

SEPTEMBER 7, 1973

MARIANAS VARIETY NEWS & VIEWS

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Page 5

MORATORIUM?

Dear Editor:

The U.S. Government's sole on the decision to declare land moratorium on Tinian, which affects the homesteading program as well as potential economic development in the way of outside private developers and investors, has been amplified and has appeared to be a unilateral decision in fact made without consultation and approval of the local political status commission? Did the commission have prior knowledge about the impending moratorium on Tinian? What important actions for personal gains were taken by individual commission members to take advantage of the alleged U.S. instigated moratorium?

Let's review the events that could lead to answer these questions. During the first session in December, 1972 between the Marianas Political Status Commission and the U.S. Delegation, the following statement was made by Chairman Ed Pangelinan with regards to Public Land lease in the Marianas. He stated, "In the interim we ask that the United States join us in requesting the High Commissioner to refrain from approving any leases on public lands to non-citizens of the Marianas without prior consultation with the Marianas Political Status Commission". (Page 20, "Report on the Marianas Political

suddenly withdraw their previous support on land moratorium? One possible answer was that, the U.S., again a scapegoat to another controversy, and moratorium being politically unpopular among the people as the members eventually found out, the members chose to change their support and instead put all the blame on the U.S.

I believe that members of the Status Commission had previous knowledge of the moratorium. I do not believe that during their two long sessions with the U.S. delegation that the subject was never brought up. Certainly, if military land requirements were discussed, it should stand to reason that public land leases and the homesteading program were also subjects of the discussion as these issues will have a direct influence on what will the moratorium on land on Tinian do to the present land owners and particularly the land values when the time comes to negotiate with the U.S. on its military land requirement? For the residents of San Jose Village, it has already been established that the U.S. will be willing to generously compensate the people for their homes and land. For those landowners such as several members of the Commission, the prospect for a better deal is eminent.

As early as January of this year, less than a month after the first session of the status talks was completed, Vicente N. Santos, a member of the Commission took steps to take advantage of the moratorium and the future prospect for land exchange or purchase by the U.S. For \$11,000 he purchased land on Tinian totalling 480,000 square feet. This is less than 3 cents per square foot. Imagine selling this size of land to the military for \$5.00 a square foot, or even \$1.00

03 - 028116

cal Status Commission, First Session Dec. 1972") Is it possible that the U.S. could have used the undertook a land transaction that involved a double above declaration in its decision to impose land moratorium on Tinian? It appears obvious to this writer that the so-called "moratorium" on land on Tinian was indirectly but originally instigated by the commission itself. This would apply only to public land leases which will have an important effect on economic development.

Just recently, some members of the commission expressed shock and disappointment on the "action" of the U.S. on the Tinian land moratorium, claiming that the "decision (by the U.S.) was made unilaterally and without any consultation with the people of Tinian. It's probably true that the indigenous people were not consulted, but isn't it the Marianas Political Status Commission's original idea to declare the moratorium on lands in the Marianas affecting economic development?

On August 7, 1973, a resolution was introduced into the Marianas District Legislature calling the alleged U.S. imposed economic development moratorium on Tinian a "blatant and flagrant denial of due process for the island's residents". The President of the District Legislature, Vicente N. Santos and Tinian's representative, Herman T. Manglona, both sponsored a resolution calling the land moratorium "a breach of good faith and the spirit of cooperation that existed between the status negotiations for the United States and the Marianas Islands District".

Both of the sponsors are members of the Marianas Political Status Commission. Both of them must have been aware of the fact that the Chairman of the Political Status Commission, in which he spoke on behalf of the Commission, endorsed the idea to temporarily stop leasing of public land in the Marianas District. Why then did several members of the Status Commission

In May of this year, two members of the Commission,

Is it possible that the U.S. could have used the undertook a land transaction that involved a double above declaration in its decision to impose land moratorium on Tinian? It appears obvious to this writer that the so-called "moratorium" on land on Tinian was indirectly but originally instigated by the commission itself. This would apply only to public land leases which will have an important effect on economic development.

Just recently, some members of the commission expressed shock and disappointment on the "action" of the U.S. on the Tinian land moratorium, claiming that the "decision (by the U.S.) was made unilaterally and without any consultation with the people of Tinian. It's probably true that the indigenous people were not consulted, but isn't it the Marianas Political Status Commission's original idea to declare the moratorium on lands in the Marianas affecting economic development?

On August 7, 1973, a resolution was introduced into

the Marianas District Legislature calling the alleged U.S. imposed economic development moratorium on Tinian a "blatant and flagrant denial of due process for the island's residents". The President of the District Legislature, Vicente N. Santos and Tinian's representative, Herman T. Manglona, both sponsored a resolution calling the land moratorium "a breach of good faith and the spirit of cooperation that existed between the status negotiations for the United States and the Marianas Islands District".

Both of the sponsors are members of the Marianas Political Status Commission. Both of them must have been aware of the fact that the Chairman of the Political Status Commission, in which he spoke on behalf of the Commission, endorsed the idea to temporarily stop leasing of public land in the Marianas District. Why then did several members of the Status Commission

GOLF COURSE RESTAURANT

NOW
SERVING JAPANESE DISHES
lunch & dinner
**Sashimi, Tempura, Kushi yaki, Yakitori,
Soba & more dishes**

OPEN SIX DAYS A WEEK EXCEPT MONDAY
SERVICE TIME: 10 a.m. to 7 p.m.
FOR RESERVATIONS CALL: 6143

028112

A Personal View

By JON A. ANDERSON

to make a deal.

Why all this sudden rush to buy land on Tinian? Obviously, these representatives of the people know the inside story of land values and the monetary potentials of the military on future land transaction, and despite their awareness of a conflict of interest, as they are intimately involved with all aspects of the status negotiation, and the public trust bestowed upon them to negotiate in good faith, they obviously let their greed overpower what remains of their dignities!

The people of the Marianas had expressed strong support for a genuine political relationship between the people of the Marianas and the people of the United States. The ridiculous proposal of the military on land use and requirements in the Marianas, however, has actually negated the solution to important land issues.

The Tinian land scandal which involved several members of the Commission should generate enough concern among the U.S. negotiators to stop the talks until our own representatives learn to negotiate in good faith instead of using the negotiations for their own personal material gains.

Interesting position paper in the Sept. 3 issue of the Micronitor. The basic suggestion is that the status issue is being pushed too fast. Let's call a moratorium, and wait five years before mentioning the subject again, the paper suggests. Worth thinking about. I've been pondering the problem of Guam Publication's application for a business permit, and must admit I have mixed feelings about it. Surely it is obvious that granting such a permit would work a hardship on the two local weeklies. There is only so much advertising revenue on Saipan, and those available dollars are already stretched pretty thin. On the other hand, the Guam papers have lately been providing the best, most accurate coverage they've ever devoted to the Trust Territory, and an expanded operation on Saipan could be a real boost to the quality of TI journalism. On balance, though, I think I'll have to go along with

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Continued from page 5

why all this sudden rush to buy land on Tinian? Obviously, these representatives of the people know the inside story of land values and the monetary potentials of the military on future land transaction, and despite their awareness of a conflict of interest, as they are intimately involved with all aspects of the status negotiation, and the public trust bestowed upon them to negotiate in good faith, they obviously let their greed overpower what remains of their dignities!

The people of the Marianas had expressed strong support for a genuine political relationship between the people of the Marianas and the people of the United States. The ridiculous proposal of the military on land use and requirements in the Marianas, however, has actually negated the solution to important land issues.

The Tinian land scandal which involved several members of the Commission should generate enough concern among the U.S. negotiators to stop the talks until our own representatives learn to negotiate in good faith instead of using the negotiations for their own personal material gains.

Furthermore, the integrity of the entire Status Commission members will be needlessly subjected to public mistrust on account of these members who deliberately abuse the "good faith" concept upon which the negotiations are supposed to be founded.

/s/ Pete A. Tenorio
Saipan

028118

the recommendation of the Marianas Economic Development Board. My friends at PDN will jump all over me for that, but I really think the board's basic position in the case is sound, at least for now.

Hard to come away from any visit to Honolulu these days without the feeling that the city is destroying itself. Gone is most of the charm of the place, replaced by high-rise, blah, concrete yuk, a familiar brown stink in the air that reminds one of Los Angeles, traffic that is worse than Los Angeles, and round-the-clock noise. The only thing that still can save the town is that a lot of nice people live there, and some of them still care. Others are escaping, though, in increasing numbers, mostly to the neighbor islands. A recent state job on Molokai, at a very low salary, drew 130 applications, most of them from people already holding better-paying jobs on Oahu. Does anybody else besides me get sick of listening to the Baptist huckster on the radio? So don't listen, you say. Well all right, I won't, but by whose strange definition does such stuff fall into the category of public service, anyhow, especially on an island where the vast majority of the public is Roman Catholic? Oh, the unions, please.

HAPPY HOUR

SAIPAN BOWLING CENTER COCKTAIL LOUNGE

MIXED DRINKS = .75
BEER = .30

These drinks are offered only on
WEEKDAYS — Between 5:30 TO 6:30 P.M.
WEEKENDS AND HOLIDAYS
2:00 TO 4:00 P.M.

Come and enjoy your favorite drink
with your favorite friends in the cool
atmosphere of the Bowling Center.

MARSHALS VARIETY NEWS VIEWS

Publishers, Abed and
Paz Castro Yonnis
Editor, Abed Yonnis

Published by YONNIS ART STUDIO
P.O. Box 231, Saipan, M.I. 96950/ Tel: 631-
Mail Subscriptions: \$15 a year

028119

JOINT STATEMENT ON TALKS

SAIPAN—Following meetings held last week the U.S. and Congress of Micronesia delegations to the Micronesian Future Status Negotiations issued a joint statement Tuesday (Sept. 4) detailing the matters discussed. Here is the complete text of that statement:

"Ambassador Franklin Poydn Williams, the President's Personal Representative for Micronesian Status Negotiations and Senator Lazarus Salili, Chairman of the Congress of Micronesia's Joint Committee on Future Status, met on Guam August 30 to discuss a wide range of matters relating to the future status negotiations. Also present were Congressman Briesman, Captain Sirk, Chairman of the Joint Commission on the Draft Compact of Free Association, USN, Director of the Office for Micronesian Negotiations, and Captain Bitch Scott, USN, Director of the Office for Micronesian Status Negotiations.

"Like other informal sessions which the Chairmen of the two delegations have been holding approximately monthly, the constructive fruitful discussion of August 30 made an important contribution to the preparatory work going forward prior to the resumption of talks by the full delegations later.

This autumn, it was agreed that the primary coming objective remains the early completion of the necessary preparatory work and subsequent completion of the Draft Compact of Free Association. Ambassador Williams noted that two U.S. fact finding teams have just completed tours of all the districts and he gave Senator Salili summaries of their preliminary reports. Finally, the two sides discussed the time table for the resumption of talks by their full delegations. It was felt that in view of the work still to be accomplished, particularly on questions relating to land, it was probable that the delegations would not meet until late October or early November.

"Also discussed were the economic moratorium onilian and pending charges involving three members of the Trust Territory Administration.

BANK OF AMERICA

BLACK GENERAL CONTRACTOR

EQUIPMENT

SERVING

"Another important substantive issue discussed

07/01/20