

July 23, 1973

03
6,7

MEMORANDUM FOR THE FILE

Subject: Interview with Mr. McHenry of the
Carnegie Foundation

On July 20 I met with Mr. McHenry and one of his assistants to discuss the study of Micronesia which is currently being undertaken by the Carnegie Foundation. I met Mr. McHenry briefly during the session of the Trusteeship Council in New York which I attended last month and the meeting was set up at my request so that each of us could become more fully acquainted with the other's responsibilities. This memorandum will summarize the substance of our meeting.

(1) Mr. McHenry described his study of Micronesia as being part of a series of so-called "humanitarian" studies. Other topics chosen for study as part of this program include Nigeria and Southern Rhodesia. One such study, dealing with Burundi and authored by Roger Morris, has already been published. The stated purposes of the program are to conduct detailed factual studies of issues which have a substantial humanitarian concern and have not been the subject of much political attention. Micronesia was chosen as a subject for study because of Mr. McHenry's interest in the field, going back to his days as a Foreign Service officer with the Department of State, and his conviction that very little attention has been paid to Micronesia. He plans to produce his study by approximately May of 1974 so that its conclusion can be reviewed in time to be of assistance in the current negotiations between the United States and Micronesia and any Congressional review of the agreement arrived at as a result of these negotiations.

(2) Mr. McHenry has consulted with the Office of Micronesian Status Negotiations regarding his study. He described his relationship with the United States representatives as "correct". He states that he intends to make a trip to Micronesia of approximately a month's duration during late September and October. Apparently the U.S. representatives are not anxious to have Mr. McHenry in Micronesia during the next round of negotiations with the Joint Committee. I got the general impression that the

01-04741

United States representatives were not cooperating in any degree with Mr. McHenry, although they apparently expressed to him their considerable satisfaction with the recently concluded round of negotiations with the Marianas. It was Mr. McHenry's general reaction to the Marianas negotiations that the parties had apparently agreed in principle on many important matters but the questions left unresolved were so important so as to cause considerable doubt on the validity of the agreement in principle. He generally is very scornful of the value of any commitments received by the Marianas (or other segments of Micronesia) from the United States Executive branch.

(3) Mr. McHenry and his numerous student assistants have spent considerable time in consulting with members of Congress regarding their knowledge of Micronesia. In addition to canvassing members of the various committees with responsibility for the territories of the United States, he plans also to consult with members of the relevant Appropriations Committee, the Subcommittees of the Foreign Affairs Committee dealing with the United Nations and the Armed Services Committee. Based upon his interviews to date, he generally concludes that people on the Hill have very little knowledge of Micronesia and what is going on in the course of the current negotiations. He is very critical of the United States delegation for not consulting more thoroughly with members of Congress regarding their negotiations. He indicated to me that some members of the United States delegation may share his feelings in this regard and may be urging that more extensive consultation with Congress be undertaken in the near future. Mr. McHenry plans to continue his own interviews of members of Congress if only to provide a basis for asserting in his study that Micronesia generally has received very little attention by Congress.

(4) Mr. McHenry indicated that his study will certainly deal with the fragmentation issue raised by the separate Marianas status negotiations. Based upon his comments and general demeanor, I believe that Mr. McHenry is a fairly strong opponent of our separate negotiations and that his report is unlikely to be favorable on this issue. We discussed at some length the reasons underlying these separate negotiations. Mr. McHenry believes that the fragmentation question will be a principal issue in Congress, specifically with such members as Congressman Bingham, who he described as one of the more knowledgeable members of Congress in this field with some specialized knowledge and concern for the United Nations. In the course of preparing

his study Mr. McHenry will be involving numerous academic experts, including some who have strong views on the subject of these separate status negotiations. Mr. McHenry was not very specific as to the basis for his views on fragmentation or very responsive when I emphasized the wishes of the people of the Mariana Islands to have a different kind of relationship with the United States than was apparently desired by the remainder of Micronesia.

(5) During the course of our meeting I reviewed the more important aspects of the Joint Communique with Mr. McHenry. With respect to our aims regarding a future political status, Mr. McHenry was very discouraging. He stated that we would probably encounter considerable opposition from Congress with respect to any efforts to depart from the usual territorial format and that our proposed political status might well trigger an overall review by Congress of the political status of each of the territories or commonwealths of the United States. I acknowledged that this was a likely possibility and explained why the Commission was interested in having a different and better political status than that currently possessed by Guam. I suggested also that Mr. McHenry's study might explore this issue in an effort to develop recommendations to Congress as to how the political status arrangements which currently exist could be improved.

(6) On the general subject of financial support, Mr. McHenry was also discouraging regarding the prospects for long term financial guarantees. He thinks that the tentative commitment on the part of the United States delegation to support such long term guarantees is virtually worthless because of the anticipated opposition of Congress. In this connection, he generally gives the impression that he thinks we are being led down the primrose path by the United States delegation and that they will ultimately give us only token support for those aspects of the negotiated agreement which they do not in truth support.

(7) On the subject of the United States military proposals for Tinian, Mr. McHenry was very skeptical regarding the extent to which these proposals had been approved or cleared before our negotiations in Saipan. Based upon his consultations on the Hill, Mr. McHenry does not believe that these proposals were reviewed with many influential members of Congress or that assurances were received regarding the availability of funds for these projects. He also questioned the extent to which these matters were cleared within the Executive branch. Based upon our own information regarding clearances in the Executive branch, I think that Mr. McHenry is probably wrong but his comments with respect to consultations on the Hill are interesting.

(8) I offered to cooperate with Mr. McHenry to the extent that he believes that it would be in our mutual interest. They are planning to interview me formally within the next several days, as they plan to do also with Paul Warnke and numerous members of the United States delegation. Mr. McHenry indicated that he plans to include Mr. Warnke and myself on a panel of advisers to review certain portions of his report prior to its publication. Apparently they hope to involve also several law professors or others with expertise in the field of international law and the other subjects which will be touched in the course of the study. I said that I certainly would be ready and willing to participate in this review function, and it obviously offers a way for us to keep in touch with the progress of the study and make our best efforts to influence its conclusion.

(9) As the above indicates, I have certain initial impressions regarding Mr. McHenry and the likely direction of his study. I believe that our contacts with Mr. McHenry and his assistants should have two principal goals in mind. First, I think we should make every effort to try to neutralize Mr. McHenry's present position regarding separate status negotiations for the Marianas and try to persuade him that the separate negotiations are being carried on in a professional and arms-length fashion between the United States and the Marianas Political Status Commission. Second, I think we should try to encourage Mr. McHenry to deal thoughtfully with the kinds of issues we are raising in the areas of political status, financial support and military land needs so that his study can be used to educate members of Congress and the public along lines which are generally in the interest of the Marianas. Because of the humanitarian emphasis of the study and the Carnegie Foundation generally, there are grounds for hope that Mr. McHenry's study will be written in an effort to assist the people of Micronesia to secure a new political status of their free choice which does honor to the United States. Accordingly, I believe that we should continue to be in contact with Mr. McHenry and that, when he visits Micronesia, every effort should be made to educate and persuade him regarding the merits of our position.

H. P. Willens