

R
03
7,2
POL 19 PACTT
497

DEPT. DISTRIBUTION
ORIGIN/ACTION
IO-0

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
AIRGRAM

RM/R	REP	AF	ARA
EUR	FE	NEA	CU
INR	E	P	IO
L	FBO	AID	3/5 56
AGR	COM	FRB	INT
LAB	TAR	TR	XMB
AIR	ARMY	NAVY	OSD
USIA	NSA	CIA	

Original to be Filed in _____ Decentralized Files.

FILE DESIGNATION

SECRET

CA-5991
NO.

HANDLING INDICATOR
TO : CANBERRA, LONDON, WELLINGTON
INFO : SUVA, TOKYO, USUN
FROM : Department of State
SUBJECT : Future of the TTPI:
with Micronesians
REF : CA-5708 of October 20, 1969 (NOTAL)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDC/MR
REVIEWED BY *W. H. [Signature]* DATE FEB. 25 1987
RDS or XDS EXT. D. *Nov 4 3 17 PM '69*
TS AUTH. _____ REASON(S) _____
ENDORSE EXISTING MARKINGS
DECLASSIFIED DATE: _____ RELEASABLE
RELEASE DENIED
RESULTS OF DISCUSSIONS

LIMDIS

SUGGESTED DISTRIBUTION

Department October 28, 1969, called in Australian (Smith) and New Zealand (Williams) Embassy representatives (British were invited but did not appear) to provide briefings on results of the discussions with Micronesian Delegation on future of the TTPI.

Department officers said that we had less of a concrete nature to report than we might have hoped. In fact, the talks had turned out to be very much preliminary in nature and amounted only to an exchange of views on various issues.

We said that both because of our desire to keep things informal and because of particular priorities established by Micronesians themselves, we had approached status question obliquely and in piecemeal fashion. Thus we had never formally discussed any of the legislative drafts that had been prepared -- either for them, or us or by the US Congress. Rather we had discussed a number of specific points of particular interest to Micronesians.

We said that, while Micronesians were in Washington for almost three weeks, serious discussions were largely confined to the last week. The Micronesians were not

SECRET

For Department Use Only

SECRET
1969 NOV 4 PM 5 49
COPY FLO - BR

POST ROUTING			
TO:	Action	Info.	Initials
AMB/PO			
DCM			
POL			
ECON			
CONS			
ADM			
AID			
USIS			
FILE			
Action Taken:			
Date:			
Initials:			

FORM 10-64 DS-323

Drafted by: IO:UNP:SRPeale:jkb
Drafting Date: 11/3/69
Phone No.: 20942
Contents and Classification Approved by: IO:UNP - Arthur R. Day

Clearances: IO:UNP - Mr. Frisbie EA/ANZ - Mr. Moore

05-419991

SECRET

2

very well prepared upon arrival, and after several brief formal meetings they had requested a week's recess to prepare their positions on the points of particular interest to them. During that week, in which various position papers were exchanged, it became clear that the question of land acquisition was of primary importance to the Micronesians. They wished (1) to see past grievances redressed; (2) to have current agreements re-examined; and (3) to have the procedures for future land takings clearly established.

We said that the US Delegation had offered to renegotiate all existing agreements and to establish a formal system of consultation and review of any intended land acquisitions through the Congress of Micronesia. For their part, the Micronesians wanted in essence a veto, both on the continuation of present agreements and on any future takings.

Despite considerable effort we were not able to find a compromise solution between these two positions. Since the Micronesians were not interested in discussing other matters in great detail in the absence of agreement on the land issue, it was decided to recess the discussions, giving both sides a chance for further reflection.

Department officers said other matters had, of course, been discussed, but the results were anything but clear. Some of the Micronesian proposals implied a very "free" association. But to the extent these proposals were discussed it was clear that they were not fully thought out and were, in any case, of secondary importance.

Another Micronesian point was their desire to draft their own constitution in a constitutional convention, but there was no clear indication of the limitation which they would accept on their freedom of action in this regard. There was some indication that they would accept very tight parameters -- a position not entirely consistent with "free" association.

Thus we said the discussions had not really produced any clear indication of where we might go from here and what the future status might be. We certainly need to re-examine our positions and hope the Micronesians will do the same. But we

SECRET

05- 419992

SECRET

3

think, as we had all along, that these discussions should be viewed as very preliminary -- as only the first step after many delays -- and that as such they should not be seen as too disappointing.

The next step is indefinite at this time. Either a special session of the Congress of Micronesia which may be called (on another, unrelated issue) in December or a trip to the Territory which Secretary Hickel is tentatively planning for January, may provide a clearer indication of how we might best proceed. We said that we thought the US position would be to seek a second meeting, perhaps early next year, quite possibly in the Territory. To have the next session on their ground might give us a better chance to find out what they really think on some of these issues.

In response to questions, the Department officers made the following additional points:

1. Military Aspects of the Land Question - We said the Micronesians had not specifically commented on this point -- that we both understood that when we were talking about land acquisition we were primarily concerned with military needs, but the Micronesians had not displayed any hostility to the military per se.

2. Time Schedule - We said that this had not really come up on either side. Obviously the results -- or lack thereof -- of these discussions made the resolution of the question within the optimum one year time frame less likely. However, we had no real feel for the Micronesian thinking on the time element except to the extent that a constitutional convention would seem to demand more time.

3. Reaction to Growing Japanese Influence - In response to a question by Smith, we said that, while the question of Japanese tourists and other aspects of an increasing Japanese presence had not arisen, the Micronesians had expressed some apprehension regarding the Japanese access permitted through the War Claims Agreement. We said we had been somewhat surprised by this attitude; that it had not been elucidated; but that we thought that the central complaint was not with the Japanese, but with the fact that we had not consulted the Micronesians more fully in formulating the Claims Agreement.

SECRET

05-419993

SECRET

4

4. Advisors - We said that the Micronesians seemed to be acting largely without advisors. We did acknowledge the presence of Professor Harrop Freeman, a law professor from Cornell, who had a claim through a resolution of the Congress of Micronesia to represent the people of the Territory. He could best be described as a self-styled defender of oppressed peoples, and with his aggressive, shock-tactic approach he was capable of causing us considerable difficulty. He had been in and out of the discussions in Washington and had been in on several of the courtesy calls which three members of the Delegation had made in New York on Angie Brooks, Lord Caradon (as President of the Security Council) and Ambassador Shaw (Australia - Acting President of the Trusteeship Council) on their way home. We thought, however, that Freeman's substantive role in the discussion had been limited, and we understood the Micronesians had made it quite clear to him that they would ask his advice when they wanted it.

5. US Congress' Reaction - We said we had heard nothing as yet. Several staff members had sat in on the discussions, but we had received no indication of Congressional reaction while the Micronesians were here. Interior would be explaining the situation to the key committees.

ROGERS

SECRET

05- 419994