue to get requests for more lawyers, at the local level and for the Congress. Again, Kaleb Udui wants one from each District at the next Congressional session. These young men are among our best professional placements. Not only do they do a fine job for Micronesia, but are themselves enjoying a productive Volunteer experience.

True, we, the PC/Micronesia Staff, have fought off efforts by TT to simply incorporate the lawyers into their existing system. More than

3.

any other Volunteers they tend to "free lance". But they are more professional than any Volunteers. To program them close to the people is truly paying off, though not always in a manner that TT/Saipan would cheer.

This is a solid program, including the placement with the Legislatures, though we can certainly do more to insure, by training and Staff counselling, that the problems imagined [REDACTED] not occur. Ain't none of these fellows really going to take over! Honest.

Political Involvement

Here, the volume of Volunteer talk about the future of Micronesia only rose because of the Congressional presence. It has not been a prior large discussion item in any District. If so, it's been so damn sub rosa no one has heard of it. It will become more a subject now, for the Congressional visit has whetted appetites for knowledge of the political future. And PC/Micronesia's Volunteers stand by to work with TT in any kind of political education program. We have urged this several times on Neiman Craley (see Deputy Director's Meeting Report), and at the fall meeting of the Distads. Volunteer interest, enthusiasm, and general political orientation can be put to work very positively on behalf of the whole gamut of political education. But PC/Micronesia has got to await the TT leadership in this one area. It is just too sensitive for us to be embarking on our own, though I'm positive we could put together a coordinated program covering the pros and cons of various USA association, in fairly good style.

This subject, however, of the USA position, the USA "interest" and Volunteer espousal or non-espousal is one for careful review on your end. The House came through much more Hawkish -- i. e. it's the USA's best interest that Micronesia affiliate in some fashion -- than the Senate. At the Status Commission meeting with the Senators, they were quite off-hand, allowed as how anything Micronesia opted for, Micronesia would get. This is certainly contrary to the thrust of the House group. Also, the Senate group felt members of the Micronesian Congress ought to be on the USA Status Commission, one bill calls for six places for Micronesia, while the House felt they should not, i. e., they ought to protect their independence of action. On this point the senators said that all the USA status commission would really do is set up the roles for the plebescite, decide what the various offerings would be, (i. e. independence, commonwealth, territory, etc.) and other aspects, including the possibility of partitioning the Trust Territory, i. e.,

22-430612

II

18

10

Marianas to affiliate with Guam, other Districts to form a political unit, etc. All of this left some confusion in Micronesia minds. To them, "plebescite" is already becoming kind of a scary word.

But my concern is that if the House position is taken, i. e. that overt U.S. policy should be to make certain Micronesia allies with the U.S., and that all government agencies must conform -- then PC/Micronesia may have a problem staying here.

I still regard, legally, the future of Micronesia, vis-a-vis the USA, as an element of our "foreign policy", hence something that Volunteers are free to form their own opinions on. Our rules at the present don't describe it that way, because U. S. policy is unclear, hence the PCV handbook carefully notes that Volunteers cannot engage in "advocacy" of any position over another -- though some have done so with the House Committee members. But I don't feel we can be pinned to the carpet in this area because U. S. policy is so fuzzy -- and certainly the Micronesia Status Commission would be the first to testify on that -- the House having told them one thing, the Senate another.

Of course, the final policy re Peace Corps out here is made on your end, and the Field Staff will follow what is decided. This, again, is a subject that should be closely followed with the House Committee, especially if it proceeds in its quest for a clarification of U. S. policy from the White House, or whoever does such things.

Dual Administration

My letter to Norwood is our attempt to get this one settled. I certainly don't argue the present PC/Micronesia pattern is the best one. I have been concerned about the pattern for the future. See the June 5 letter to Ross on my June PC/Washington visit which notes this subject, introduced my concerns. I also noted them in the report of my final talk with Evaluator Carroll. I've never been able to bring the subject up with Norwood, for various reasons. Certainly a fusion of Staffs might be considered in the future. Norwood is under orders, in my judgement, to decentralize his government, put it closer to the people. He is going to need some expert managerial help to dis-entangle his headquarters setup and re-distribute power to the Districts. Whether he seeks it outside is hard to say at this point. While I defended the present staffing pattern to Senator Burdick with some vehemence, because of the rather one-sided manner he arrived at his conclusions, I don't for the moment have a doctrinaire position. As we have written time and again, Micro-

nesia is a unique program, hence regular Peace Corps staffing may not be required. The only requirement is the guarantee, not just in writing, but in daily practice, that a Volunteer can be as much of a Volunteer in Micronesia as elsewhere. This can come from many patterns of staffing. Again, a subject that might well be discussed at the Ruth Van Cleve level soon, perhaps when Norwood is in town.

Miscellany --

Committee Staffs

I wrote on Van Ness, a real friend. Gamble of the Senate Committee I only talked with perfunctorily. I get the feeling he is Burdick's bird-dog, so see Van Ness as the best channel.

Charles Lippert of the House Committee -- A friend, but would tend to bend with the Committee majority without voicing his own feelings. He was positive on us. Lee McElvaine (sp.?) I did not see much of, nor get much of a feel for.

Jerry Murphy of HEW -- a friend, who learned a lot and who is quite positive on our efforts.

Senator Moss -- Note Clancy's report which seems quite positive, but then Leo's is less so on this Senator. For certain I don't think he holds Burdick's strong negative views, but probably not Metcalf's most affirmative views either.

Metcalf -- Again, can only emphasize he is very positive about PC/Micronesia and certainly serves as a Senatorial entree for EAP for discussing any problems.

Burdick -- The more I review the manner of his handling of PC/Micronesia, the positiveness of his feeling we all should be under "the Distad", the feedback I got from Van Ness on his general reactions to Volunteers, as members of the younger generation, the more I feel he is lost to Peace Corps for good. At most he will be a "yes, but" supporter. I'm quite sure he will push for such items as one administration, one budget, etc.

FINALLY: the voice is loud and clear that both Committees want to know more about what's going on out here. I cannot too strongly recommend the development of a direct liaison with both Committees, or Staffs, a high-level person in EAP. I don't see the future of this program