

Hold for possible letter
to Murphy.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE TRANSMITTAL SLIP	CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED
	DATE October 29, 1974
TO See Distribution Below	For the Attention of
FROM Status Liaison Office, Saipan	
TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE	TO THE DEPARTMENT
<input type="checkbox"/> For Transmittal to Addressee at the Discretion of Post <input type="checkbox"/> Post Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> Transmit to Foreign Office <input type="checkbox"/> Submit Report <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to the Individual	<input type="checkbox"/> Dept. Information Only <input type="checkbox"/> CERP Publications <input type="checkbox"/> Enclosure to Previous Airgram <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Department Request
<input type="checkbox"/> Transmit to: <input type="checkbox"/> Inform:	(U. S. Agency)
REFERENCE Saipan A-14, October 25, 1974 "Guam Legislature Request for Dialogue with Committee of 24"	
ITEMS/REMARKS Attached is an editorial of the <u>Pacific Daily News</u> , Guam, October 29, 1974, concerning the Guam Legislature Resolution No. 326. Copies to: ✓ Ambassador Williams OMSN DOTA IO/UNP EA/ANP COMTWELVE CINCPAC FOR POLAD USUN	
IN REPLY REFER TO FILE NUMBER AND DRAFTING OFFICE	
FILE NO.	SIGNATURE A. E. Bergesen
CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED	OFFICE Status LNO

Editorial

Strange Resolution.....

At first blush it appears that almost the entire Guam Legislature took leave of their collective senses, and a bare week before the General Election, passed and printed in the Daily News a resolution which seems to be anti-American in nature.

The Resolution said: "Whereas, this report of the Special Committee reaffirms the inalienable rights of the people of Guam to self-determination and independence in conformity with the declaration of the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples contained in the General Assembly Resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960."

Further the Twelfth Guam Legislature then asks the U.S. Department of State to take immediate steps to permit representatives of the Special Committee of the U.N. to visit Guam for the purpose of examining firsthand the Federal presence on Guam, and to help establish a dialogue with Guam concerning the issue of political status.

The whole thing is exceptionally strange in that political status has really been an issue during the entire campaign. One earlier poll had shown that a mere one percent of the Guamanian people wanted independence, and that the vast majority preferred a continued, strong and lasting relationship with the U.S.

Why on earth would the Legislature, all but three standing for re-election, come out with a resolution which seems to condemn U.S. colonialism, seems to condemn U.S. military, and asks the United Nations to send out an investigation team, and seems to talk loosely about independence?

The United States, of course, has always taken the position that because Guam is a part of the U.S. and all Guamanians are U.S. citizens, there could be no U.N. visitation because that would be interfering in a domestic matter—much the same if the U.N. team tried to visit Riga, in what used to be called Estonia, but now is an integral part of the Soviet Union.

Needless to say the Resolution received immediate criticism from several sources. One, patriotic and influential Sen. Hiram Fong of Hawaii, happened to be on the island. He said that he was "shocked to read that there was a resolution asking for independence, after 78 years of association with the U.S." However, he said that if the resolution came to the attention of the Senate, and was considered, "I would vote for the wishes of the people here." He interpreted the resolution as being pro-independence. Sen. Fong said that the people must be "very unhappy" with the status quo here. Sen. Fong outlined the hazards of staying outside the protective belt of U.S. association.

Another person to blast the resolution was Sen. Al Ysrael, who said he voted against the resolution, introduced and sponsored by Sen. Paul Bordallo and Ricardo Salas. He said "I lodged an unequivocal rejection of this resolution and voted a strong 'no'." He went on to say: "I believe that the Democratic leadership is out of touch with the wishes of the community. Our future and our goal lies with a stronger association with the United States of America. We are Americans, bound by unbreakable chains that have been forged with the blood of our fellow residents in Guam in three wars. Many have died to establish our rights as U.S. citizens."

Ysrael went on to charge: "The Democratic leadership has been consistently anti-American, anti-military, and anti-investment. They would like to build a 'coral wall' around Guam and prevent Guam from becoming a part of the mainstream of the best country in the world, the U.S.A." Ysrael said that the Democratic leadership, "will lead us to bankruptcy and recession," and pointed out that the greater bulk of our Government of Guam income of nearly \$120 million comes from the military, from tourism, and from investments. The "New Day Crusaders would like to exclude them without giving us an alternative substitute for the economy benefits presently being derived from such sources." He said that Wednesday's resolution "is just like asking the United Nations to interfere with the internal affairs of California or Hawaii."

He concluded by saying: "Our future lies in continuing our present close association with the U.S.A. and having more to say about our internal affairs, in a slightly amended version of our present political status. The Democratic leadership is preaching bigoted nationalism and selected racism, which is contrary to the best interest of the community of Guam."

We're not sure that the Legislature feels quite that way. The majority may have been led down the primrose path by a minority of leaders, in keeping with the spirit of United Nations week. When you carefully read over the resolution, it doesn't sound quite that drastic, although as we said earlier, the timing, in the midst of the last two weeks of the campaign, seems to be incredibly bad. The U.N. Special Committee, after all, was quoted in the resolution that the "administering power" plans to talk with Guamanian officials to review the relationship of Guam to the United States government and its programs. It also noted "with satisfaction" that progress has been made on Guam economically, and several other bills including the submerged land bill are being considered by the U.S. Congress.

Still, the entire legislature (with the exception of Ysrael) has, perhaps, unnecessarily and unfairly been tagged with an "anti-American" and "anti-military" label in the critical last week of a campaign in which scarce mention of future political status has been made. It might be wise for individual members of the legislature to stand up and be counted this week. Do they really want the U.N. to come to Guam in defiance of what the U.S. thinks is an internal matter?

Guam, in the years ahead, will have to make some hard and firm decisions on its political status. We don't believe that we can be a territory forever. We are not sure that, at the present time, Guam would be accepted, by reason of its location and size, as a U.S. state. Sen. Fong was unenthusiastic about Commonwealth status, but that may be one eventual solution. We are convinced, though, that Guam can't resolve this question in the week that lies ahead in the campaign. We'd like to see the legislative members either repudiate the resolution, or defend it in the days ahead. JCM.