

The Christian Science Monitor  
An International Daily Newspaper  
Published by The Christian Science Publishing Society  
One Norway Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02115

01  
6,2

Office of the  
Editor in Chief

August 18, 1975

Dear Johnny:

Though I have, as I say in the attached Letter to the Editor, maintained strict neutrality on the issues of the Marianas plebiscite, I feel impelled to raise my voice just a little in comment on the Times' editorial position and the recent letter from Professor Gould. Incidentally, I had a tremendously fascinating time administering the plebiscite. Saipan is a beautiful place, the people are intelligent and politically savvy, and we are committed to helping them find their way to a reasonable and sustainable political status. There could be a dreadful mess if we act irresponsibly. The military side is really only a small part of it.

Anyway, plebisciting is very nice work for an editor emeritus.

Sincerely,

*Ervin D. Canham*  
Ervin D. Canham  
Editor Emeritus

Mr. John B. Oakes  
Editorial Page Editor  
The New York Times

03-023241

8/18/75

The Christian Science Monitor  
An International Daily Newspaper  
Published by The Christian Science Publishing Society  
One Norway Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02115

01  
6175

Office of the  
Editor in Chief

To the Editor:

As Plebiscite Commissioner in the recent voting in the Marianas I naturally had to maintain strict neutrality on the issues being decided. But the Times' editorial convictions and a letter on August 15 from Prof. James W. Gould, impel me to add a word.

The United States is committed to completing its trusteeship obligations in Micronesia by helping the people to an acceptable political status. We cannot let the trusteeship run on indefinitely. Surely we must also respect the wishes of the people of Micronesia. A start has been made with the long and careful negotiation of Commonwealth status with the people of the Northern Marianas. When equally careful negotiations are completed with the people of the other five districts in Micronesia, they too should be consulted and their wishes respected, whatever they turn out to be, if they are consistent also with the best interests of the United States, and with our trusteeship obligations.

My job was to see that it was a free and fair election in the Northern Marianas. I worked very hard, in particular, to see that the opposition to the Commonwealth Covenant had every opportunity to campaign, that the registration of voters was fair to both sides, and that the voting and counting were honest. Even the opponents campaigned not against Commonwealth status, but for "a better commonwealth." We registered over 90% of the estimated eligible voters,

023242

and about 95% of them actually cast ballots. There was abundant evidence of voter awareness of the issues.

Prof. Gould says that Ambassador Williams' letter to The Times gave the impression that the Plebiscite was "internationally and impartially supervised". I did not get any such impression from the letter, but it was certainly observed very carefully by the U. N. Mission which came out to see exactly how it was conducted. Their report will speak for itself.

I have a deep affection and admiration for the people of the Northern Marianas. I believe we should respect their wishes.

Erwin D. Canham  
Editor Emeritus  
The Christian Science Monitor

Boston, Mass. August 18, 1975

023243

The irony is that if taxpayers continue to go unrecognized—if attention

### Of Carey's \$10,000

To the Editor:

The "explanation" by Gov. Hugh L. Carey (letter July 24) of his extra \$10,000 income from the Peerless Petro-Chemical Corporation raises as many questions as it answers.

Governor Carey states: "The \$10,000 editorial referred to was not a 'gift' nor was it from my brother's oil company. It was deferred payment that was recompense for my contributions to the growth of the family-owned Peerless Petro-Chemical Corporation of which I was an executive for fifteen years prior to being elected to Congress in 1960."

Yet on July 8 Carey's press secretary told reporters that "the funds were intended as a stipend from the family" and that the Congressman had done no work for the company although he said that the salary was reported on his tax forms as earned income and not as a gift" (news story July 8).

Still earlier, on Oct. 29, 1974, while being interviewed by Bill Moyers on WNET-TV's public broadcasting program "Politithon," Carey gave this "explanation": "What I did for it [the \$10,000 a year] was to really in-

### Solzhenitsyn's Priority

To the Editor:

When Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn continued to shout against Communist tyranny after arriving here, it was inevitable that he would be vilified. The present trickle of abuse will undoubtedly become a torrent.

Although it is a tribute to Mr. Solzhenitsyn's stature that his opponents have been hesitant so far, he cannot expect to escape. Once the first rotten egg has been thrown, the more timorous members of the mob are made bold to join in the attack. However, Mr. Solzhenitsyn is in the distinguished company of Roosevelt, Churchill, Mikhailovic and countless others who have endured calumny and even faced death as their reward for opposing Communist expansion.

Kenneth Libo, with heavy-handed irony, finds it "wondrous strange" that "a man with such impeccable moral standards" as Solzhenitsyn's would insistently warn of the threat to America presented by the ruthless oppressors of his homeland, while neglecting all sorts of injustices in this country [letter Aug. 5]. It is hardly "wondrous" that, having lived under a particular form of oppression all his life, a man would give the highest priority to opposing it.

ABRAHAM G. GERGES  
Chairman, 29th District  
Brooklyn, July 22, 1975

### Marianas: The Issue

To the Editor:

The defense of the proposed annexation of the Northern Marianas by the special negotiator appointed by President Nixon [letter July 23] usefully corrects some typographical errors in your otherwise excellent editorial but may lead to some misunderstanding of this important issue.

First, saying the plebiscite was U.N. observed gives the impression that it was internationally and impartially supervised, but President Ford's letter of transmittal states that it was supervised by the former editor of an American newspaper, and says nothing of U.N. approval of the methods or of observation.

Second, there is the impression that there has been full public discussion, including Congress. However, it has been played very "low key" and public knowledge is still quite small. Consideration in Congress has been confined almost entirely to the two Interior Committees. It is obvious that this does not lead to considerations of the important international and strategic implications.

The treaty (which in effect it is) was brought to the House so quickly that it gives the impression of being a rush job before the American people wake up to the fact that they have annexed about a million square miles of the Pacific, 6,200 miles from home.

The negotiator emphasizes that the Pentagon has said it has no "current" intention to build bases. Then why annex it and arrange to lease Tinian? We are surely not so naive as to believe that it is merely because the local people have been clamoring for twenty years. The Navy has had its eye on this area since World War II, and that is our principal justification—a military interest cloaked weakly by a plebiscite run by us.

The critic of your editorial has not addressed himself to the main issue: Why has the U.S. arbitrarily, i.e., without consulting the U.N. or Micronesia, sliced off about a quarter of the area and an eighth of the population of Micronesia to serve its imperial interests?

Now that the House hurriedly consented on July 21, it is important that discussion not be confined to the Interior Committee of the Senate but that it be treated as an important international agreement, which involves the United Nations, our future role in the Pacific and our responsibility to humankind.

JAMES W. GOULD  
Cotuit, Mass., July 25, 1975

The writer is professor of international relations, Scripps College.

### U.N.: The Wrong Unity

To the Editor:

...in my family affairs and the mother and father. And that's where the money came from."

Finally, we have the report in Newsday by reporter Brian Donovan that "Gov. Hugh Carey, while serving in Congress, voted against imposing tough White House controls over oil export licenses, at the same time that his brother and a business associate were arranging a multimillion dollar oil deal requiring such licenses."

When Hugh Carey voted against the export-control measure on Dec. 13, 1973, during the Arab oil embargo, he was both a Congressman and a paid consultant to one of Edward Carey's oil companies.

State Secretary General of the United States, denigrating the Carey oil deal and the reported role of former Congressman, now Governor Carey in helping it along. Let's hope he gets more consistent answers to his question than the public has been given by Governor Carey about his \$10,000 a year outside oil company income while serving in Congress.

RICHARD M. ROSENBAUM  
Chairman,  
N. Y. Republican State Committee  
Albany, July 31, 1975

("fraternizing with... people in positions of power") demonstrates only that McCarthyism also makes strange bedfellows. Whatever the merits of Mr. Solzhenitsyn's arguments, his moral credentials, evidenced by his time spent in Soviet prisons, remain secure.

ROBERT D. HUGHES  
New York, Aug. 6, 1975

### To Greet Former 'Enemies'

To the Editor:

In reply to Paul P. Tamagno's letter (Aug. 8), I am one of the Veterans Against the War who upset him by greeting the new South Vietnamese Government's delegate to the U.N. In fairness to your readers, Mr. Tamagno should also have reported that two of the most voluble well-wishers were prisoners of war in Vietnam, and that several of the rest of us "fanatic peace-mongers" were veterans of America's insane war in Indochina.

I myself went as a founder of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War to welcome to America fellow humans who should never have been treated, as our "enemies." Three days later, with much greater fanfare, Citizen Ford greeted the U.S.S.R.'s Comrade Brezhnev in Helsinki.

For Mr. Tamagno to imply that there is something subversive about

OL  
7615

03072244