CRAWFORT PL ODOWENAS SEIEN 12/13 Hennel Seen 13

## U.S. Reassures Micronesia

STAR-BULLETIN

## on Weapons

By Gardiner B. Jones
Editor, Pacific News Service

SAIPAN, Mariana Islands—For the second time within days, the United States has felt compelled to clarify the state of negotiations on the future political status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific

U.S. Ambassador Franklin Hadyn Williams has sent a lengthy telegram to Trust Territory High Commissioner Edward E. Johnston dealing with what has and has not been said about possible storage of nuclear weapons in Micronesia.

His telegram, intended to be a reassurance to the political leaders of Micronesia, followed closely on a public statement by John Dorrance, State Department advisor to the High Commissioner. Dorrance, like the ambassador, addressed himself to points on which he felt there was misrepresentation and misunderstanding in Micronesia.

The U.S. position on the future status of Micronesia, spelled out in talks with Micronesian negotiators at Hana, Maui, in October, has in part been misrepresented. Some elements in the Micronesian independence movement seem to have a well-developed gift for incorrectly presenting the U.S. position.

AT THE SAME time.

however, the U.S. has contributed to the confusion by its fondness for imprecise language. The argument about nuclear weapons storage is a case in point.

At Hana, the Micronesians specifically asked Ambassador Williams whether the U.S. intended to store nuclear weapons in Micronesia and, if so, whether the U.S. would agree to prior consultation with the Micronesians before so doing.

The ambassador said, in effect, that there are no current plans for such storage. Without saying so specifically, he did indicate that the U.S. would want an option for such storage. And he quite firmly rejected the idea of prior consultation.

On close reading, the Ambassador's meaning seems quite clear — but his remarks were couched in anything but simple, direct English.

A couple of weeks later, Assistant Defense Secretary David Packard, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in Washington, was asked if the U.S. intended to move the nuclear weapons stored on Okinawa to Micronesia when Okinawa reverts to Japan.

Packard replied in much the same vein as Williams had spoken at Hana. He said there were no such plans currently but that the U.S. was keeping its options open.

BUT PACKARD, like Williams, was less than precise in his language. The lack of precision allowed some independence advocates to conclude, or profess to have concluded, that the U.S. was planning a secret nuclear weapons storage facility in Micronesia.

Williams' telegram to the High Commissioner said in part:

"It would be wrong and misleading for anyone to-conclude that the testimony on the Okinawa treaty showed any inconsistency with the U.S. government's firm and limited proposal that I outlined in Hawaii.

"The U.S. proposals there represent the decision of the highest levels of the U.S. government and I made them with full authorization. Those proposals are firm, and no U.S. official intended to imply amendment to them in any way."

The episode is significant because it tends to obscure the major shift in position made by the U.S. to accommodate Micronesian desires on future status. At Hana, the U.S. accepted in principle the Micronesian proposal for a free association with the U.S., under which Micronesia would handle its internal affairs without hindrance and the U.S. would be responsible for defense and foreign relations.

- Honolulu, Hawaii HAWAII CLIPPING SERVICE HONOLULU STAR-BULLETIN PHONE: 734-8124

## Œ,

Jordiner B. Jones tor, Pacific News Service PAN, Mariana Islands-the United States has political status of the the second time within compelled to clarify the Territory of the Pacifnegotiations on the ď

Ambassador Franklin ward E. Johnston deal-Williams has sent a y telegram to Trust ory High Commissionith what has and has en said about possible e of nuclear weapons d rronesia,

-telegram, intended to eassurance to the pol-

followed closely on a public the High Commissioner. misunderstanding in Microstatement by John Dorrance, State Department advisor to dor, addressed --himself to Dorrance, like the ambassapoints on which he felt there was misrepresentation and nesia.

The U.S. position on the Hana, Maui, in October, has Some elements in the Mimovement seem to have a independence well-developed gift for incorin part been misrepresented. rectly presenting the U.S. negotiators cronesian cronesian position.

Y. eaders of Micronesia,

time

THE

however, the U.S. has conto the confusion about nuclear weapons storby its fondness for imprecise language. The argument age is a case in point. tributed

dor Williams, whether the U.S. intended to store nuspecifically asked Ambassafuture status of Micronesia, clear weapons in Micronesia spelled out in talks with Mi- and, if so, whether the U.S. At Hana, the Micronesians would agree to prior consultation with the Micronesians before so doing.

The ambassador said, in effect, that there are no current plans for such storage, ly, he did indicate that the Without saying so specifical-U.S. would want an option for such storage. And he firmly rejected the quite

idea of prior consultation.

thing but simple, direct En-On close reading; the Ambassador's meaning seems marks were couched in anyquite clear -- but his reglish.

before the Senate Foreign Relations Conmittee in Washington, was asked if when Okinawa reverts to Ja-A couple of weeks later, Assistant Defense Secretary David Packard, testifying the U.S. intended to move the nuclear weapons stored on Okinawa to Micronesia

Packard replied in much the same vein as Williams had spoken at Hana. He said there were no such plans currently but that the U.S.

its options keeping Was open.

to have concluded, that the U.S. was planning a secret BUT PACKARD, like Williams, was less than pre-cise in his language. The lack of precision allowed cates to conclude, or profess nuclear weapons storage faindependence advocility in Micronesia. some

Williams' telegram to the High Commissioner said in part: "It would be wrong and misleading for anyone to conclude that the testimony Okinawa treaty and limited proposal showed any inconsistency with the U.S. government's firm

hat I outlined in Hawaii

erunent and I made theur with full authorization. Those proposals are firm, "The U.S. proposals there highest levels of the U.S. gov and no U.S. official intended represent the decision of the to imply amendment them in any way."

be responsible for defense ple the Micronesian proposa The episode is significan for a free association with the U.S., under which Micromodate Micronesian desire on future status. At Hans because it tends to obscurthe major shift in position made by the U.S. to accom the U.S. accepted in princ nesia would handle its inter drance and the U.S. nal