

Contradictions weaken argument against plebiscite

Although I welcome any discussion on decolonization, the fact that much of the grievances expressed dwell on the question as to who should vote in the decolonization process makes the discussion moot.

The question has been asked and answered by UOG professor Gaffar Peang-Meth, Ph.D., about who is construed as colonized peoples and who is not.



Ed Benavente

I will, however, respond to a couple of items he raised for the sake of clarity and truth. It seems that Peang-Meth continues to vacillate. First, he qualifies himself as a U.N. "expert" beginning

with the struggle for home rule in his homeland Cambodia. In that, he concluded that his country underwent the same process through self-determination in which he played a significant role. He then solidified his commitment to self-determination by teaching these sacred principles to his students at the university.

But he later contradicts himself when he condemned any Chamoru or Guamanian self-determination because he is denied the "right" to participate.

Let's look at this closely. First, as a Cambodian, he mentioned that he partook in his peoples' self-determination that resulted in independence for Cambodia. Subsequent to that, he again exercised his "individual right" to become a citizen of the United States.

Now, he again demands that he be included to exercise his "right" to vote in the Chamoru decolonization process. It makes you wonder how one person can be given three opportunities to various self-determination, while we Chamorus are still waiting for our first!

Second, unlike Chamorus or Guamanians who are statutory citizens, Peang-Meth and his associates presumably are constitutional citizens of the United States. How is it then that they can again renegotiate a new political status, i.e. independence, free association and statehood, with the federal government that owns them?

Where do they derive their "right" to be decolonized? Are they considered colonized peoples pursuant to Chapter XI of the U.N. Charter, Article 73, Res. 55 (I) and Res. 742/743? Peang-Meth answered these questions by citing the 1966 civil and political rights which pertain to ethnic minorities in independent states. The covenant protects ethnic minorities and their individual rights, and all member states are prohibited from discriminating on ethnic minorities. What he failed to mention is that this covenant has nothing to do with minorities intentionally brought into colony awaiting decolonization nor does it give ethnic minorities in non-self-governing territories the right to participate in any decolonization process.

Furthermore, Chamorus are colonized peoples and not yet a member state. The relationship between Chamorus and the United States falls under a different set of U.N. rules. Decolonization must occur before all else. Only then can the covenant apply. Don't worry. Chamorus have always been hospitable to their guests and I predict that we will continue to be hospitable even after decolonization. We can spend the next millennium arguing "internal and ex-

ternal" self-determination, "collective" rights. The process of decolonization through self-determination is relatively an elementary process. Administrating powers continue to exist on a legitimate process. It comes with confusion and pessimism as the process of "Jes" Perez's analogy "How can a sovereign nation, the United States, a subject, Guam, from subjecting a purely fallible assertion to describe to the statement. How can a master free a slave from slavery?"

Last, Peang-Meth's prediction of anarchy would occur if decolonization comes about without including peoples not listed under the U.N. Charter, is just as questionable as support for Chamoru self-determination.

It's unfortunate and tragic that we advocate hegemony over self-determination for oppressed peoples of the world community and that we set limits as to how many subjects of the world should be decolonized.

I would rather have a thousand peoples with distinct languages and cultures than a few that would be extinguished. Extinction of a people is the greatest evil and many colonized peoples are being destroyed by those who occupy their lands.

Peang-Meth tends to focus on the not the thousands of rice fields in his respective homeland that would be lost but the reverse.

To cast anarchy as a threat to peoples for regaining their self-determination is typical of Eurocentric

Ed Benavente

mediscite

ternal" self-determination, "individual or collective" rights. The bottom line is that decolonization through self-determination is relatively an elementary process, if only administering powers comply.

Detractors can continue to throw doubt on a legitimate process. It only adds confusion and pessimism as illustrated by "Jes" Perez's analogy "How can a sovereign nation, the United States, release a subject, Guam, from subjection? That's a purely fallible assertion unless we subscribe to the statement. How can a slave master free a slave from slavery?"

Last, Peang-Meth's prediction that anarchy would occur if decolonization comes about without including other peoples not listed under the U.N. for decolonization, is just as questionable as his support for Chamoru self-determination.

It's unfortunate and tragic that he would advocate hegemony over equality and freedom for oppressed peoples in the world community and that he would set limits as to how many subjugated peoples of the world should be decolonized.

I would rather have a thousand free peoples with distinct languages and cultures than a few that would control their existence. Extinction of a people by another is the greatest evil and it is what many colonized peoples are facing today by those who occupy their homeland.

Peang-Meth tends to forget that it was not the thousands of races in their respective homeland that invaded Europe, but the reverse.

To cast anarchy as a threat to oppressed peoples for regaining their former freedom is typical of Eurocentric thoughts!

Ed Benavente is a resident of Mangilao.