

Dr. LaPlante
VN file

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

July 29, 1960

Dr. Lloyd D. Husolf, Chief Advisor

Conversation with Arthur Gardiner, Director of USOM, July 28, 1960

Mr. Gardiner greeted me cordially and after exchanging pleasantries we proceeded immediately to a discussion of various topics. I noted that various incidents concerned with relations between the Police group and USOM had been discussed with Drs. Smuckler and Austin in Washington. In view of the fact that these incidents had already been raised and discussed and that relations were now proceeding more smoothly, I stated that I did not intend to discuss them again. Mr. Gardiner was, of course, agreeable to this suggestion.

The first item considered was Milton Taylor's final report on taxation. This is a document of only a dozen pages or so which summarizes the need for tax reform, presents both short-range and long-range steps, and makes references to the lengthy reports produced earlier. Hopefully it will lend itself to acquainting high GVN officials with the tax problem. Although the USOM-MSU Taxation Policy Committee had reviewed the document, Gardiner told me that he had not been informed of the contents of the document. For such a contingency, I had brought the one revised copy with me and at Gardiner's request it was left with him for his perusal.

We turned next to a discussion of police matters. Gardiner was told that MSUG did not anticipate a need for a new police contract after mid-1962. Probably certain of our activities would have to be carried on after that time, but this could be done by USOM advisors. Possible fields would include Record and Identification bureau tasks, communications, traffic, and training. I explained that Walton and Turner had discussed this question and were in agreement on possible fields requiring advice after mid-1962. I stated also that Ralph Turner had reported Walton had reviewed with the Ambassador MSU projects that might be turned over to USOM at the end of contract. The Ambassador's reaction had been that he was surprised that any follow-up would be needed for MSU. Walton had then explained that MSU found a very primitive set-up in 1955, that MSU had brought GVN police services along well, but that satisfactory standards could not be reached in all fields by mid-1962. By way of emphasizing our willingness to help out wherever we can, I informed Gardiner that: 1) Hemye is writing a report summarizing the communications situation for USOM and plans to

hold conferences with USOM's new communications man when he arrives; and 2) MSU continues to stand ready to help USOM answer the Civil Guard's request for teachers to instruct in civil police subjects. Gardiner expressed his gratification about MSU's willingness in both of these areas.

Next, I reviewed the future personnel situation in the Police group. I thought it wise to do this because of the Embassy-USOM emphasis on reducing the number of Americans in Saigon. (It will be recalled that Coster even called me into his office for an explanation of the hiring of Evert Emery; Coster said that the Ambassador probably would ask him.) Atkins, I stated, would be here until mid-1962 and Hamville is scheduled to leave in December, 1961. I said that the University is now discussing the question of whether there should be a successor to Ralph Turner. There are many projects only now beginning which will hit their stride after the time that Ralph leaves in May, 1961. Our feeling is that it may be preferable to have an MSU man to supervise the completion of a number of projects. These include the completion of various communications centers, the construction of several buildings, the training of radio technicians, and the giving of English language training to participants. Gardiner indicated some preliminary sympathy to the idea of having an MSU person around to see that these projects were completed. Gardiner stated that he would like to have Turner draw up a careful justification for obtaining a replacement for him. I stated that Turner is already planning to draw up such a document for East Lansing and that we could easily send it to USOM. Gardiner said he wants Walton to examine the justification very carefully. Gardiner seemed particularly skeptical as to how much a general supervisor could do in seeing that the communications centers were finished, that the radio equipment was installed, and that radio technicians were trained. I inferred from his manner that he thought USOM supervisors might well check on such activities.

Before I had a chance to get into the question of MSU's future relationship with the NIA, Gardiner brought up the topic. He said that he was strongly in favor of foundation financing for our work at the NIA after mid-1962, and that "a number of people in Washington agree with me." Gardiner said he had been wondering what the best method would be to get a foundation interested in sponsoring such a set-up. I stated that I hoped the matter of MSU's future role at the NIA could be put strictly on a basis of needs at the NIA. I said that I was sure that USOM and GVN might have varying ideas as to what should happen after mid-1962, but that in any case the question should be answered by a careful evaluation of needs. Such a study, I said, has already been begun and it is being carried out jointly by MSU and NIA. (Although I did not explain the specific situation to Gardiner, the NIA at present merely knows that we are cooperating in a study of its own future activities.) I stated that I thought the second stage of this study process might involve bringing a consultant from Campus. I said that the Chairman of the Department of Political Science is familiar with other MSUG projects, with a number of foundation programs, and with the resources of the Campus. In January or February it might be a good idea to have this consultant come out to help us evaluate the picture

of needs uncovered at the NIA. Cardiner made no explicit comment but by his manner seemed to react favorably to this suggestion. On the question of foundation financing, I made a point of mentioning Dean Seelye's question about the attitude of a foundation that knew ICA was not renewing a contract. Cardiner said he saw no difficulty in approaching a foundation in this situation. He based his reaction on two points: 1) foundations are increasingly playing a role in projects which have long-range significance, and the best evidence of this is the Ford Foundation's decision to send five Brookings Institution experts; and 2) the United States Government is increasingly favoring foundation-supported projects that involve raising the performance level of underdeveloped countries. Cardiner also stated that we ought to recognize the advantage to the University in having an arrangement that permitted greater freedom. In an apparent reference to some recent happenings, he said, "When we tell our people to follow a certain policy they had better do it." I said that I was sure that NSU appreciated the value of freedom of action. Turning again to what we contemplated at the NIA after 1962, I stated that we were making a proposal to the NIA that various evening courses suitable for police leaders be instituted. If the NIA accepted such an idea, it is likely, I stated, that at least one police advisor would be included in any NSU group at the NIA after mid-1962.

Turning to still another subject, I asked Cardiner whether he was familiar with the recent disallowance involving the fictitious vendor. He stated that he was, and I proceeded to fill him in on the fact that during his absence USCM had referred the disallowance question to ICA/W. I then mentioned Vice President May's proposal that USCM temporarily assume the pre-audit function until NSU could train NIA to assume it. Cardiner confirmed my suspicion that USCM would not undertake such a move while the disallowance question was up for discussion in Washington, and he added that USCM simply does not have the manpower to pre-audit any contractor's expenditures. Also, he foresaw a mingling of USCM's pre-audit and post-audit functions if such a step should be undertaken. We agreed to drop any further discussion until some decision on the disallowance was forthcoming from ICA/W.

The final topic discussed was the custody of duplicate reports on certain conversations (not in the line of duty) held with GVN officials. A dilemma has arisen from the fact that USCM has classified the original copies of a number of these reports. By law, then, NSU is not entitled to keep any copies. It was finally agreed that copies of classified reports would not be kept in the custody of NSU or its staff members. Whenever an NSU official requires access to such classified reports at USCM such access will be given.