



UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL



PROVISIONAL
T/PV.995
1 July 1959
ENGLISH

*Pacific Islands
Political Nov. 2-58*

Twenty-fourth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 1 July 1959, at 10.30 a.m.

JUL 2-59

President: Mr. VITELLI (Vice-President) (Italy)

Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the
Pacific Islands 3c, 4, 6 (continued)

*abou = 11,375,57
attainment 32
health 43
NSGT 6,18*

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record,
will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol
T/SR.995 and will be subject to representatives' corrections.
It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

AGENDA ITEMS 3c, 4 and 6

EXAMINATION OF CONDITIONS IN THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

(T/L.912)(continued)

- (a) ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 JUNE 1958 (T/1453, 1470)
- (b) PETITIONS RAISING GENERAL QUESTIONS (T/PET.GEN/L.3; T/PET.10/L.3)
- (c) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORIES OF NAURU, NEW GUINEA AND THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, 1959 (T/1447)

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nucker, special representative for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under United States administration, took a place at the Trusteeship Council table.

Political advancement (continued)

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): Before I start my questions, I should like to take this opportunity to welcome the special representative, Mr. Nucker, whom I had the privilege of meeting last year.

It has given us special pleasure this year to have in our midst and to hear, as we did yesterday, Mr. Henry, who is an inhabitant of the Trust Territory. My delegation benefited greatly from his intervention in the Council's proceedings yesterday.

My first question relates to the services in the Territory. The annual report for the year 1958 mentions the "Micronesian Title and Pay Plan". So far as we have been able to gather, this Plan lays down the conditions of employment and wages of indigenous Government personnel of various grades. We should like to know whether the special representative can give this Council a little more detailed information about this pay plan. What we are particularly interested in is to find out whether there is any plan in the Territory or any policy or an administrative decision establishing regular cadres of indigenous civil servants. Are there any provisions regarding the tenure of service, promotions, pension or provident fund benefits for indigenous employees of the Government? How is the recruitment to these services made? Is there any body resembling a Public Service Commission? If there is not such a body existing at present, is the constitution of such a body contemplated in the near future?

Mic. Title & Pay Plan

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): Our Title and Pay Plan was developed by the director of personnel and his staff after several studies and surveys were made throughout the Territory over a period of several years. The Pay Plan provides for promotion; it provides for within-grade increases in salary based on tenure within an office; it provides for annual and sick leave; and it is administered locally by the representative of the director of personnel. There is no commission, comparable to our Civil Service Commission in the United States, having solely the responsibility of administering the Title and Pay Plan. The administration of the Plan flows from the High Commissioner's office through the office of the director of personnel. If there are questions I have left unanswered, I shall be glad to answer upon further questioning.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): That was a fairly comprehensive answer, and I do not think the High Commissioner left anything out on which I had asked for information. I shall go on to my next question.

I should like to refer the High Commissioner to Appendix B, page 149, of the annual report, where it is stated:

"The policy of the Department of the Interior is to encourage the political advancement of the people of the Trust Territory toward a goal of self-government."

At page 11 of the report, again, it is stated:

"The Trust Territory Government in the year under review continued as its basic policy the encouragement of political advancement toward a goal of self-government which evolves through the will, the needs, and the desires of the inhabitants of the Territory."

I am sure the special representative will recall that the obligation placed on the Administering Authority -- in fact, on all Administering Authorities -- by Article 76 b of the Charter is to promote the development of the inhabitants of Trust Territories towards self-government or independence, as may be appropriate to the Trust Territory. It seems to us that in the definition of the objectives of its policy the Administering Authority overlooks that the ultimate objective defined by the Charter is independence. What is the explanation for this omission in the statements of policy and objectives of this Administering Authority?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): That there is an omission of the word "independence" is granted. It was not a purposeful omission. Our thinking at Guam in the preparation of the report and the thinking in the Interior in the preparation of a policy statement, I believe, is predicated on the necessity first to have Micronesia capable of self-government before a decision is made as to the form of that self-government. There certainly are no objections to independence by the Administering Authority at such time as they are capable.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I am very glad to have that answer because I felt that that omission was likely to create misunderstanding and that a clarification would be in order. I am very glad to have that clarification.

Marianas In paragraph 63 of the Visiting Mission's report, the Mission refers to certain resolutions adopted by the legislature of Guam calling for the unification of the Marianas. This report also mentions that ~~the people of Rota~~ intend to seek clarification of the implications of these resolutions. I am aware that Guam is not within the range of competence of this Council but we should like to know what the implication of these resolutions of the Guam legislature is in so far as they concern the future of the Rota and Saipan districts of the Trust Territory.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): As is known, the world over, a legislative body may legislate or resolve almost any given problem. The legislators of Guam in good conscience passed a resolution recommending the bringing together of the Marianas within the Guam orbit. This recommendation or resolution of the Guam legislature has no bearing whatever upon the High Commissioner. My sole judgement will be predicated upon resolutions coming from within the Trust Territory, not resolutions coming from without the Trust Territory. If Rota or Saipan passed such a resolution requesting consideration, then the High Commissioner and the Administering Authority, I think, must give every consideration to such a resolution. We have no obligation to give consideration to a resolution from without, such as from Guam.

So far as Rota is concerned, it is only natural, seeing a resolution advertised in the local newspaper by the Guam legislative body, that the Rotanese would want to examine into and find out why such resolutions were passed. I have no specific knowledge of given reasons for the passing of such a resolution by Guam, other than the belief possibly that Guam would like to have the neighbouring islands a part of Guam, but this is no consideration of mine.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): My next question also relates to paragraph 64 in which the High Commissioner is said to have told the Mission that when the stage was reached where the Rota people expressed a clear and definite desire for their unification with Guam, he would be prepared to give full consideration to their proposal. Now, could the High Commissioner explain the significance of this statement to the Council? As members of the Council are aware, Guam is a Non-Self-Governing Territory under the administration of the United States of America. The Rota District and Saipan Districts are parts of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands which are administered under a definite agreement between the Administering Authority and the General Assembly. Now, the separation of a part of the Trust Territory from the rest of it, and the union of that separated part with the neighbouring Non-Self-Governing Territories in our view is not envisaged either in the Charter or in the Trusteeship Agreement. What then is the basis for the suggestion that on a possible request from the people of Rota, that district or some other district of the Trust Territory could be merged or united with the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Guam? How is it proposed to be done? Is it the intention that Guam could possibly come under the play of the Trusteeship Agreement in some form or other? Or, is it intended that some parts of the Territory might be separated and tagged onto Guam as a Non-Self-Governing Territory? I have difficulty in understanding the mechanics. If a union of that kind is intended at any stage, what are the mechanics proposed?

unif
for
Guam

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): At this time there is no intention with respect to any potential union of any kind. My wording was that if the people of Rota strongly desired -- that I then would consider that request. This consideration I feel to fall within the scope of my responsibilities as High Commissioner, and to fall within the intent of the Trusteeship Agreement that people in Trusteeship areas shall be aided towards self-government. This would become to me an expression on the part of the Rotanese of a desire. It does not necessarily mean that we would honour such desire immediately; but certainly we would consider it, and certainly in such consideration would be taken into account the views of this Council, and discussion would be held with this Council at the time. I have not gotten into the mechanics of how such a thing would be done because I believe it is quite a way in the future, and possible by that time there would be no such development occurring. But certainly if the people

(Mr. Nucker, Special Representative)

of Rota request, I would be duty bound to consider, and I think obligated, to discuss with members of this Council the desire of the Rotanese.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): In reading the sentence, it seems to me that the representative of India has asked a very good question -- I think it is a little misleading. To supplement what the special representative said, I can assure him that Chapters 11 and 12 of the Trusteeship Chapters will be rigidly adhered to.

✓ Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I am very glad to have that assurance from the representative of the United States because I felt that this was one of those statements which might encourage people in the belief that their future possibly is linked with Guam, which is a Non-Self-Governing Territory. The Trusteeship status is an advance of the Non-Self-Governing Territory, and my delegation could not believe how a territory or a part of a territory can revert to something which it left behind years ago. At any rate, as I said, the assurance given by the representative of the United States is very satisfactory.

Several questions were raised yesterday about this Inter-District Advisory Committee to the High Commissioner. My delegation views the activities of this Advisory Committee with great favour because in our view it is indeed the first step in the direction of creating a legislature in the Territory with all the responsibilities that legislation implies. We would be grateful if the special representative could give some information as to the work accomplished by this Advisory Committee: any specific recommendations that it made during its second and third sessions. Another part of the question is whether it is the intention of the High Commissioner or the Administering Authority to convene this body more frequently than once a year, as is the plan for the present?

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): The body meets for one week, during which time problems of common interest throughout the Trust Territory are discussed. Numerous recommendations have come from that body which have been put into effect. The giving of Yapanese coconuts to the typhoon-stricken areas came in large measure as a result of discussion of the need for better coconuts to be planted in the typhoon areas, and the offer of the Yapanese to provide such coconuts,

(Mr. Nucker, Special representative)

the island of Yap having what is considered by all agriculturists and coconut experts, the best coconut stands in the Trust Territory. Discussions of shipping problems have resulted in recommendations which have aided towards solving some of our perplexing problems with respect to shipping. Discussions have been held with respect to taxation, with respect to some of our laws and our court cases, all of which have been extremely helpful. So far as holding the meeting more often, we have not as yet discussed that. Once a year, for one full week, which in effect take a minimum of two weeks out of the Micronesians' time -- they travel to and from, and in some instances a little more -- seems to be all we can handle in terms of the other meetings we are constantly having with educators, judicial folks, our district administrators, our trading company managers, and so on. There seems to be just so many weeks in the year. Personally, I would like to have the meetings once each six months, but at the present time I do not think it physically feasible to so do.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I am grateful to the special representative for that answer. My delegation hopes that as time passes and this body acquires greater experience steps will be taken to give it more work and to convene it more frequently so that the training which is intended to be imparted to this body as the future legislature will be intensified.

Answer My next question relates to displacement of the Marshallese and their resettlement and the problems arising therefrom. The Visiting Mission referred to this question. It stated that it felt that there were grave apprehensions and fears in the minds of the inhabitants of the Rongelap Atoll. According to the report the scientists have found that coconut crabs are unsafe for eating due to their irradiation. Could the special representative tell us the extent to which the coconut crab forms a part of the diet of these inhabitants? Could he also tell us whether the supply of non-poisonous fish, fish that are not poisoned by the effects of radiation or through irradiation, is sufficient for the requirements of the inhabitants? Is it possible for these inhabitants to distinguish between poisonous and non-poisonous fish? Has anyone suffered from eating poisonous fish or the irradiated coconut crab? Is there any evidence of anyone having suffered from food poisoning on these accounts? Have any measures been adopted to warn the people or to increase their supply of foodstuffs?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): This question consists of more parts than the previous one. I shall see if I can remember all of them.

Coconut crabs are not a mainstay in the diet of the Rongelapese. They are somewhat of an additive to a normal diet and do not create a problem when not available for food.

The discussion concerning fish has become a little involved. For clarification, I wish to say that there are throughout the world fish that are poisonous not by reason of any radiation effects but simply by their nature to be poisonous. In Rongelap this is confused with the possibility that fish which are poisonous may be so by reason of radiation. Scientists have told me -- and I have every reason to believe it because I have eaten of the fish -- that the fish in the Rongelap Atoll are not poisonous by reason

(Mr. Nucker, Special representative)

of radiation and that the poisonous fish on that atoll have been poisonous all along and will continue to be so simply because they are poisonous by nature. I am assured that there are in the atoll adequate quantities of non-poisonous fish for the local diet. I am also advised there are not in the atoll any quantities at all of fish poisoned by radiation. I make that distinction. Rongelapese have become ill by reason of eating poisonous fish. This is also true in other parts of the Marshalls and, in fact, in other parts of the entire Trust Territory, as well as in other parts of the world. To our knowledge, Rongelapese have not suffered from eating irradiated fish; they have suffered from eating poisonous fish.

I have found the Micronesians to be cognizant of the types of poisonous fish. It may be that occasionally a fish will be eaten which is considered non-poisonous and does have personal effects on a particular person. We have informed the Marshallese and Micronesians generally through pamphlets and so on of fishes which are normally poisonous. We have not felt it necessary to go into any major campaign in Rongelap because the fish question there is no different from elsewhere throughout the Trust Territory.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): Thank you. It is perhaps true that the fish question in Rongelap is no different from other areas. But I recall that the Visiting Mission in one or two paragraphs of its report has especially emphasized that these people of Rongelap Atoll are faced with some very special problems which are emotional and psychological and which result from their having been subjected to radioactive fall-out from nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests. In view of that I think it is necessary that measures be adopted to allay the emotional or psychological fears of these people. What are the measures that the Administering Authority has adopted to help these people get rid of their emotional and psychological problems?

The survey conducted by the medical and scientific team of the Atomic Energy Commission also reports that there is a persisting low level of radioactive contamination, and this conclusion is not likely to help the state of mind of these people. Is the Administering Authority of the view that

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

an assurance to these people that they will not be subjected in the future to hardships of this kind might help alleviate the situation? Or, if that is not its view, what other measures does the Administering Authority contemplate to rectify this situation and to improve the mental, psychological and emotional state of these people?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): I believe that our greatest good can come from living with Rongelapese and their problems and daily showing our true desire and intention to help them. We have, for instance, assigned to Rongelap an American agriculturist who works with the people constantly, who eats the food they eat and who, in every manner possible, intends to help them. We have a monthly visit from one of our medical officers, a Micronesian, who shows a personal interest in them. He is a Micronesian, one of them. The people have a radio and daily contact our staff at Ebeye, so that if anything unusual did occur we would be notified immediately. It is of interest to know that seldom ever do we get daily calls of emergencies. We get our complaints and our statements of not feeling well when regular visitations are made by Americans from the outside world. Left to their own devices, they do not normally happen.

We have assured the Rongelapese that every step possible will be taken to guarantee against any repetition of the fall-out incident of March 1954. The Visiting Mission, when on Rongelap, heard the scientists and the AEC doctors assure the Rongelapese that their land, their food and their fish were not radioactive to the point of injury or danger. We are constantly assuring them, and we intend for several years to live with and be a part of them. I think that de-emphasizing the constant physical checks will resolve the problem satisfactorily.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): The measures enumerated by the special representative will go a long way in helping the situation, at least we certainly hope they will. We should be happy if the Administering Authority will continue to consider and devise new measures to help alleviate the mental and emotional stress that these people are subject to. Now I come to my one and only question about the judiciary in the Territory. We notice from the annual report judges of the Saipan Court of Appeals are naval officers. At first sight seems rather peculiar, and I wondered whether the Administering Authority, appointing these naval officers, makes sure that they have adequate legal qualifications. Do they in fact have legal qualifications before they are appointed? How many judges, in addition to the chief justice, are there category? In the case of District Courts, the annual report states that judges are appointed from amongst the local inhabitants. Does that also to the District Judges in the Saipan District, or is that in a separate category?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): The judges and chief judges in the High Court, which consists of the Court of Appeals and the Trial Court, are legally trained individuals. They must be learned in the law to be judges at that level. The District Court judges and the Community Court judges are Micronesians; they are not learned in the law in the same sense as the Americans who are at the High Court level. The District Court judges are men of stature in their community, men of vision and wisdom, and in my opinion they have been doing an exceptionally fine job with the law at a district and community level.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I take it that these naval judicial officers administer civil law and not naval or military law. Perhaps the special representative could confirm that?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): Yes, that is correct.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I come now to my last question which in fact *have* was asked by the representative of the United Arab Republic yesterday and relates to the location of the administrative headquarters of the Territory in Guam.

Yesterday, the special representative said that this question will be considered by the Advisory Committee some time this year or perhaps next year, and that the Committee will discuss it with the High Commissioner. That is perfectly all right; I think it is a good thing that the Advisory Committee should discuss as many matters as possible with the High Commissioner, but I should have thought that the location of the capital or the administrative headquarters of the Trust Territory within the Territory itself was a matter on which the Administering Authority could straight away go ahead and take a decision itself. After all, if self-government is to be promoted or encouraged in the Territory, I think the first step is that the Territory should be administered from within itself rather than from outside, especially when the area selected for the administrative headquarters outside the Trust Territory is itself a non-self-governing territory. This, to my delegation, seems somewhat of an anomaly and I wonder what the difficulty really is about moving the administrative headquarters to somewhere within the Territory. I am looking at the map, and I see that Guam is tucked away towards one corner of the Territory, which covers a vast area, but is in fact outside the Trust Territory. It would seem to my delegation that the location of the headquarters in the Truk District or in the Ponape District or even elsewhere in the northern Mariana Islands, would be much more convenient, administratively speaking, for the Administration of the Territory. What are the real difficulties in the way of bringing the capital into the Territory? I am not suggesting that Guam should be incorporated in the Territory, but could the capital be moved?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): The Administering Authority could decide to move the capital into the Trust Territory and could move it if that decision were taken, but the representative of India used one word which helps me greatly in my reply -- the word "convenient". I would leave to the Visiting Mission members the interpretation of the word convenient with respect to the headquarters being located in any given District or on any particular island in that District. Convenience is one of the real reasons why we continue to operate from Guam, where we have shipping, air transport, and communications services which are of the best quality. Were we to go to another District in the Trust

Territory we should need to duplicate these facilities. It is also true that if the capital were to be placed within the Trust Territory, it would be assumed that the Administering Authority personnel would benefit from living within the Territory and working with its inhabitants. However, if one stops to think that there are nine languages and that there is no one centre of population with which the Americans could work, the matter appears in a different light. If we were to move to Dublon, which geographically and physically could be considered the best location in the Truk District, we should be living with approximately 1,000 Micronesians and although we could learn certain things from them we could not use them as a cross section of Micronesia, so that the ability to acquire the benefits of living with the governed fall away in large measure by the very nature of our area.

There is another consideration. The Administration is in the process of using more and more Micronesians at higher levels in our Government and in my opinion we have now reached a point of fairly complete use of Micronesians in administrative and political affairs. We should not be too hasty about placing the Government anywhere without some consideration being given to what the Micronesians themselves may want. This Council constantly discusses the need for developments to be on a self-contained and self-governing basis. I would like to think that at this stage we should permit the Micronesians to engage in discussions as to the ultimate disposition of their capital.

Mr. RASGOTRA (India): I am all for permitting the Micronesians to engage in discussions in regard to this as well as other matters of importance to them. I also recognize that convenience is to be considered. It is however my delegation's view that considerations of convenience ought not to weigh too heavily in matters of this kind. Projecting ourselves into the future, we visualize that this Territory will become self-governing and independent. It will have to administer itself. The future of Guam, which is a non-self-governing territory, we do not know and we are not in a position to pronounce upon it.

(Mr. Rasgotra, India)

Therefore, what I see is that some time in the future the Territory will have to develop a capital of its own. If it is to be done ten years from now and the burden of that development is to fall on the indigenous people, it seems to us that it should be much better to consider this matter more actively now and take a decision in the immediate future to shift the administrative headquarters to somewhere within the Territory. There are sites and the High Commissioner mentioned some. There was a site, I think, in the Kokor Island which was at one stage in the past used as an administrative headquarters of the Territory. I do not want to make a categorical recommendation on the subject, but so long as the question is exercising the minds of the Administering Authority and it is their intention to take a decision in line with the Trusteeship Council's recommendation in the near future, my delegation is satisfied.

U TIN MAUNG (Burma): Before I ask questions, I would like to express my delegation's gratitude for all that the officials of the Administration in the Pacific Islands have done for the Visiting Mission, with the result that we were able to obtain all the available information and assistance in visiting practically all the districts and islands and atolls in the Pacific Ocean. I would especially like to welcome to this chamber the special representative, Mr. Nucker, whom I had the pleasure of meeting for the first time in Guam. I also would like to welcome Mr. de Young, whose company I enjoyed most thoroughly. My delegation is also pleased to welcome one of the Micronesian nationals, Mr. Henry, in our midst and we continue to hope that in future sessions we will see more of the Micronesians joining the delegation of the United States and helping us understand better the conditions in the Pacific Islands.

Before I ask a few questions in the political field, I would like to seek clarification on one or two points from the special representative. I think that yesterday, in answer to a question posed by the representative of the United Kingdom, Mr. Nucker referred to the unicameral congresses of Ponape and the Marshall Districts. He was not quite sure whether hereditary chiefs in the Ponape District are elected or whether they really sought election.

(U Tin Maung, Burma)

He said that in Ponape all members are elected, and he was satisfied that some of the members are of noble lineage, but that they are also in the minority. These are his words:

"The Nahnmwarki, which is the highest title we have in the Marshalls, in my opinion has not run." (T/PV.944, p. 54-55)

I want to seek clarification with respect to this title. I think that the Nahnmwarki is the title which is only applicable to all the nobles in the Ponape District and not in the Marshalls District. I would like to get the confirmation from the special representative.

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): That is correct. Nahnmwarki is a title used only in Ponape.

U TIN MAUNG (Burma): I would like to go on to the municipal councils in the Pacific Islands. As the Trusteeship Council knows, the municipality is the basic unit of government in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the indigenous government or agencies with the greatest degree of local authority and self-government. We know from the annual report that there are 112 municipalities in existence and we also know that the Administration is trying to grant charters to these municipalities. According to the programme, ten municipalities will be chartered every year and within five years we hope that fifteen municipalities will have been chartered.

We also notice a very interesting development in local self-government as regards the institutions in the Palau District. It seems to my delegation that out of sixteen municipalities in the Palau District, fifteen have already been granted a charter. There is only one municipality which has not been recognized by a formal grant of the charter. Could the special representative give me any reason why that is the case.

Municipal Council

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): This is the municipality which I referred to yesterday when I said that one municipality stated that if it could not be first, it would be last. The municipality in Palau is now, I think, working on its charter and is fully expected to be chartered within a few months, if papers are not already on Guam.

clerk U TIN MANING (Burma): My next question is in connexion with Ujelong. May I invite the attention of the special representative to paragraph 32 of the Visiting Mission's report. The Visiting Mission attended a public meeting in Ujelong and one of the most important requests brought to the Mission's attention was, one, with regard to the installation of radio communications, and two, the assistance of an agriculturist. In his opening statement, the special representative said that an out-island radio station was put into operation at Ujelong this month, namely June; whereas at the public meeting the people were told by the Administration that the radio set would be installed within two months. I think that the Visiting Mission visited Ujelong on 3 March 1959. According to my delegation, the radio should have been installed on 3 May, and now it is June. I do not know what reason the Administration has to offer for this slight delay.

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): The radio in question was taken to Ujelong some time in the latter part of April. Installation was made and completed in May. The test run was made the latter part of May. And then our statement -- not realizing that there would be such a fine check on time -- was apparently the loose statement that the radio station is in operation this month. It was in operation last month. We might have been two or three weeks late, but there is no particular reason for it other than possibly transportation delays or a non-application of energy to meet a specific date of 3 May.

U TIN MAUNG (Burma): I thank the special representative for his answer because we really have to be careful when we make promises to these people, especially those who have been displaced in these islands.

My next question is in regard to the training of the people on Ujelong Atoll in the agricultural programme. The special representative in his statement yesterday told us that an agricultural programme is now being put into operation. I do not know whether actual measures have now been taken to train the people of Ujelong to participate particularly in the extension work. Could the special representative give us more details about this programme?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): An agriculturalist has been chosen to work with the Ujelongese. Over this next year we will have constant contact with the Ujelongese and will have constant ability to aid them in the developing of their island. This is what is meant in the report so far as helping the Ujelongese is concerned. We will have a person there physically, working with them in their agricultural programme.

U TIN MAUNG (Burma): I should like to invite the attention of the special representative to paragraph 51 of the Visiting Mission's report. In Ponape district there is only one Polynesian village. We have visited that village, but I am not going to ask questions on that village. Within the district limits there is an island called Kapingamarangi and a graduate of PICS, that is the Pacific Islands Central School, who is now earning his living as an elementary school teacher, has been elected as chief magistrate, and he has already organized a municipal council to assist him in the administration of local affairs. But he decided -- I do not know whether correctly or not -- that questions concerning the Council's size and the procedure to be followed in its election would be decided; at the time when the Visiting Mission visited Ponape district, we were told that these questions were still under consideration. Could the special representative tell me whether these questions have been resolved?

The PRESIDENT: Before I call on the special representative, I feel I should draw the attention of the representative of Burma to the fact that his question seems to be outside of the political field. I am saying this so that we can deal with our business in an orderly manner. I wonder if the representative of Burma would consider this point.

U TIN MAUNG (Burma): I bow to your observation, Mr. President, but the municipalities are one of the questions with which we will have to deal in the political field.

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): The team which works with the municipalities in the Ponape district on chartering has been in Kapingamarangi and has worked with the Chief. Because of lack of knowledge I cannot report on the results of that visit because I had left Guam slightly over a month ago and have seen no report. But I do know that the team was there to meet and work with the magistrate.

magistrate
U TIN MAUNG (Burma): My last question is fairly simple and is of very minor importance. I think that the special representative told us yesterday that the chief executive officers of the municipalities in the Pacific islands are called and known as chief magistrates. Although some people would like to call them mayors, there seems to be some misunderstanding or confusion in the minds of the people whether they should be called mayors or simply chief magistrates. As the special representative will know, at least in one particular municipality, that is, in the Saipan district, the chief municipal executive is known as the Mayor. I do not know whether these two names should have the same uniformity. Could the special representative tell us whether the chief magistrate is the name which is desired and appreciated by the people of Micronesia?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): Throughout Micronesia the term or name of "magistrate" seems to carry more meaning than the name "mayor". I would have to reply that I believe the Micronesians throughout our section prefer "magistrate" to "mayor"; it has more meaning.

U TIN MAUNG (Burma): I quite clearly understand why the people of Micronesia would like to call their chief municipal executives "chief magistrates". However, I should like to quote from a book which is already in circulation. This book is entitled "Paradise in Trust" and it is written by Mr. Robert Trumbull. I shall quote a relevant portion of the book in regard to this question:

"In the Marshalls, for example, there are twenty-two organized municipal Governments. Each has an elected chief executive called a magistrate -- the Americans would have preferred the term "mayor," with which they are familiar, but the title "magistrate" was chosen in deference to the wishes of foreign members of the Trusteeship Council, I was told", that, is, the author was told that the magistrates were chosen in deference to the foreign members of the Council.

Could the special representative comment on the observations made by this author?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): First, I should like to say that each member sitting around this Council table is a foreigner in the eyes of the Micronesians. So I would then comment that author Trumbull's comment is a sweeping comment that carries in truth no true meaning. I can only comment further that this is the first time I have heard the reason why "magistrate" was used other than the fact that the Micronesians understand magistrate, as it has come down through previous occupations, more than they have understood the term "mayor" which is essentially an American word. So far as I am concerned, Robert Trumbull's comment is Robert Trumbull's belief, one man's opinion. I have no further comment.

Mr. Oberemko
Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have several questions on political development in the Trust Territory. Some mention has already been made here of how the Administering Authority conceives of the end purposes of the Trusteeship System in regard to the Trust Territory. The representative of the Administering Authority replied to a question by the representative of India by saying that one should not attach too much importance to the fact that the word "independence" does not appear in the report of the Administering Authority and that the question is merely one of self-government. We should like to know whether the Administering Authority proposes to include in its report in the future the word "independence" in that section, for instance, which deals with the political development of the Trust Territory. On page 11 we read:

"The Trust Territory Government in the year under review continued as its basic policy the encouragement of political advancement toward a goal of self-government."

The word "independence" is indeed lacking here. I should like to know whether in the future reports the word "independence" will appear again, all the more so since it is my belief that this omission is not purely accidental.

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): Firstly, I did not make the statement that this Council should not attach any importance to the word "independence". I think I made clear the fact that the deletion of the word was not an intended deletion or one connoting an important policy approach to a problem.

With reference to the question, I have no reason to believe that we should not include the word "independence". The purpose of the Trusteeship Agreement is to develop these people to self-government, and it is inherent in the Trusteeship Agreement that they have the right of plebiscite to decide the form of government. We, the Administering Authority, have no programme of end result of type of government. So I would have no objection to the use of the word "independence".

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): I should like to point out to the representative of the Soviet Union that in this 1958 report the words "self-government or independence" will be found at page 149. I should also like to point out that it is written into the Trusteeship Agreement. You would never catch my country denying that opportunity. It is everywhere.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Yes, indeed, the word does figure in appendix B. You have put it forward somewhat, about a hundred pages forward, but that is merely a repetition of the formula we find in the Trusteeship Agreement and the Charter. Of course, it is not very easy to change anything in those texts. What we should like to see is a clear-cut indication that the Administration of the Trust Territory, as its basic policy, would continue the encouragement of advancement towards self-government or independence, and this is, of course, the place, at page 11, part V, where the word should come in, rather than in one of the appendices

Now I should like to tell the special representative that I did not say that the Administering Authority was not attaching much importance to the word "independence". I said merely what the special representative has just himself confirmed. We could understand his words to mean that the omission of this word was not such an important one and that therefore one should not attach too much significance to the omission, in other words, that the omission was accidental, and that is the way I now understand his words.

Now I should like to go ahead somewhat with this issue and remind you of resolution 1274 (XIII) of the General Assembly, which contains a recommendation to the Administering Authorities to set deadlines for the attainment of independence or self-government by the Trust Territories. It is said there that the Administering Authorities should take the necessary steps to attain this goal at an early date. I should like to know whether the special representative considers that this resolution of the General Assembly applies also to the Trust Territory we are considering today or whether in his belief, because of the somewhat special status of the Territory, for that purpose there would have to be a decision on the part of the Security Council rather than the General Assembly.

Chairman

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): If I understood the question properly, I think that what the representative of the Soviet Union is asking is whether the United States in its trusteeship over these islands is willing to go along with a request of the General Assembly that we announce a final date on which self-government or independence will be attained. If that is true, I must answer that it is not the policy of the United States at present to determine or to announce ahead of time what the final target date will be. It is, however, the policy of the United States to announce from time to time intermediate target goals.

I would also point out that, with regard to the type of Territory with which we are dealing, it is not easy to forecast long periods ahead of time. Many of the islands have never heard of one another, and we have somehow to impose a sense of belonging to a geographic entity before we can begin to inculcate in the people a desire to become independent. It is a difficult problem. I wish we could say that on date X they will be self-governing or independent, but we cannot.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In other words, there are no real technical difficulties; it is not a matter of legal texts. A special decision on the part of the Security Council, for instance, would not be called for. Apparently this is merely a matter of principle and policy on the part of the Administering Authority.

Local Council
My next question refers to the pattern of administration of the Trust Territory. From the recent reports of the Administering Authority and from the Working Mission's report, we see that the Administering Authority is doing something in the field of setting up local councils. Though much has still to be done, something is being done.

(Mr. Oberemko, USSR)

We would like to know when the Administering Authority thinks it will be able to take the steps that would lead to self-government for the Trust Territory as a whole? We heard quite a lot about the geographical difficulties, the linguistic difficulties, and others too; but since time is passing, we would like to know when the Administering Authority thinks that legislative bodies and executive bodies could be set up whose powers would extend over the entire length and breadth of the Territory rather than over one District, one atoll or one island?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): I have been associated with the Trust Territory for five years. During that time great progress has been made by the Micronesian in the understanding and acceptance of government by law and self-government. However, in terms of my knowledge of the growth of the past five years, I still find it difficult to place a finite date or a specific event such as territorial legislative bodies and executive bodies operating in a true sense throughout the Trust Territory. I could hazard a guess of ten years, and would hasten to remark that I think this would be probably the soonest such event could be expected to take place; and also caution that the estimate comes from a sense of feeling and not from a sense of complete knowledge as to what progress will be made during the ensuing ten years.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I would like to ask the special representative who is the High Commissioner for these Territories, How often does he meet with the representatives of the indigenous population? How many islands, for instance, did he visit this year? And in this connexion, we would like to know which problems are of most urgent concern to the population at this point?

High Comm & Popul

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): Last year -- by that I mean the preceding twelve months -- I visited each District in the Trust Territory at least three times; and I have, during the course of those visits, gone to numerous out-islands. Problems in the Trust Territory are divided between the Districts. In the Marshalls, there is a terrific desire to get the island replanted and rehabilitated from the past typhoons. In Ponape, typhoon work

(Mr. Nucker,
Special representative)

still is leading in importance. In Truk, typhoon work is of paramount importance, and the establishing of regular transportation to the widely-scattered islands in that group. In Yap, problems of growth politically are receiving first attention. In Palau, economic matters are of the most importance. In Rota, the delivery and development of produce for Guam is of most importance. In no District that I have visited do I find any common desire or great cause for self-government across the Trust Territory. The problems I have given you should indicate the parochialism and the nature of the thinking of the Micronesian; he is concerned with the problems at hand more than he is concerned with the problems in the next District.

about Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It is quite natural that the people in the Trust Territory are concerned and are discussing the cause and are working to liquidate the consequences of the typhoon. But did they not also concern themselves with those typhoons which were created by man in the past? From the reports, we have the impression that any American or any foreigner who visits the Territory and talks to the people, very often they put questions, and they show concern about the consequences which could follow for the Territory and its inhabitants from the holding of nuclear tests in the Territory. We read that the indigenous inhabitants are still concerned about this. I should like to know, in this connexion, whether the people ever addressed any questions of this sort to the High Commissioner. Why does not the United States hold nuclear tests at home? And, if such questions were ever put to the High Commissioner, I should like to know what was his reply?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): Certainly such questions had been put to the High Commissioner. The matter of atomic tests and nuclear tests is of concern to the world around, such concern that today in Geneva there is a meeting of scientists from all countries involved on just this problem. The people were told, when asked in response to queries about why the United States held tests in the islands, that it was felt that this was in the interest of world peace. They know that we hold tests at home. They have gained immeasurable confidence in the United States. Since the fallout of 1954, there

(Mr. Nucker,
Special representative)

is, however, a natural, very strong interest in these tests, because they live in the area. But there is not the graphic fear which could be expected of people who did not understand why the tests were being held, and in a period of time have come to understand the nature of the tests in large measure themselves.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Of course, we must say that the population of the territory have already painfully experienced, and have quite painful memories of the difference between a major test and a minor test. Therefore, they could put these questions in full knowledge of the fact why the United States is holding its major tests in the Trust Territory and not at home. They know, for instance, that not a single hydrogen bomb was tested in the United States. Therefore, perhaps the rather too easy reply which the special representative quoted to us would hardly answer such a question: Why are the major tests being held not at home, but in the Trust Territory? Whatever the interest of peace may be, I submit that the consideration of peace and security does not suffice to explain this fact away.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): Let me start out by saying that we do not believe that the Trusteeship Council is the proper place to discuss the general world-wide problem of nuclear tests cessation, which is now under negotiation in Geneva. Furthermore, it does not make much sense to discuss this subject in view of the present de facto United States and United Kingdom suspension of nuclear tests. I hope that answers the representative's question.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): If the Administering Authority has nothing else to say, then needless to say we will not press our question. But we did have the impression that the population had addressed such questions to the High Commissioner. It was quite natural, therefore, for the Trusteeship Council to inquire what the replies of the High Commissioner were and to see to what extent they could give satisfaction to the very understandable inquisitiveness of the indigenous inhabitants.

What is the situation with regard to the drinking water in the Territory? It might seem peculiar that I ask this question. ~~It might be argued that my question does not refer to the political situation in the Territory. I suggest, however, that it has a~~ direct relation to the consequences of radiation to which the inhabitants were exposed at a given point. As we know from the Press, the main source of drinking water for the population is the open reservoirs or basins or tanks in which rain water is accumulated. Is this true? Is that the main source of drinking water?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): The catching of rain water is a large source of drinking water. "Major" is not quite the proper word, but I will not quibble. Large islands have streams and wells. For purposes of this question, however, yes, rain water is a large portion of the drinking water.

rainwater
Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): At this point, may I address a rather personal question to the special representative. The Scientific Committee on the Effects of Radiation published under the auspices of the United Nations a fairly voluminous report regarding the effects of radiation on man and his environment. Did the special representative ever have an opportunity to see this report and to read it?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): I have not read the report.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): At this point, I am not of course making a recommendation on the part of the Council. But as a personal piece of advice I would very much recommend to the special representative that he look at that report because it contains information not only for the benefit of scientists but also of very great significance and interest to statesmen and administrators. The information contained therein would be of great interest, I am sure, to the High Commissioner in connexion with the carrying out of the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement in this particular Trust Territory.

I should like to know whether the scientists of the AEC who submitted conclusions to the High Commissioner ever told him what was the reason for their assurances that there was no longer any mortal danger as far as the inhabitants of Rongelap were concerned. Did they make this known in the form of an oral assurance? Did they submit any justification? Have these conclusions been endorsed by the scientific advisors of the AEC? Or are they merely the personal opinion of the individual members or scientists of the AEC who made these assurances?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): From time to time, the AEC scientists have given us in writing a breakdown of their findings as a result of their constant tests and checking on Rongelap. In fact I believe that in the United Nations Visiting Mission's report there is a letter from Dr. Conard giving the most current findings with respect to the health of the people of Rongelap. This can be found in annex I of the report.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Yes, that is precisely why I wanted to know this. Annex I, which is summarized in the report, states that it was drawn up by the Medical and Scientific Team of the USAEC. Is this to be interpreted as an official conclusion? These are not the personal views of these scientists but the official views of the AEC, is that right?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): Yes, that is right.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In his conversations with the scientific advisers, did the special representative ever discuss whether the soil, the food and the fish in the neighbouring waters were contaminated at all or to some degree which was not apt to endanger the health of the inhabitants? What was the degree of contamination? Was there any contamination at all?

The PRESIDENT: Before I recognize the special representative, I should like to hear from the Soviet representative whether he thinks his questions are still in the political field or whether they should be postponed to the time when we discuss the social, educational and health fields. I hear the word "health" repeated very often.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): If there would be a special scientific section in our questioning then perhaps that would be the best moment to put the questions. I mentioned not only the word "health". I was speaking of the consequences of the tests, which, after all, are a political matter. The resettlement of the population, which is something else again, and the data to which we are referring are published in the political sections of the documents. That is why we have decided to put these questions at this time. When we come to the public health section, we will have some other questions in this regard.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of the Soviet Union for his clarifications. I apologize. I thought the implications so far were not quite clear.

Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative): I have had numerous conversations with the scientists and they have never at any time said that there was no radiation in any given area in the world. There is radiation in the world but it is a question of degree, not a question of "if" or "any", as I understand the problem. I am constantly assured that the degree of radiation in Rongelap and in the Trust Territory is not such as to be a cause for worry; that we are well within safe levels throughout the entire territory.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): My question refers to the following aspect of this issue. After Rongelap suffered this fairly heavy dose of accidental radiation and fallout rain, the population had to be resettled. Then it was concluded that the danger had passed and that the population could go back. Since concern over the health situation of the population is one of the principal concerns of the Administration under the Trusteeship Agreement and one of the principal concerns of our Council, we should like to be fully convinced that the population has been returned to Rongelap without any danger to their health from any lingering radiation.

I am voicing all these questions because we know that, aside from the short-life fallout element, you have such other elements as strontium-90, which has a 28-year half-life period or caesium-137, with a period of thirty years, or C-14, the half-life of which is 5,600 years. The scientists who sat in the Scientific Committee of the United Nations stated that these were the elements which were the fundamental elements to be found in fallout from hydrogen bomb tests. That is why we, not being scientists, can hardly arrive at any conclusion, although we can show justified concern.

I hope you understand what I mean, and I should like to know what the opinion of the special representative is regarding the usefulness of obtaining some data from the United Nations Scientific Committee on Radiation whereby this highly authoritative body of the United Nations could make a very objective appraisal of the situation, an appraisal which would be the authoritative view, not of individual scientists, who are thought to be responsible to some extent for the after-effects of these explosions, but of a highly objective body such as the United Nations Scientific Committee on Radiation.

Mr. WUCKER (Special Representative): To answer that, I think I would need go into two avenues of thought. Firstly, I thoroughly agree with the representative of the Soviet Union that this is a scientific discussion which is being participated in by laymen neither of whom, in my opinion -- and I apologize for including the representative in the same company as myself -- can individually carry on a very conclusive discussion with respect to the scientific aspects of the fallout in Rongelap or in the world at large. This conversation should take place between scientists.

With respect to our Atomic Energy Commission scientists who have conducted tests of the soils, the people, and the water, I have no reason whatever to question or to doubt the findings of that body of men. I have worked with them and I think you would not find men with more compassion towards their fellow citizens anywhere in the world. I believe them. Personally, I have no objection to their discussing with anyone they may desire the problem of fallout at Rongelap in the Marshalls, nor have I personally any objection to anyone's checking the soils at Rongelap. I have a natural pride in our own Atomic Energy Commission's abilities not only to find the truth but to state the truth. I do not think it is necessary, but I have no objections.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Of course, nobody can prevent the special representative from having implicit or absolutely unquestioned belief and faith in his AEC, but we know what a very wide discussion was held on the subject, and there would seem to be no obstacles in the way of receiving information from the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. It has often been said that the inhabitants of this island and of others are still being examined and tested. In other words, even the prominent scientists who advised the distinguished High Commissioner do not know everything, and even if they do know everything, they do not necessarily tell all they know. Since the issue is the health of the population, the Trusteeship Council is entitled to make quite certain that complete security prevails in the area. But as far as I understand the last remarks of the High Commissioner, he seems to have no objections to calling in the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation to submit its findings,

since this Committee may already have in its possession sufficient official information to arrive at its conclusions. If there is no danger, we can be very sure that the scientists of the United Nations will arrive at the very same conclusions as the American scientists have, and then everybody will be happy: we will be happy, the High Commissioner will be happy, the inhabitants will be happy, and the Visiting Mission as well.

The Visiting Mission has stressed the concern of the inhabitants, the High Commissioner has confirmed this concern. If there is no reason for concern, then let us be completely sure there is no reason.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): The representative of the Soviet Union is pushing us a little too hard. We do not have the kind of authority that I think he envisages. I do not know this, but I believe it is probably true that a good part of the information furnished to the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation came from the AEC, and that all other information on aspects of nuclear energy probably came from the AEC too. Furthermore, if the United Nations Radiation Committee had any information which they thought we did not have, I have no doubt that they have given it to us already. This is entirely an academic discussion and I do not see where exactly it is leading us.

Mr. OBERENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Of course, I understand that the representative of the United States may not be in a position to have a final say. Perhaps it is a matter which should be discussed. I am merely raising this point for your consideration. I do not intend to push this very hard at all. I do not insist on any immediate answer on the part of the United States delegation. I am merely throwing this out as a suggestion, as a possible approach. We are not engaged in the general debate on the Trust Territory; we are still in the questioning period.

We would like to put a somewhat general question which is of a quite concrete import. I would like to know whether the Administering Authority, bearing in mind the fact that the tests have been suspended, that conversations are proceeding satisfactorily in Geneva that may lead to an end to tests in general, does not think that it might be good to assure the inhabitants that no resettlements and no further tests will be carried out in the Trust Territory. It is quite obvious that such an assurance on the part of the Administering Authority would be of momentous importance in order to reassure the inhabitants. This would make it possible for them no longer to be worried about their future. They would be able to go more into the question of self-government and independence and the growth of their territorial awareness, and so on.

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): If I understand correctly the comments which the representative of the Soviet Union has just made, they seem to me to be well within reason and I can only add: let us hope that his optimism, which he has just expressed about the outcome in Geneva, will be translated into factual reality, because, of course, we want to let all these people know about not having to conduct tests. It is a terrible thing.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Perhaps the special representative has understood me even better and would be able to answer me more to the point.

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): I can only say that at such time as there is a world consensus on tests, I would be only too happy, as the High Commissioner, to relate the results of that consensus to the people in Micronesia, the same as I would hope every Government of the world would be happy to relate the results of that conference and those meetings to their people.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Before the talks started in Geneva, the Trusteeship Council had already discussed the matter at its various sessions, and discussed it as a specific issue which was of specific interest to the Territory. That is why I am putting the question at this particular point. We all hope, of course, that the Geneva talks will be successful. But, bearing in mind the special status of these islands as a Trust Territory, does not the Administering Authority already consider now the possibility of assuring the population that there will be no further resettlements and that there will be no further tests held in the Territory?

Mr. SEARS (United States of America): I think that the representative of the Soviet Union is making himself perfectly clear. On the other hand, I hope that he will keep in mind that this whole subject has, at least every year and for some time, been under discussion in this Council and is in the records and available for him to read. They ought to answer

the whole series of questions that he has in mind, if the questions are intended to be legitimate.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Unfortunately, the question was taken up many times in the Council without any positive result, and we know why. Since the Administering Authority seems to be unable to give any assurances to this effect, I will go on to my next series of questions. Who instructed the High Commissioner, and how were these instructions passed on, to resettle the population from one island to another?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): I do not quite understand the point of the question. There were no specific instructions given to the High Commissioner to do a particular thing, at a particular time, to a particular group of people. The decision to return them to Rongelap was based on the desire of the Rongelapese people to return, and on our decision that the island was completely safe for a return and meeting minimum conditions which we thought necessary for the proper handling of the people when they returned. As far as a line of instructions, I am pleased to state that the Administering Authority handled this problem in terms of what it considered best, so far as timing is concerned, for the Rongelapese.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Perhaps I should elaborate a little bit on my question. In 1946, 167 inhabitants of the Bikini Atoll were evacuated, first to Rongrik, then to Kwajalein, and then to Kili. Then a second group was resettled. In 1947, 137 people were taken from Eniwetok to Ujelong. I would like to know who issued the orders for their resettlement. What were the motives or what was the origin of this resettlement order? Who decided that they had to be resettled and how was it decided?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): I think that this question has been discussed innumerable times before this Council. I should like to answer the question by asking one. What is the purpose of again going over the same ground we have covered so many times in the past?

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have discussed this matter many times and yet we have never received a reply, neither then nor now. Is it that the High Commissioner would not like to recall these rather sad days, in the hope that these days will not ever recur? If that is so, I too am quite prepared to think now about the present and the future and to forget about the past.

I will now put a question which refers strictly to the administrative hierarchy. Perhaps the question is so clear to the special representative that it will not even be necessary to put it, but we should like to have the question elaborated upon. Are the military authorities, the naval and army authorities, on Saipan who administer that district subordinate to the High Commissioner in so far as the implementation of the Trusteeship System purposes in this district are concerned? Or is this something completely separate? Is there any co-ordination or subordination of these authorities to the High Commissioner's office? ✓

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): There is complete co-ordination between the Navy and the officials of the Trust Territory. There is subordination in the field of the desire to do that which is called for under the Trusteeship Council by the Navy. There is constant clearance and a oneness of desire between the two agencies of Government in their desire to discharge the responsibilities under the Trusteeship Agreement properly.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Questions have been put here regarding the island of Rota and its possible unification with Saipan. Are the inhabitants of Rota able to visit Saipan and Guam freely or do they require special permits to that effect? *Saipan
Rota
Guam*

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): The residents of Rota are permitted to visit Saipan and Guam. There are no restrictions which would prohibit such visitations.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): The special representative used the word "permitted". Does this imply that you have to have a permit? Do they need permission to go or are they able to go whenever they feel like it?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): They need their passports to enter Guam or to visit Guam. "Permission" could be a word used in that connotation, but there is no restriction prohibiting the visits of the Rotanese either to Saipan or Guam.

Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): May I pursue this matter a little further. I realize that Guam may be regarded to some extent as another territory since it is not a part of the Trust Territory, even though the Headquarters of the Trust Territory is in Guam. Therefore, there may be a need for an inhabitant to see the High Commissioner. We were told that he needs a passport but that there are no restrictions. What about Saipan? If an islander of Rota wants to go to Saipan for any reason, does he have to be permitted to do so? Does he have to notify anybody or is he able to go to Saipan too if he wants to and when he wants to?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): As I recall, he is expected to notify the people in Saipan of his intended visit. This is to ensure that the man will have someone with whom to stay. We do not have hotels and normal facilities to care for tourists in the Trust Territory as one thinks of it in the United States and elsewhere. It is a matter of courtesy, not a matter of necessity based on his not being welcome or not being able to visit the island of Saipan.

abound
Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): We did read that such permits were required in certain of the literature on the Trust Territory, and that is why we put our question.

The special representative is apparently aware of the fact that in May of this year a group of persons that included prominent scientists such as Dr. Pauling, one of the Nobel Prize winners, Mr. Bertrand Russell, the well-known

(Mr. Oheremko, USSR)

philosopher, priests and fishermen from Japan and also inhabitants of the Marshall Islands addressed an appeal to the Federal Court of Appeals of the United States. They requested that the United States should put an end to nuclear tests in the Trust Territory. Does the special representative know about this fact and does he know the decision of the Court, if any?

Mr. NUCKER (Special representative): I do not know. I know that this same group tried to make representations to the Soviet Union to stop testing bombs, without any ability to get into the country even to place their request.

I do not know the current status of the question.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

Trusteeship Council
24th Session, 29th Meeting (AM)

JUL 2 - 1959
Press Release TR/1512
1 July 1959

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL -- TAKE 1

The Trusteeship Council this morning continued the questioning of the administering authority's special representative, Delmas H. Nucker, on political conditions in the trust territory of the Pacific Islands administered by the United States.

Before the Council were the administering authority's annual report on the territory for the year ended 30 June 1958, the report of the Council's 1959 visiting mission to the territory, and certain petitions raising general questions.

M. RASGOTRA (India) asked whether the administration had any plan for establishing regular cadres of the indigenous civil service.

Mr. NUCKER said the 1957 Micronesian Title and Pay Plan was developed by the Director of Personnel after several studies and surveys made in the territory over a period of years. The plan, he said, provided for promotions, within-grade salary increases, annual and sick leave. The plan was administered locally by the High Commissioner through the Director of Personnel.

However, there was no commission comparable to the United States Civil Service Commission, he added.

On another question by the representative of India, the special representative said there was no objection to granting independence to the Micronesians at such time as the people were capable of assuming such responsibilities.

Mr. RASGOTRA next referred to the Inter-District Advisory Committee which, according to the administering authority, was envisaged as a first step toward the establishment of an elected territorial legislature. He asked whether it was possible for this body to meet more frequently than once yearly as now provided, and thereby give it a longer period for training.

Mr. NUCKER said the Inter-District Advisory Committee met once a year for one week. Including the time spent for travel, the actual time taken up by the representatives was about two weeks. This "seems to be all we can handle" at present, he said, when considering that, on top of these meetings, they had other meetings with educators, trade managers and others.

(END OF TAKE 1)

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(For use of information media-- not an official record)

Trusteeship Council
24th Session, 29th Meeting (AM)

Press Release TR/1512
1 July 1959

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL -- TAKE 2

Replying to another question by the representative of India, Mr. NUCKER explained what the administration was doing to dispel the fears of the people of Rongelap that their atoll might still be suffering the effects of radiation, resulting from radioactive fallout following the 1954 nuclear tests.

The special representative said the administration believed that the greatest good could come in tackling the problem by demonstrating to the people of Rongelap "our true desire to help them." The administering authority had assigned an American agriculturist who worked with the people and ate the food they ate. There was also a monthly visit by a medical officer, a Micronesian, who was devoted to their well-being.

The people of Rongelap, Mr. NUCKER continued, had a radio and were in daily contact with an adjacent island, so that, in the event of an emergency, it would be known immediately. The administration, he said, had given a "guarantee" to the Rongelapese that there would not be a repetition of the 1954 fallout, and scientists had assured them that their land, food and fish were not radioactive to the point of injury.

The administration, the special representative went on, intended to keep up these activities and believed that such efforts would resolve the problem satisfactorily.

Mr. RASGOTRA next asked whether the administering authority planned to move the seat of the territory's administrative headquarters from Guam to a site within the trust territory.

Mr. NUCKER replied that the administering authority could decide to move the headquarters to the trust territory. But the question of convenience was the real reason why "we continue to operate" in Guam where there were shipping, air and other communication services. If they were to move to a district in the territory, "we would have to duplicate those services," he said.

(END OF TAKE 2)

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

Trusteeship Council
24th Session, 29th Meeting (AM)

Press Release TR/1512
1 July 1959

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL -- TAKE 3

U TIN MAUNG (Burma) referred to developments in local self-government. He noted that there were more than 100 municipalities in existence and that the administration intended to charter 10 municipalities every year. Of the 15 municipalities in the Palau District, only one had not yet been chartered. He wondered why this was so.

The special representative, Mr. NUCKER, replied that this particular municipality had decided that, if it could not be the first to be chartered, it would be the last. They were now working on the charter and within a few months the formalities would be completed.

VALENTIN I. OBEREMKO (USSR) asked whether the United States, in view of the special strategic status of the trust territory, was willing to abide by the General Assembly resolutions recommending target dates for self-government or independence, or whether this matter would be one for the Security Council to consider.

MASON SEARS (United States) replied that it was not the policy of the United States at present to announce what the final target date would be. It was, however, United States policy to announce intermediate dates relating to the trust territory's development. "Many of the peoples on these islands have never heard of each other. We must first inculcate in them a sense of belonging, of national unity," he commented.

Mr. OBEREMKO said he understood from the reply that there were no special "legal" issues involved due to the territory's special status and that the question of target dates was governed solely by the administering authority's policy.

He next asked whether the inhabitants had never asked the administration why the United States had held its atomic tests in the Pacific Islands and not at home.

The special representative said the administering authority had explained to the inhabitants that the tests were "in the interest of peace" and that such tests were also held within the United States. The peoples on the islands had gained "immeasurable confidence," he declared; although there was a "natural concern" about the tests, there was no "fear."

When Mr. Oberemko continued questioning on the cessation of tests, Mr. SEARS intervened to say that the general world-wide problem of cessation of nuclear tests was now under examination in Geneva and not a matter for discussion in the Trusteeship Council.

(END OF TAKE 3)

UNITED NATIONS

Press Services
Office of Public Information
United Nations, N.Y.

(For use of information media -- not an official record)

Trusteeship Council
24th Session, 29th Meeting (AM)

Press Release TR/1512
1 July 1959

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL -- TAKE 4

Replying to further queries about fallout and radiation, Mr. NUCKER, the special representative, said he had been assured by scientists "that we are well within the safe level in the territory." Tests to determine the degree of radiation had been conducted in the water and soil of the islands. "I have no reason to doubt the findings," he declared.

Mr. OBEREMKO (USSR) asked whether the US, "bearing in mind that the conversations in Geneva were proceeding satisfactorily" would not consider assuring the population that no further atomic tests would be held in the territory.

In reply, Mason Sears (United States) said he hoped the "optimism" expressed by the Soviet representative about the outcome of the talks in Geneva "will be translated into the factual reality." The question posed by the Soviet representative had been answered many times in the course of previous sessions, he added.

Mr. OBEREMKO declared that in May 1959 a group of people, including such prominent scientists as Nobel-prize winner, Dr. Linus Pauling, and Bertrand Russell, presented an appeal to the United States Federal Court of Appeals for a cessation of nuclear tests in the Pacific Islands. He asked whether the High Commissioner knew of this and what the outcome of the appeal was.

Mr. NUCKER said he was not informed of the particular case mentioned by the USSR representative but he did know that this same group had tried to submit a similar appeal to Russia to end nuclear tests. However, the group was not permitted to go to Russia to present its appeal, he said.

The questioning of Mr. Nucker will be continued by the Council at 2:30 p.m. today.

(END OF TAKE 4 AND OF PRESS RELEASE TR/1512)