

7
MVTrent/cg/5/21/75

~~Mr. Schmitz~~
03
5,67

Memorandum

Subject : Meeting with IAG Working Group representatives on wording
of NO ballot for Marianas plebiscite
Date : May 16, 1975
Place : OMSN
Participants : OMSN : Mr. Schmitz, chairman
Col. Smith
Mr. de Graffenried,
Mr. Archer
Miss Trent
DOD : Lt. Col. Burger
State : Mr. Knowles (EA/ANP)
Mrs. Williamson (IO/UNP)

At the invitation of OMSN, members of the IAG working group on Micronesia met to discuss the May 1 letter from the United Carolinian Association to the Secretary of the Interior requesting a revision in the wording of the NO option on the ballot for the Marianas plebiscite.

Pointing to the problem posed by the Carolinian letter, Mr. Schmitz opened discussion on the subject. Mr. Knowles stated that in a concerted position, the interested State Department elements (IO, EA and USUN) vigorously opposed any change in the wording of the ballot. Mrs. Williamson amplified this statement on the basis of conversations with USUN which she reported as being strongly opposed to any change. She said USUN felt it essential that, in order to meet the UNIC resolution of last year, there should be a clear simultaneous option to choose unity, and that if the ballot wording were changed in line with the Carolinian recommendation, the U.S. Government would be open to the charge that we have not in fact provided such option.

03 - 034782

A change in the wording would not, USUN believed, be effective in eliminating the feeling of racism that is a factor in the Marianas.

Reiterating firmly the position of USUN, Mrs. Williamson undertook to furnish to OMSN copies (or references) of texts from UNTC documents to back up the USUN position that, given the UNTC views, is needed in the ballot which will make clear that there is an option of remaining with the other Districts, or, in other words of maintaining Micronesian unity.

Lt. Col. Burger did not comment in the meeting but remarked afterward that he opposed any change in the ballot wording, feeling that it would increase the NO vote because of its implication that the Covenant could be renegotiated.