

23

July 2, 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. WILLENS

Subject: Carnegie Endowment Report on the Marianas Negotiations

I have reviewed the chapter of the Carnegie Endowment report concerning the Marianas negotiations.

1. With respect to the supposed failure of the Joint Committee to approve the Marianas' request for separate negotiations (p. 5), it seems to me that the testimony of a Micronesian delegation staff member is not the sole source of information. Do you have any knowledge that the Joint Committee did in fact approve the request?

2. A minor point: Ben Manglona, if I am thinking of the right person, is presently a member of the MPSC, not a former member as stated on page 6.

3. On page 11, I do not know what it means to say that Pangelinan and Guerrero "are concerned with protecting their own best interests instead of thinking on a territory-wide basis as the other districts do." These men, of course, are concerned only with the Marianas; but the sentence implies that they are simply protecting their personal interests. Note also that Guerrero is wrongly described as a co-chairman of the MPSC.

4. You have already noted the inaccuracies with respect to fees on page 13. Note also that the expenditures for you and Leonard are described as covering only air fare! Finally, Joe Screen is no longer a financial consultant.

5. A very important mistake appears on page 21, where the report states that the mutual consent provisions are not binding on a later U.S. Congress.

6. On what would be pages 31 and 32, if they were numbered, there is a discussion of the Tinian referendum. Perhaps the only point worth making is that the Commission has in fact consulted often and fully with the people on Tinian, and the Tinian has two representatives on the Commission. I would not get into a discussion of the competing petitions, since there is no reference to them in the chapter.

09445

7. On page 36 there is a report that Pangelinan made a land purchase through an uncle. True?

8. The only matter which the chapter ignores entirely is the applicability of United States laws and the United States Constitution. This might be brought out as a way of showing that the people of the Marianas do in fact have very different views with respect to the relationship with the United States than do the people in the other districts. The customs and traditions and level of economic development in the other districts is such that the applicability of U.S. laws and major portions of the U.S. Constitution would seriously disrupt normal life - while in the Marianas this is not so.

9. In general, it certainly could have been, and in earlier drafts was, a lot worse.

Michael S. Helfer