



**TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL**  
*Twenty-sixth Session*  
**OFFICIAL RECORDS**

Thursday, 28 April 1960,  
 at 10.45 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

C O N T E N T S

Page

*Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued):*

- (i) *Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1959 (continued);*
- (ii) *Examination of petitions (continued)*

*Questions concerning the Trust Territory and of the representative and special representative of the Administering Authority (continued) . . . . .* 79

President: Mr. Girolamo VITELLI (Italy).

*Present:*

The representatives of the following States: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, China, France, India, Italy, New Zealand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; World Health Organization.

*Examination of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued):*

- (i) *Annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 June 1959 (T/1513, T/1521, T/L.964) (continued);*
- (ii) *Examination of petitions (T/1511, T/PET.10/30 and Add.1) (continued)*

[Agenda items 3 (f) and 4]

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nucker, special representative of the Administering Authority for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, took a place at the Council table.*

**QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE TRUST TERRITORY AND REPLIES OF THE REPRESENTATIVE AND SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY (continued)**

*Political advancement (continued)*

1. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) observed that, although the special representative had spoken in his opening statement (1059th meeting) of the adherence of the Administering Authority to the principle of targets and dates for the development of the Trust Territory towards the objectives of the Trusteeship System, the annual report of the Administering

Authority<sup>1/</sup> gave no clear indication in that respect. He had been unable to find any reference to a target date for the establishment of a Territory-wide legislative council or for the transformation of the present district congresses from advisory bodies to responsible legislative organs of government.

2. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) pointed out that in reply to questions he had expressed the opinion that at least five years would be required before self-government or independence could be seriously considered. It could be assumed that within the next two or three years the present Inter-District Advisory Committee to the High Commissioner would have been changed into a Territory-wide congress with delegates elected by the people.

3. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) recalled that at the 1062nd and 1063rd meetings one of the petitioners, Mr. Kabua, had said that in his opinion one of the steps which would lead to political development in the Territory and to the speedy attainment of the objectives of the Trusteeship System would be the immediate granting of legislative powers to the district councils. He had further suggested that a consultant on legislation should be appointed by the Administering Authority to assist the district councils. Mr. Rifai would like to hear the special representative's opinion regarding that suggestion.

4. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that in his opinion no district in the Trust Territory was ready for full legislative powers.

5. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) recalled that in reply to a question put by the United Kingdom representative at the 1059th meeting the special representative had mentioned the desire of some Micronesians to be associated permanently with the United States. In view of the fact that the special representative had expressed a wish to see such a situation materialize, Mr. Rifai asked whether he had been referring to a particular district or to a particular section of the Micronesians and whether the feeling in question was growing and was being encouraged by the Administering Authority.

6. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that Micronesians in various districts had told him they would like to be associated with the United States. He emphasized, however, that he had not expressed a wish to see that situation materialize. It was not the policy of United States personnel working in the Territory to induce the Micronesians to remain permanently associated with the United States; they were

<sup>1/</sup> 12th Annual Report to the United Nations on the Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, July 1, 1958 to June 30, 1959; Transmitted by the United States of America to the United Nations Pursuant to Article 88 of the Charter of the United Nations, Department of State Publication 6945 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960). Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by a note of the Secretary-General (T/1513).

constantly told that they were there to help the Micronesians to raise their level of living and to develop politically, economically and so forth.

7. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) referred to the opening statement of the special representative, in the course of which he had said that the Inter-District Advisory Committee had advanced another step towards the eventual goal of the conversion of that group into an elected Territorial advisory council. He would like some elucidation of that statement and would also like to know what the difference would be between the present Inter-District Advisory Committee and the proposed Territorial advisory council.

8. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) explained that in speaking of another step forward he had referred to the fact that for the first time the Advisory Committee had selected from among its members a group to study social conditions which would meet during the year and in 1961 would report to the Advisory Committee and make recommendations. He fully anticipated that the next meeting of the Inter-District Advisory Committee would result in the establishment of a committee for economic study and possibly one on education.

9. In reply to the second part of the question, he said that within a few years the delegates to the Inter-District Advisory Committee would be elected by the people in their districts, whereas at the present time they were selected by congressmen who had been elected.

10. Mr. RIFAI (United Arab Republic) asked whether there was any general plan regarding the chartering of municipalities and whether the number of ten each year was fixed and immutable or depended on circumstances.

11. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) explained that the figure of ten was an estimate. In no event would a municipality be chartered unless the people were ready for it.

12. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that in reply to several questions the special representative had made reference to a five-year period. He asked whether the objective to be attained at the end of that period was the one envisaged in the United Nations Charter, namely, self-government or independence, or whether the Administering Authority had some other more limited objective in mind.

13. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) explained that he had not intended to convey the impression that the final objective would be reached within the next five years but rather that steps would be taken during that period which would ultimately lead to its attainment. The most important of those steps would be the establishment of a Territory-wide congress.

14. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked if he was correct in understanding that once such a congress had been established another five years would be required, making a total of ten years, before the objective of the Trusteeship Agreement would be reached.

15. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that, if the fundamental task entrusted to the Administering Authority was to train the indigenous inhabitants to manage their own affairs in such a way as to

benefit the people as a whole, that task was more likely to be accomplished satisfactorily in ten years than in five.

16. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that, whereas it was stated in one paragraph on page 159 of the annual report that the objective of the administration of the Trust Territory was the attainment of self-government of independence, a subsequent paragraph, concerning the policy of the Department of the Interior, mentioned only self-government. He asked whether the failure to include the word "independence" in the second instance was an oversight or an indication that the Administering Authority had ruled out independence as an objective.

17. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the answer to that question was to be found on page 15 of the report, where it was stated in the section on political advancement that it was the policy of the Territorial Government to foster and encourage political advancement towards a goal of self-government or independence evolving through the will, the needs and the desires of the inhabitants. The omission of the word "independence" in the instance to which the USSR representative had referred did not signify that self-government rather than independence was the objective but simply that the attainment of self-government would be the first stage, after which the people could decide whether they wanted to become independent.

18. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), addressing the United States representative, asked when the Administering Authority intended to comply with the Council's recommendations that the Territory should be brought under a single civil administration and that the headquarters should be transferred from Guam to the Territory itself.

19. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) recalled that the reasons why the Administering Authority did not find it advisable to transfer the headquarters at the present time had been explained at previous session of the Council; it had never taken the position that those headquarters should not be moved at an appropriate time in the future. In the meantime it did not feel that the maintenance of the headquarters in Guam was in any way inconsistent with its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement.

20. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Administering Authority's position on the matter seemed somewhat self-contradictory. His delegation would welcome fuller information concerning the anticipated duration of the present arrangement.

21. He asked the special representative whether consultations had been held with the indigenous population concerning specific measures for the attainment of self-government or independence.

22. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that discussions with various groups among the indigenous inhabitants concerning the rate of advancement and the increasing ability of the Micronesians to manage their own affairs were a normal and constant feature of the administration of the Territory.

23. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked what was the Administering Authority's position with regard to the seven-point programme

put before the Council at the 1062nd and 1063rd meetings by the petitioners from the Marshall Islands.

24. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that most of those points, including the broadening of legislative powers, improved transport, the transfer of headquarters and the matter of legislative consultants, were under constant consideration by the Administering Authority.

25. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the petitioners' complaint that the district congresses had no real powers, recalled the recommendation made by the Council at its twenty-fourth session that their powers should be broadened and asked what the Administering Authority planned to do along those lines during the current year.

26. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that it was not correct to state that the district congresses had no powers and he did not think congressmen from other districts would agree with the petitioners on that point. The Administration intended to continue working with the congresses with a view to broadening the powers of the local authorities at every level at the appropriate time. It had no specific plan for broadening or changing the powers of the congresses during the current year.

27. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that according to the petitioners twelve people in the Territory had died as a result of atomic radiation following the nuclear tests conducted by the United States military authorities and that the special representative, while challenging that figure, had not denied that such deaths had occurred. He would like to know if in addition to the deaths there had been other indications that health conditions in the Territory had been adversely affected by the tests. That question was particularly important inasmuch as the Administering Authority had repeatedly stated that the danger period was over and that there was no longer a need even for regular medical examinations.

28. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that he had at no time stated that any inhabitants of the Trust Territory had died as a result of atomic radiation. What he had said was that of the eighty-four people who had been affected in any way by radioactive fall-out only four had died and that the causes of death had been cancer in one case, chicken-pox in another and illnesses contracted prior to the experiments in the remaining two.

29. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked if it was the opinion of the specialist reporting on the case that the person who had died of cancer had contracted that illness as a result of exposure to fall-out.

30. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that it was his understanding, based on the medical information he had received, that none of the four deaths in question could be attributed to the effects of atomic radiation.

31. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that even if the Council accepted that statement it must take into account the report by the petitioners that many of the persons affected were now experiencing failing eyesight, lethargy and other symptoms which, according to the report of the Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation

(A/3838 and Corr.1), were characteristic of the effects of exposure to fall-out. In view of the authoritative character of that report he would like to know whether the United States medical staff in the Territory had noted cases in which, as claimed by the petitioners, the health of the inhabitants had been damaged by atomic radiation.

32. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that United States medical and scientific personnel had been keeping a close check on the people of Rongelap since the time of the experiments. As far as the petitioners' statements were concerned, he pointed out that a suit had been filed with regard to the people of Rongelap and that it would not be appropriate to pre-judge the issue by discussing it in the Council while it was at that stage.

33. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), noting from page 145 of the annual report that the Administering Authority had reconsidered its plan for an organic Act for the Territory, asked whether the formulation of the Act had been left entirely to United States legal experts or whether the indigenous inhabitants were being consulted.

34. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that it was precisely because the Administering Authority wanted to ensure that the wishes of the inhabitants would be reflected in the organic Act that it would not be able to complete the preparation of such an instrument in 1960, as originally anticipated, for it was only recently that it had become possible to discuss the matter with Micronesian lawyers. The Administering Authority had, however, been ascertaining the views and wishes of the indigenous inhabitants and transmitting that information to the Department of the Interior, which was working on the formulation of such an Act. There was at present no special committee in the Territory engaged in preparing such an Act but there was a constant exchange of information on the subject.

35. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that he thought the interests of the Micronesians would best be reflected in the organic Act if they participated directly in its preparation.

36. He noted from page 145 of the annual report that the Administration was planning to replace two American assistant district administrators by qualified Micronesians by 1964. He asked if it was intended that Micronesians should also fill the post of district administrator and, if so, how soon that would take place.

37. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that the purpose of appointing Micronesians to the post of assistant district administrator was to enable them to gain the experience they would require for later service as district administrators. He thought it likely that Micronesians would qualify for the latter post within the next six or seven years.

38. Mr. OBEREMKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked what was the total amount of the salaries paid to the 273 United States members of the Administration staff as shown on pages 193 to 197 of the report and whether that total was part of the \$1,195,608 for general administration shown on page 208.

39. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that, while he could not give a complete answer to that

question without reviewing the numerous schedules shown in the report, he could state offhand that some 240 of the 273 positions allotted to United States personnel were at present filled and that the salaries attaching to those posts totalled approximately \$1,250,000. The figure of 240 did not include United States personnel on Saipan.

40. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) referred to the fact, already mentioned by the USSR representative, that on page 159 of the annual report the policy of the Department of the Interior was stated to be to encourage the political advancement of the people of the Trust Territory towards a goal of self-government. He had raised the same question at the twenty-fourth session with regard to the same sentence, which was to be found on page 149 of the previous annual report,<sup>2/</sup> and had been informed by the High Commissioner that the omission of any mention of independence had not been deliberate. In view of that fact he asked for an explanation of the repetition of the omission in the annual report now under consideration.

41. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) again drew attention to the first sentence on page 15 of the annual report, where the word "independence" was used. The policy statement in appendix B, on page 159, had been written some years previously and through and oversight he had omitted to ask that it should be changed to include the word "independence". He assured the representative of India that the statements he had made at the twenty-fourth session and during the current session with respect to independence held good.

42. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) welcomed that assurance.

43. The question of the administrative headquarters of the Territory was of interest to his delegation. He wondered under which provision of the Trusteeship Agreement or the Charter an Administering Authority could administer a Trust Territory from outside. In the present case the administrative headquarters was not even in the territory of the administering State but in a Non-Self-Governing Territory. The special representative had said that the matter should not be decided in haste and that the people should be consulted. He wondered, however, whether the people had been consulted when the headquarters had been set up in Guam. His point was that once the Territory had obtained independence it would have to be governed from within its own boundaries. The previous year the Indian delegation had recommended that some steps should be taken in the matter. He would like to know what difficulties were involved.

44. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) recalled that in previous years he had explained in detail the advantages of having the headquarters in Guam, which included its central situation and the shipping, air and other facilities available there. He felt it would be unwise to move the headquarters now, with the risk that in a few years' time the Micronesians might not like the place that had been chosen. The demand that the headquarters should be moved into the Territory was made on purely theoretical grounds. It

should be borne in mind that the eventual Government of the Trust Territory would be different from that which the United States was now exercising and that fact might influence the choice of a site.

45. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) did not agree that the question was a theoretical one; it was one of practical necessity. Guam might be near Saipan District and the Carolines but it was very far distant from the Marshall Islands. At the 1062nd meeting of the Council the President of the Marshall Islands Congress, Mr. Kabua, had mentioned as one of the steps to be taken to lead the people to self-government and independence the removal of the High Commissioner's headquarters into the Trust Territory. A capital would bring a great deal of activity into the Territory; it would furnish opportunities of training of various kinds and create commercial opportunities and other benefits of which the people were at present deprived. Obviously when the Territory became independent it would not be able to maintain a headquarters on so large a scale as the present Administration, but he felt the Administering Authority would do well to make a beginning and assist the people by creating a headquarters and erecting buildings.

46. He would like to know that the Administering Authority's plans were with regard to Guam.

47. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the matter of Guam was but one facet of the whole problem. He assured the representative of India that the United States had no desire to acquire territory or to be known as a colonial Power.

48. It was true that the Administration could create a headquarters in any district, but in his opinion that should not be done until the Micronesians themselves had decided where they wished it to be.

49. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that the present position was giving rise to separatist tendencies. At the twenty-fourth session he had brought to the Council's attention the alleged desire of the people of Rota for integration with Guam. The Council had now been told that the people of Saipan District favoured integration with Guam and association with the United States. It might happen at a later stage that a different tendency might arise in other parts of the Territory and the Council would then be faced with the problem of the virtual cutting up of the Trust Territory, which according to the Indian delegation's interpretation of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement was unthinkable. If the High Commissioner could assure the Council that the Administration was conscious of the problem and that, should the tendency appear, it would try to rectify the position, the Indian delegation would be satisfied for the time being, though without prejudice to its position on the question of the capital.

50. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said he had no reason to think that the Administering Authority had any intention of separating the areas or of doing anything which would hamper the creation of a self-governing unit comprising the whole of Micronesia. Any such plans would be quite contrary to the aims of the present Administration, which were to bring the people together, to help them to know each other and to develop a centralized form of government.

<sup>2/</sup> Eleventh Annual Report to the United Nations on the Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, July 1, 1957 to June 30, 1958: Transmitted by the United States of America to the United Nations Pursuant to Article 88 of the Charter of the United Nations, Department of State Publication 6798 (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959). Transmitted to members of the Trusteeship Council by a note of the Secretary-General (T/1453).

51. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) asked whether the non-indigenous employees in the civil service mentioned on pages 193 to 197 of the annual report were all Americans.
52. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied in the affirmative.
53. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) asked what portion of the \$1,195,608 allocated to general administration was expended on indigenous personnel.
54. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the salaries paid to both United States and indigenous personnel were included in the figures for all the different activities listed on page 208 of the report. The figure of \$1,195,608 was for general administration only.
55. There were at present over 1,800 Micronesians on the payroll; according to his recollection, the Micronesian payroll amounted to about \$1 million and the United States to slightly more.
56. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) asked whether Micronesians could qualify for appointment to the GS grades mentioned in the annual report, and, if so, whether they received the same salary as the United States personnel.
57. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that there was a difference in the wages paid to the Micronesians and those paid to Americans but there was no discrimination. Micronesians were used wherever possible and were paid in terms of the economy of their areas; Americans, who were brought out only when they were needed to fill specific posts, were naturally paid according to the American economy.
58. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) wondered whether there were any instances where an American and a Micronesian doing equal work received different salaries.
59. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the case did not arise, for if a Micronesian could do the work of an American, the American was sent home. For example, it had recently been decided that Micronesian communicators were able to operate a communications station in each of the districts, although they could not do the repair work. A Micronesian had therefore been appointed district director of communications in each district, replacing the American directors.
60. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) inquired what period of time was covered by the "pay period" mentioned on page 201 and what the reason was for the great discrepancy between the salary of the Saipan judge and the salaries of the judges in the other six districts.
61. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that the presiding judge of Saipan was sitting constantly, while the other were not. The differences in salary reflected the differences among the districts in level of development, number of court cases and quantity of work performed. In addition, Saipan had a higher wage-scale than the other districts because of its proximity to Guam, among other things.
62. The pay period was two weeks.
63. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) wondered why the salary of the Saipan judge was two and a half times higher than the salary of the judge in Rota, which was even closer to Guam.
64. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the population of Saipan was about 6,000 whereas that of Rota was only about 900, and that there was very much more urban development in Saipan than in Rota.
65. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) asked whether the Naval Administration of the Saipan District as a rule paid higher salaries to its Micronesian employees than did the Civil Administration, and if so whether that caused any dissatisfaction in the other districts, whether there was co-ordination in the matter between the two Administrations and whether the Civil Administration's employment policy was affected by the possibility of people being attracted to Saipan on account of the higher wages paid there.
66. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the Naval Administration paid higher salaries than did the Civil Administration but that did not occasion any major problems. One reason was that the cost of living was higher in the Saipan District than in the other districts.
67. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) asked what the Administering Authority was doing to implement the recommendation made by the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territories of Nauru, New Guinea and the Pacific Islands, 1959, that steps should be taken to end the anomaly of the same Territory being administered by two different authorities. The Indian delegation felt that the Territory should be administered as a whole; in fact there was no provision in the Trusteeship Agreement for the administration of the Territory by two different authorities in two different ways.
68. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the problem was under serious consideration at the present time and that a decision would be taken by the United States Government, not by the High Commissioner.
69. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) asked the United States representative whether he could give the Council some information on those discussions. Although the Territory had been designated a strategic area in the Trusteeship Agreement, neither the General Assembly nor the people of the Trust Territory had expected a military rather than a civilian Administration.
70. Mr. GERIG (United States of America) said that as the whole matter was under consideration, he could add nothing to what the special representative had said. He would point out, however, that under the Trusteeship Agreement the United States Government had assumed certain responsibilities and it was entitled to ask two different departments to discharge those responsibilities. There might be differences of opinion about the efficiency of that procedure but the important thing was that the obligations undertaken by the Government were being faithfully carried out, and in a manner which was not inconsistent with the initial undertaking.
71. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) said that his delegation fully realized that the Administering Authority was carrying out its obligations. It merely felt that it would be more desirable, and indeed in conformity with the Trusteeship Agreement if the Territory were administered as one unit by one authority representing the Administering Authority.
72. He asked the special representative what type of recommendation made by the Inter-District Advisory

Committee the High Commissioner had accepted and what he had rejected.

73. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) said that the High Commissioner had accepted the recommendations concerning changes in the Executive Order covering riparian rights; the introduction of a bank into the Territory; the provision of scholarships for vocational, agricultural and general education; the creation of the Hold-Over Sub-Committee on Social Affairs; and changes in the curriculum and school year of the Pacific Islands Central School. Another request which had been accepted and which indicated a degree of growth was that all district orders or po-

licy statements concerning the district should be submitted to the local congress or hold-over committee for discussion before being put into effect. He could not recall any recommendation that had been rejected.

74. Mr. RASGOTRA (India) inquired whether the Hold-Over Sub-Committee was empowered to take the initiative to advise the High Commissioner on various matters pertaining to the administration of the Territory.

75. Mr. NUCKER (Special Representative) replied that the Sub-Committee was competent to do so.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.