

03

58

August 23, 1973

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. LAPIN

Subject: Marianas Background Memorandum

I have reviewed the draft memorandum dated August 16, 1973 and submit the following general comments for your consideration:

(1) I generally agree with the length and tone of the memorandum, although as indicated below I have some specific suggestions with respect to matters that should be deleted and those that should be discussed.

(2) In connection with the first paragraph of introductory matter, I think it would be useful to try and enlist the interest of the reader by suggesting that recent negotiations culminated in a Joint Communique dated June 4 which shows substantial progress being made towards bringing the Marianas within the American political family and that this is an historic event of some significance.

(3) I also wonder whether the memorandum can be written along these same lines without specifically addressing it to Congress. The only other possible use I can imagine is in connection with fundraising efforts but there may be other uses which come to mind over time. I wonder whether we lose anything at all by trying to write this without addressing it specifically to Congress.

(4) The first real substantive problem I have is in the discussion beginning at page 3. I agree that we need some brief historical background regarding the origin of the separate status negotiations but I want to carefully avoid any criticism of the Joint Committee's negotiations with the United States. I would try and compress the materials at pages 3-6 into approximately three paragraphs or so. The main point to emphasize would be that as the Joint Committee has identified the dual negotiating goals of independence or free association, the Marianas have confirmed their contrary desire for a close status with the United States. In this connection, I like the point made at page 10, which might be made earlier, to the effect that the Marianas have a common interest in early termination of the Trusteeship and, therefore, the success of the Joint Committee's negotiations.

01-05031

(5) I believe that too much space is devoted to the United Nations and fragmentation issues, and I apologize if this is a change of view on my part. Since we have an attachment which spells out our position in some detail on this issue, I think it is less important to deal with it at this length in the memorandum. I also have the sense that even the informed and interested reader is not really going to be too interested in this aspect of the matter, although I could clearly be wrong. To the extent that this matter is discussed, we should make reference to the recent appearance before the Trusteeship Council, and the apparent decision of the Council not to adopt the recommendation of the U.N. Visiting Mission. On the whole, the disposition of most readers of the memorandum will be to favor any negotiations which are aimed at a close relationship with the United States and I am looking for a way to more or less put things in this light earlier in the memorandum. Also, I wonder whether we should emphasize the relative amount of progress which has been made in connection with our negotiations, as opposed to the Joint Committee's, as an additional reason for writing and circulating this memorandum.

(6) I believe that the last section of this memorandum, beginning at page 10, should be increased significantly in length. I agree that there is some virtue in identifying the important goals of the Mariana Islands in their negotiations but I still am inclined that it might be useful, particularly since the Joint Communique will be attached, to separate our discussion into the three areas of political status, economics and land requirements.

(7) On the political status side I think that we should include the discussion at pages 12-14 which represent a graceful way of recognizing that the future relationship between the United States and the Marianas may be somewhat unique. In this connection, I wonder whether we do have to try and recognize the fact that the relationship will be different from that existing in Guam and the Virgin Islands and try to explain why this is appropriate. To the extent we do address this problem, I think we should emphasize the desire to learn from the experience of various territorial relationships, to reflect the particular needs of the Mariana Islands and to try and do what is most fitting and appropriate at the outset rather than develop the relationship gradually over time. In this connection, I would not hesitate to use the language of the Washington Post editorial

regarding the "vexing responsibility" of the United States and the necessity of leaving the Mariana Islands in a situation "of promise and dignity."

(8) With respect to financial support, I wonder whether we need some additional discussions. For example, it might be useful to put in some per capita income figures, to emphasize tactfully the limited monies which were made available to the entire Trust Territory by the United States until the early 1960's, the extent that capital improvements ~~which~~ have not been made in the Marianas, etc. I wonder also whether more detail might be usefully provided in support of our need for comprehensive economic planning and to suggest the kind of financial support that might be necessary over an initial period of years until the Marianas reach economic self-sufficiency. I clearly believe we should be more explicit as to why the guarantee of financial support is important.

(9) With respect to the military land requirements, I think we should be somewhat more explicit about the kind of proposal which has been made by the United States for the island of Tinian. I would consider adding as an attachment to the memorandum an appropriate news article which does this job, perhaps the Oberdorfer article of some months ago or some article from the Guam newspaper outlining the military proposal. I think our stated reservations about the proposal will be more meaningful if the breadth of the proposal and its security significance have been made clear to the reader.

I think that we should consider a separate conclusion for the memorandum, looking forward to the next round of negotiations and the kinds of problems which will be discussed at that time. Generally we want to leave the reader with a sense that some substantial progress has been made, the aims of the Marianas are legal and realistic, and men of good will should be able to negotiate fully to enable all parts to achieve their goals.

cc: Mr. Carter

 HPW