

1985a

First Impressions after one careful reading, but given with the reservation the suggestions are not based on mature reflection.

MATTERS OF SUBSTANCE

The substance is all there and we have the structure for precisely the type of brief that is needed. It merely needs, as I think you recognize, the same sort of changes that an architect makes in his final drawings, based on his preliminary drawings; that is, refinements in arrangement and finished detail. Please consider all the following to be based on that premise.

1. I think that <sup>the</sup> introductory portions, based on your speech, should be further condensed by the elimination of anything that can be spared. This is not because there is anything at all objectionable in this material, but because it leaves one with the feeling we have been long in getting to the real issue - so much so, there is danger we have led their minds into other channels.

I think your delegate should steer away from this. You should know to say it with not spirit back, but may cannot.

2. There may be too frequent references to groups of business that may opposed to consolidation for either thoughtless of selfish reasons. They might well complain that this is the first time the issue has been presented to them in a way to ~~raise~~ raise it above the level of an inter-departmental row - and that we are partly at fault in that. I think it might be more effective to argue entirely on the premise that opposition is almost entirely based on a lack information and opportunity to know the facts. It is true that we have to quite an extent permitted Commerce to usurp the field and business has, in general, heard only the Commerce viewpoint.

3. I am a little dubious about making <sup>lectured</sup> specialists Foreign Service officers, even temporarily, and think you may have used this term only in a general sense. Strictly speaking an F.S.O. is a creature of statute and I think we should reserve it to those appointed in the regular way. Would it not serve the the same purpose to say ~~that~~ they should have suitable commissions under the Department of State to enable them to fulfill their missions.

4. I have some ideas for an insert to focus into one paragraph the thought that a mission that is a collection of representatives of several departments can never be anything but a house divided within itself as an instrument to conduct our business in a foreign country and that the conduct of our relations has become definitely a mixture of political, economic and commercial problems; that any ~~segregation~~ segregation of classes of duties as between Department's is impossible. I think we must state without specifying cases that we do have constant and damaging interference <sup>in Policy Board</sup> from other departments that have foreign representatives, sometimes perhaps innocently, but none the less destructive. We must assert this will continue until we get consolidation and no coordination methods can cure it. They are going to try to make us compromise and we must make out a case to show it is impossible.

5. By the consolidation of services in our own department which you have well described, we have vastly improved out foreign establishments with greatly increased work and with less F.S.O.'s that in pre-depression days. What other Government service can show such a ~~record~~ record. The opportunity for similar accomplishment is even greater by consolidation.

Arrangement of Material

Warren and I will work on this during your absence and there seems no purpose in discussing it. I am surprised to find the sequence of material so nearly correct in view of your expressed doubt on that point. We will work out sub-headings. The only noteworthy change I have to suggest at the moment is that quite a bit of the material which now follows your outline of the actual plan of consolidation should probably precede it in that part of the memorandum where you indicate that consolidation is now imperative and can no longer, in view of changes in our international relations, be considered even debatable, or subject to \$\$\$\$\$\$ considerations of mere expediency.

Language

We will make such minor changes as seem advisable to promote smoothness, \$\$\$\$ simplicity and clarity. They will not be numerous or change the meaning. I do not wish your individuality, \$\$ eliminated for rhetorical considerations because you are going to be the spearhead of all oral negotiations and the written brief should largely conform to the oral approach and the two should be absolutely consistent.

I think we should have a section definitely indicating how the prestige of the B. of For, and Dom. Com. will be built up by consolidation and in other ways, wherever possible in the \$\$\$\$ memorandum, insert language calculated to raise the issue definitely above the status\$\$\$ of interdepartmental friction, ambition, or jealousy. I am convinced past efforts have always suffered and failed from this cause and it is by no means an easy impression to dispel with Commerce constantly \$\$\$\$\$ urging it as our motive.

\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$

Excuse my typing. It is the first time I have tried to type more than a line or two for a couple years. I do not think the foregoing is of fundamental importance but thought my first impressions might be moderately interesting before you leave.

