

October 5, 1966

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DIRECTOR

FROM: Kevin Delany

SUBJECT: Vaughn/Norwood Memorandum of Agreement

(1) I have discussed this thoroughly with Ross Pritchard, and we are very concerned about Bill Norwood's request to make your agreement with him a public document in Micronesia. We feel that wide publication among the Micronesians could dissipate a good deal of the pro-Peace Corps feeling among the Micronesians themselves.

(2) The Interior Department came up with the idea for the document, and they have pressed strongly for it. We agreed on the understanding that this was to be an informal instrument between the Peace Corps and the High Commissioner and his staff. If we had known that this was intended for publication among the mass of Micronesians, we would have insisted upon language indicating in a number of places that the Peace Corps will be in Micronesia at the pleasure of the Micronesians, that our program there will be responsive to their wishes.

(3) Pritchard, Pincetich, and everyone else from the Peace Corps has spent a lot of time cultivating the Micronesians. We have tried to respect their sensitivities and their suspicions about the Peace Corps' role in the Trust Territory. If publicized, the tone of this agreement as it now stands could be badly interpreted by them.

(4) For these reasons, I have suggested Point 5 in the attached cable. We are not against having the agreement, but if it is to be made part of the public record, it should be rephrased in a number of places.

II
22-37 430626

OCT - 5 1966

Honorable William R. Norwood
High Commissioner of the Trust Territory
of the Pacific Islands
Saipan, Mariana Islands

Dear Mr. Norwood:

This is in further reference to your letter of September 7 enclosing copies of H. J. R. No. 6 requesting that the name of the territorial government be changed to "Government of Micronesia," and to H. J. R. No. 47 requesting a Presidential commission to study the political status of the islands. We have asked you for information on the votes on Resolution 46 (which you have since supplied) and for a letter outlining the background and discussion of the proposal.

As you know we have for several years been discussing political status questions with State on an "ad hoc" basis, with results that are unsatisfactory to all those involved. The more we discuss the question, the farther apart we seem to be.

Your letter of September 7, by happy coincidence, arrived just as we were being questioned informally by Senate committee staff personnel on the general subject, and at the precise time that Dr. Taylor handed to us his report to the House Committee on his trip to Key West. (Mr. Mangan sent you a copy the other day.) You will recall that Dr. Taylor recommended that the Senate and House Committees confer on the subject.

On reading H. J. R. 47, several of us concluded that another "Presidential commission," even, one formally designated, would only lead us down the same road to futility unless Congressional representatives are included. What we actually need is a "commission" composed of members of the Executive (presumably Interior, State and Defense); the Congress (House and Senate Interior but possibly also House and Senate Foreign Affairs); and the Congress of Micronesia (representatives of, not the full membership). This suggestion was made, informally and in a low key manner, to State by Under Secretary Luce but we received no real reaction from State.

Various Interior Committee people, both staff and members, have inquired about a commission possibility, and our rough idea has met with a generally enthusiastic response. Although by no means fully "staffed out," the response in Interior has been equally enthusiastic.

We had hoped during the past week to draft a proposed U. S. Congress "status commission" resolution to be submitted as (1) a drafting service (for which we already have an informal request), or (2) a formal Executive Branch proposal (which, unfortunately, involves a tremendous amount of inter-departmental clearances, including clearances from some who might drag their feet far too long). Our drafting efforts were, however, sidetracked by preparations for the House consideration of the ceiling bill and, since the hearing, in a major effort to get to members of the committee material which they can use in floor debate.

However, I should like to have from you as soon as possible your thoughts as to how the Congress of Micronesia members might best be chosen and how many. We do need to keep the "commission" as small as possible, but we would expect to have an absolute minimum of two from the Congress of Micronesia—one from each house. We could specify the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, or we could specify that they would name the Congress commission members. You might prefer a formula which would guarantee that at least six Congress of Micronesia commission members would be chosen, one from each district. Or you might find it more practical to have each district legislature name a participant on the commission.

Your views will be greatly appreciated. We only ask that you not formally discuss this with Congress of Micronesia people or other Micronesian leaders at this juncture. At the appropriate time we shall certainly ask that they be formally consulted.

With respect to the "Government of Micronesia" resolution, we should also like to have your views as well as any background information on votes and discussions in the Congress of Micronesia. Our own reaction is favorable but we doubt that the change in names can easily be accomplished. The term "Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands" has been written into a number of Federal statutes and, if the name change is to come about, these statutes should also be amended. Actually, the technique of doing so is quite simple; the problem is getting the Congress to turn to it, possibly at the cost of legislation more important to us. The Code of the Trust Territory would also have to be amended appropriately, and the technique could again be relatively simple. In each case a bill saying something like "wherever they appear the words 'Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands' are hereby deleted and the words 'Government of

Micronesia' are substituted in lieu thereof" would probably suffice. We have, however, taken a quick look at the trusteeship agreement and, while the phrase "Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands" does not specifically appear, the area is consistently referred to as the "trust territory." More unfortunately, the last sentence of Article I reads:

"The Territory of the Pacific Islands is hereinafter referred to as the trust territory."

In light of that language, some members of the trusteeship council or of the U. N. generally might look very suspiciously upon the name change contemplated. For example, the Committee of 24 has recently concluded with respect to the Cocos Islands (population 470) that "The Cocos Islands have special problems of size and economic viability but that should not preclude the administering Power from complying with the implementation of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)," Resolution 1514 is the one that calls for an immediate grant of independence to "all colonial peoples and countries."

In the circumstances, the proposed name change might generate a tempest. We should like to have the background of it, however, and particularly we would like to know how strongly the Micronesians may feel on the point. Perhaps the UN Visiting Mission will endorse it. That would take some of the sting out of it if we should decide to attempt to implement H. J. R. No. 6.

Lastly, can you let me know when the printed version of the laws and resolutions enacted by the second Congress will be available?

Sincerely yours,

~~1966~~ Mrs. Ruth G. Van Cleve

Mrs. Ruth G. Van Cleve
Director