

March 30, 1959

To: Dean Glen L. Taggart
From: Wesley R. Fishel
Subject: National University, Taiwan

I spoke with three of the California people and with other persons in the State Department and ICA. The picture which I was given stressed the Chinese attitudes toward the California program, although some mention was made of California's attitudes as well.

To dispose of the latter first, California appears to have had considerable difficulty in staffing the project. Ryerson had too many things to handle to be able to spend much time giving personal guidance or direction to the Taiwan project. Furthermore, there was not "feed back" which accrued to Berkeley from this program, since apparently most of its staff in Taiwan were not regular members of the faculty. The project did not fit into on-campus work and programs, and comparisons were drawn several times between this project and the reportedly highly successful Purdue engineering project in Taiwan.

The Chinese felt that California was not really interested ("it has so many projects") and that it did not do a careful job of staffing ("they sent pasture types or very young men without experience"). The Chinese also stated that California showed a lack of understanding and an unwillingness to try and see things as the Chinese believed them to be. They took the attitude that the Chinese were "underdeveloped" and needed "help" and "advice", whereas the Chinese wanted "collaborators" who could appreciate their sophistication and the advances they had already made, and who would treat them as equals "with patience and understanding." The Chinese thought well of Ryerson personally, but they pointed out that he visited Taiwan very seldom and stayed but a brief period on each visit. This the Chinese resented.

The point was made by almost everyone with whom I spoke that patience is the key to successful negotiations with the Chinese; that ICA might very well meet that and all stipulations which MSU might have, but that it might take the Chinese as long as a year or even more to complete their end of the negotiations. This sort of delay should be anticipated and taken in stride, if MSU is really interested in the proposed involvement. I also found a strong feeling on the part of the State Department people that any arrangement with the National University would be worthwhile and rewarding to us from an intellectual standpoint, and there was also agreement that we should try for a relationship which would take in more than just agriculture, but

March 30, 1959

that we should move slowly so as not to frighten or alarm the Chinese into possibly thinking that we wanted to get our fingers into the things which should not properly concern us. It was suggested that it would be useful to us if at some early stage in negotiations representatives of the National University could visit MSU and be enabled to draw their own conclusions as to our qualifications for the job.

Among the persons with whom I talked the most helpful were Gardner Palmer, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs; Dr. John Lacey, Director, Office of Research and Analysis for Asia, Department of State; Josiah Whitney Bennett, Chief, Political Section, Office of Chinese Affairs, Department of State; Ambassador George Yeh of the Republic of China; and members of the staff; Dr. John Tsu, Head of the Far Eastern Institute at Seaton Hall University; and Professors Robert Scalapino, Guy Pauker, and Richard Park of the University of California. It was not possible to speak with Ray Moyer, because he was on Capitol Hill answering questions about "Mismanagement in Laos." Mike Adler was also unavailable since he is currently in the Far East on an inspection trip.

WRF:jb