



UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL

N 118PADV

JUN 13 1986



Distr.
GENERAL

T/PV.1616
6 June 1986

ENGLISH

UN/DA/CONF/1001

Fifty-third Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTEENTH MEETING

Held at United Nations Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 28 May 1986, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. RAPIN (France)

- Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 September 1985: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)
- The future of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)
- Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1985 (continued)
- Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to observe the plebiscite in Palau, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, February 1986 (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1985: TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/1888 and T/L.1249)
(continued)

THE FUTURE OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/1886) (continued)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Before resuming the general debate, I should like to inform the Council of the following, in response to a concern of three members. At this stage in our work I suggest that the Council appoint a drafting committee whose mandate would be to prepare, with the help of the Secretariat, a draft report on the organization and work of the fifty-third session of the Trusteeship Council, to be based on the recent procedure and included in the Council's next report to the Security Council. The drafting committee would also be called upon to decide on the contents of the second part of the Council's report, which until last year was entitled "Conclusions and recommendations".

It is my intention, as in previous years, to appoint a drafting committee made up of France and the United Kingdom. If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. President, since you referred to organizational matters relating to the Council's work, specifically to the establishment of the Drafting Committee, the Soviet delegation has some questions about the organizational aspects. In particular, if possible, we should like to know what is on the agenda for our future work: first, the order of work for the two meetings scheduled for today and, secondly, the order of work for the next few days.

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

These questions arise in connection with what happened yesterday morning and the dilemma that we faced. In particular, we should like to know how some other organizational questions are being settled. This justifies our view that we are now considering all the agenda items. We are not clear how we are to move forward and exactly where we are at this particular stage.

About two weeks ago we asked about the dissemination of some material. Unfortunately, it has not been distributed. Then yesterday our delegation drew attention to a cable from Palau relating to a case in the Supreme Court there. We do not have the document before us, but we wish to know whether the cable has been distributed and, if not, when it will be distributed. We should also like to know the fate of some of the other documents that I mentioned earlier. I do not wish to list all of them now. We should like some clarification on those matters.

We also request you again, Sir, to distribute some other petitions in the languages of the delegations here.

I am sure that other delegations are also interested in these matters, and we should be very grateful for an answer.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I shall try to answer the questions of the representative of the Soviet Union, which are, of course, fully justified.

With regard to the dissemination of the documents he mentioned, a decision was taken to issue in all the working languages of the Council, and to distribute, about 60 pages of petitions annexed to the Visiting Mission's report. After my last bilateral contact with the head of the Soviet delegation last week, I urged the Secretariat to do the work as quickly as possible, rather than within the three-week period that had earlier been indicated. I was assured that the documents would be distributed on Thursday or Friday morning.

(The President)

I did not receive a cable from Palau, but yesterday I received a letter addressed to me as President on the matter to which the representative of the Soviet Union referred, and I invited the Secretariat to submit a copy of the letter and annexed documents for this morning's meeting. I believe the Secretariat must have done so.

With regard to the other petitions, as I said last week, I asked the Secretariat that, together with the work of translation and publication, a photocopy be made of the petitions and given to each delegation, so that delegations would learn of them as quickly as possible. It goes without saying that at the same time I gave instructions for the translation and official publication of the petitions to be proceeded with as quickly as possible, so that we may take up the petitions, even in the case of the several petitions that arrived in New York after we had started the session.

The representative of the Soviet Union also asked a question about the organization of our work. At the present stage, pursuant to requests made by various delegations, I foresee our work proceeding as follows. This morning the representative of the United Kingdom has asked to speak, and I shall call on him. Then we shall continue the general debate. After the general debate, if we still have time this morning, and if delegations agree, then, as I said last week, I should like us to take a decision on the two draft resolutions which were distributed last week concerning the two Visiting Mission reports. If we still have time this morning we shall be able to resume our consideration of written petitions and move on from where we left off yesterday. However, I cannot be sure about that. Long statements may be made in the general debate, and it is a tradition here that there is no limitation on the length of such statements.

As I informed delegations yesterday outside the meeting, in my capacity as

(The President)

President, the delegations that sponsored the draft resolution distributed yesterday wish the Council to take a position on it at some point this afternoon. I do not know how long that will take. In any event, we shall be able to do something else as well, and I suggest that we continue consideration of written petitions. We have no meetings scheduled for tomorrow, and I had not intended to have a meeting tomorrow. If there are no other suggestions from delegations, I intend to resume on Friday, but I think that will not give us very long to complete the consideration of the pending agenda items, on information, racial discrimination, scholarships and so on.

If we are unable to complete our work on Friday, I invite delegations to consider the possibility of our having two more meetings next week. I have spoken to two delegations on the matter, and I know they are willing to agree if it is necessary. I have told all delegations that it could happen, but I do not know what items we should have to take up then. I think matters will become clearer by Friday, but all delegations should make arrangements to ensure that they will be able to attend one or possibly two meetings next week.

For the benefit of members of delegations who are taking part in our work for the first time, the Council's report will be adopted, as it was done in prior years, two or three weeks after the end of the last meeting we shall hold next week. Therefore, in about two weeks we shall be ending the session by submitting the Drafting Committee's draft report to the Council.

I hope I have answered all the questions put to me by the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The information you have given, Mr. President, is extremely useful, and we thank you for it. It gives us a clearer picture of how we shall be working over the next few days.

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

As to your comments on the possibility of holding one or two meetings next week - and we may even need more - the Soviet delegation has no objection to this. It will be recalled that at the beginning of the session we stated that there should be no rigid deadline for the end of our work and that in the course of our discussions we might well find that we needed a brief additional period for our work.

We also note that your views on the organization of the Council's work over the next few days do not coincide completely with the written timetable we adopted earlier. For instance, you stated that you did not envisage a meeting tomorrow, but you also spoke of Thursday as being a working day. Moreover, there are two meetings scheduled for Friday, but if we understood you correctly, you said that it was possible we would not work on Friday. Perhaps you could clarify our schedule for Thursday and Friday.

We regret, Sir, that you did not have the text of the 20 May cable on the Palau Supreme Court's consideration of the question we referred to earlier. We note that it is requested in a letter addressed to you that a petitioner be permitted to submit the question of the situation in Palau for the consideration of the Council. In preliminary consultations and in our subsequent discussions in the Council, we had come to an understanding that these matters might be considered.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of the United Kingdom, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom): I had understood that when the representative of the Soviet Union intervened before I was able to make my statement he was intervening on a point of order. In fact, the subjects he is discussing are not points of order; they are questions of the future work of our session. If we are to have a discussion about that, it should be agreed that we

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

are to do so, and the subject should not be introduced in the guise of a point of order, which indeed it is not. If the representative of the Soviet Union has not got a genuine point of order, I should like to make my statement.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representative of the United Kingdom is correct. Before calling on him, I wish however to respond to our colleague from the Soviet Union on two points. I confirm that there will be no meetings tomorrow; none have been scheduled, and since the Secretariat sometimes makes the Chamber available to other bodies I am not calling meetings - to the extent possible and unless there is a specific request - for times when none were scheduled. There will be two meetings on Friday, although in view of where we stand I believe our work will have to continue next week.

If I am asked to schedule meetings tomorrow in order to avoid having to continue next week, I should be willing to consult with delegations on that possibility.

On the question of the telegram: I received no cable, but rather, a letter dealing with the same subject. Yesterday afternoon I asked the Secretariat to distribute copies of that letter to all delegations this morning.

Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom): I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution contained in document T/L.1252, sponsored jointly by my delegation and the delegation of France. The draft resolution, I think, speaks for itself, but delegations may find it useful if I briefly highlight its main points.

I draw the Council's attention to the second and third preambular paragraphs, which reflect the Charter obligation placed on Administering Authorities of Trust Territories to promote the establishment of free political institutions and to encourage progressive development towards self-government or independence as appropriate.

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

Council members will note that the fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs acknowledge that negotiations between the United States and the Micronesian Governments on a new political relationship to replace the Trusteeship Agreement have been successfully completed.

The sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs record the view of last year's Visiting Mission to the Territory as well as that of the Micronesian representatives who have spoken at this session that the Trusteeship Agreement should be terminated. The seventh preambular paragraph goes further and expresses the view that the request for termination accords with the wishes of the Micronesian people.

The final preambular paragraph recognizes the responsibility of the Security Council, pursuant to Article 83 (1) of the Charter, which provides that all functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas, including the approval of the terms of Trusteeship Agreements and their alteration or amendment, should be exercised by the Security Council.

Operative paragraph 1 notes that the peoples of Micronesia have freely determined their political future in plebiscites observed by United Nations Visiting Missions. That paragraph reflects the conviction that those plebiscites were valid acts of self-determination by the people of Micronesia on the constitutional future of the Trust Territory. That conviction was underscored by the statements of all the Micronesian representatives at this session, as well as by the statements of the States of the region.

Paragraph 2 requests the United States and the Trust Territory Governments to agree on a date for the coming into effect of their new political relationship.

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

Paragraph 3 constitutes recognition of what has been the recurrent theme - indeed the keynote - of this session, namely the unanimous and unqualified wish for termination of the Trusteeship Agreement expressed by all the Micronesian representatives and their underlying concern that nothing should be allowed to stand in the way of termination. Accordingly, paragraph 3, having acknowledged that the United States has satisfactorily discharged its obligations under the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement, considers that it is appropriate for the Trusteeship Agreement to be terminated with effect from the date referred to in paragraph 2.

Paragraph 4 requests the Secretary-General to circulate the draft resolution when adopted and other materials received from the United States as official documents of the Security Council, consonant with its role, to which I have referred.

I commend this draft resolution to the Council for adoption, believing it to be in the best interests of the peoples of Micronesia. I suggest, in line with what you have said, Mr. President, that we proceed to a vote on the draft resolution this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We shall now, as agreed, resume the general debate, which we began yesterday when we heard the representative of France, and I shall now call on those delegations which wish to participate.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We listened carefully to the statement just made by the representative of the United Kingdom and should like, through you, Sir, to obtain some clarification from him. The usual practice is that a draft resolution is voted upon after delegations have had a chance to study it and hear statements by its sponsors. We shall listen carefully to what he says just as we will give careful study to the draft resolution itself. Of course all of us here represent Governments and naturally we need time to contact our capitals and receive instructions from them. In this connection we should like to draw the attention of the United Kingdom representative to this, especially since we are talking about a draft resolution on matters which still have not been completely discussed. The general debate has not yet been concluded; we have not yet studied the results and materials emanating from those discussions. Therefore, for purposes of clarification I would merely ask our United Kingdom colleague his reason for requesting this morning that a vote be taken on that draft resolution.

Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom): I was under the impression, Mr. President, that you had announced that we were proceeding to the general debate.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): That is indeed the case. Therefore, in the circumstances I propose that we take up matters pertaining to the draft resolution this afternoon, as I had indicated.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not quite understand why the representative of the United Kingdom is getting disturbed. We do not object to starting with the discussion. But he

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

has just made a specific proposal, and naturally in that connection he is not going to deprive those here of their democratic right to ask some questions. I do not understand why there is this lack of logic here and why one question is being replaced by another. Up till now, I think, we had all been observing the rules. For the representative of the United Kingdom to violate those rules at the last moment will not do honour to this Council.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I appeal to the understanding of the Soviet Union representative. It was my intention that he have an opportunity to ask these questions when our afternoon meeting begins.

So I come back, as I had announced, to the general debate, and I now ask delegations to address this topic.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We do not wish to obstruct the course of our discussion here, or discussion of this draft resolution, but the question was put in such a way as to imply that we would not only be discussing it but also voting on it. In the light of organizational matters which arose precisely because some issues are discussed in the corridors and then do not come up for discussion and official adoption here by consensus, we would like to express our views in this connection so as to obviate any misunderstanding later on when the United Kingdom representative might criticize the Soviet delegation, since my delegation raised no objection to the possibility of voting on the draft resolution in the afternoon.

Before concluding, I should like to say that my delegation may have been the first to learn about the existence of this draft, which, by the way, was not submitted until this morning. We learned of it only yesterday. In any case, we have had too little time to determine our position on this draft and, as I said earlier, to receive relevant instructions from our capitals.

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

In conclusion, in the light of the agitation which has overcome the representative of the United Kingdom my delegation not only would welcome his statement but would have no objection to his officially opening our general debate.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I do not consider it within my competence as President to determine the order in which delegations should speak in the general debate. That, I think, is up to delegations themselves. If he wants to speak I am willing to call on him right now.

If not, we shall resume the general debate and I shall call on those delegations wishing to speak.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I simply wanted to recall that yesterday the representative of the United Kingdom asked that his delegation be given the opportunity to speak today, and we would welcome his statement.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): If no delegation wishes to speak, I shall take it those delegations which have not spoken wish to change their statements in the general debate into statements either before or after the voting on the draft resolutions tomorrow.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Since the delegation of the United Kingdom does not insist on being second to none, the Soviet delegation will ask to speak.

Little more than a quarter of a century has passed since the overwhelming majority of representatives in this building adopted one of the most important and effective United Nations documents, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. In that historic document, the United Nations proclaimed its main goal of "bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations".

We derive satisfaction from the fact that of the almost 100 colonial and Trust Territories which gained independence and statehood after the establishment of the United Nations, more than 70 achieved that status after the Declaration on Decolonization was adopted.

As is emphasized in the political report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the twenty-seventh Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, "the liberation of former colonies and semi-colonies was a powerful political and ideological blow to the capitalist system".

However, the goals of the Declaration have still not been fully achieved. The United Nations cannot reconcile itself to the fact that the peoples of some 20 colonial and dependent Territories are still deprived of their legitimate right to freedom and independence. As indicated in a letter from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to the Member States of the United Nations on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration:

"In the attempt to maintain their dominance, the imperialist Powers are imposing various types of neo-colonialist status on these Territories and turning them into strategic military strongholds and bases for aggression.

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

One obvious example of this may be found in their acts of annexation in connection with the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands." (S/17571, p. 2, annex)

Each new step towards eliminating the last remaining links in the chain of colonialism encounters the vigorous opposition of the colonialists and neo-colonialists, who are trying to stop the clock of history. Through political manoeuvres, financial deals, threats and blackmail, and frequently through direct interference in the internal affairs of States, they are establishing and refining a subtle system of neo-colonialist exploitation. And there is a new mask being worn by different forms of dependence which camouflages neo-colonialism with various types of propaganda screens, such as "commonwealths", "free association", and so on.

This is fully true also of the policy and practice of the Administering Authority of the United States in the Strategic Trust Territory of the United Nations of the Pacific Islands, for Micronesia. According to the Trust Agreement, which was unanimously approved by the Security Council, the United States, as Administering Authority, assumed the obligation to establish on that Trust Territory conditions which would give the people of Micronesia the chance freely to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. In carrying out a policy of absorbing Micronesia, the United States proposed the inclusion on the agenda of this session of the Trusteeship Council of an item on the future of the Trust Territory of the Pacific islands. Moreover, its representative, even before consideration of that item at the session, unequivocally demanded that the Council end trusteeship "and do so without delay".

A legitimate question arises: Has the Administering Authority, over the almost four decades of its activities in the Trust Territory, carried out the

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

obligations it assumed under the United Nations Charter and under the Trusteeship Agreement which was concluded in the Security Council? That was the criterion of the Soviet delegation in studying the past year's report of the Administering Authority and United States activities in the Trust Territory over a still longer period of time.

Naturally, we listened carefully to the statements and responses of the petitioners - citizens of Micronesia and of other countries. Analysis of the material presented to the Trusteeship Council reveals that, after receiving a temporary mandate from the Security Council in 1947 to administer Micronesia as a strategic Trust Territory of the United Nations, the United States was guided not by the lofty ideals of the United Nations Charter or of the Trust Agreement but by its own strategic interests. It put those interests above everything else, especially above those of the Micronesian people. Accordingly, it has taken steps to bind Micronesia to the United States and to frustrate positive developments in the Trust Territory towards self-sufficiency. Its actions have also tended to deprive the Micronesian people of their right to elect or choose their genuine freedom, to maintain their unity and to embark upon an independent, self-sufficient road to development. As a consequence, the fundamental goals and principles of the international Trust System set up by the United Nations over the Micronesian Territory have not been realized.

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

First, in carrying out the functions of Administering Authority of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the United States has not met its obligation under Article 76 a of the United Nations Charter which sets out as one of the main tasks of the trusteeship system: "to further international peace and security". Neither has Washington met its obligations under Article 84 of the Charter which provides:

"It shall be the duty of the Administering Authority to ensure that the Trust Territory shall play its part in the maintenance of international peace and security."

The Soviet Union has repeatedly emphasized that the main goal of United States policy towards Micronesia is the intention to turn that strategic United Nations Trust Territory into a military-strategic springboard in the Western Pacific for the Pentagon for the purpose of ensuring control over a large region of the globe and dominate the States there. In this regard, Mr. Noel Koch, United States Deputy Secretary of Defense, made a noteworthy statement to the effect that the Micronesian islands were needed by Washington primarily as safe, strategic bases for the conduct of military operations. He declared:

"We need to have guaranteed rights of access, transit and overflight over the Micronesian region in order to reach the Philippines, Indonesia, Australia and the Indian Ocean by the quickest route."

Clearly, it is not for civilian purposes, peaceful passage of vessels or overflight of aircraft that Washington wants those rights. What we are talking about are United States dangerous intentions with regard to the countries of Asia and Oceania that undermine stability and security in that region.

Indeed, what kind of strengthening of international peace and security can we talk about if, from the outset of the establishment of control over the Pacific

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

Islands, the Administering Authority has pursued a policy of perpetuating its military presence there? The Trust Territory had imposed on it compacts and long-term military agreements according to which the Pentagon acquired the right to build, expand and maintain on the islands military and naval bases and other military facilities. In spite of the will of the native Micronesian population, the United States forced the local authorities it established on the Micronesian islands of Palau to adopt agreements that would permit the transit of nuclear weapons over the Trust Territory, port calls and landings by American vessels and aircraft carrying nuclear weapons. According to articles in the United States press, those agreements give the Pentagon an opportunity to store weapons of mass destruction there. Kwajalein Atoll has been transformed by the Pentagon into a huge test range for intercontinental ballistic missiles. Moreover, as Mr. Balos, a petitioner from Micronesia, indicated at this session of the Council, the military, crudely trampling on the interests and rights of the native inhabitants of the atoll, drove them out of Kwajalein.

Everyone knows the facts of the broad use made by the United States of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands as a testing ground for atomic and nuclear weapons. Dozens of types of those monstrous weapons have been exploded on Bikini and Enewetak as a result of which serious damage has been done to the well-being and health of the Territory's native population and to the environment not only of Micronesia but also of a broad region of the Pacific Ocean waters. The harmful consequences of nuclear testing have been acknowledged in the United States press by specialists. Repeatedly, at this session of the Trusteeship Council as well, petitioners have referred to those effects. However, for many years now United States authorities have not taken effective, timely measures to eliminate all the consequences of those tests or to ensure the necessary medical help for the inhabitants of Micronesia who suffer from them.

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

The militarization of the Trust Territory and plans to deploy nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction there represent a serious threat to the Micronesian people and the countries of the entire Asian-Pacific region; they also contradict the South Pacific Forum's decision to make the South Pacific a nuclear-free zone. As pointed out in the statement of the Soviet Government of 24 April 1986, all that can lead to a serious worsening of tension in the Asian-Pacific region.

My second point is that the Administering Authority has violated paragraph 6 of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which clearly and precisely states:

"Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations." (resolution 1514 (XV))

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

Having taken under its administration the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands as a single entity, the United States, encountering resistance from Micronesian political forces which wanted to maintain the unity of the Territory and the people, deliberately established a policy of dismembering the Trust Territory and dividing its population. While striving to maintain the unity of its Territory and to establish an independent Micronesian State, the Congress of Micronesia was dissolved. The united Congress had rejected a form of union of Micronesia with the United States, following the Puerto Rican model, and unambiguously spoken in favour of maintaining the unity of the Marshall Islands, the Caroline Islands and the Mariana Islands.

In the negotiations with the Administering Authority, the delegation of the Congress of Micronesia persistently tried to put an end to the trusteeship and to transform its country into a self-governing State, in which the Micronesians would have the full range of authority in all areas of the country's domestic life and the inalienable right to enter into treaty relationships with any other country. During the negotiations the delegation put forward four principles, reflecting the fundamental aspirations of the people of the islands: in particular, full sovereignty, self-determination, independence and the right to adopt and if necessary change its own Constitution. Those just demands of the Micronesians were refused by the United States.

As a result of the policy and actions of the Administering Authority, the Territory of Micronesia was divided into four island entities. All of that was done with one specific goal - to weaken the resistance of the native population of Micronesia to the neo-colonialist, annexationist policy of the Administering Authority.

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

What the representative of the United States tried to describe at our meeting on 16 May as "free and fair acts of self-determination" (T/PV.1609, p. 8) by the Micronesian people, were in fact the result of the ancient Roman principle of divide and conquer, which was adopted by the neo-colonialists at the end of the 19th century.

The negotiations on the future status of the United Nations Trust Territory imposed on the Micronesians took place under conditions of undisguised pressure by the Administering Authority, which applied a policy of diktat and completely ignoring the vital interests of the native population of Micronesia. The negotiations were secret. They took place under conditions of inequality of the parties and without any participation whatsoever by the United Nations, the Trusteeship Council, the Security Council or the Special Committee on decolonization.

If the Administering Authority had not divided the Trust Territory into four parts, but had instead granted Micronesia - as the Micronesians themselves sought - full independence, then, in spite of the assertions of the United States that such a country would not be viable, because it was small in population and territory, Micronesia would be in population terms larger than dozens of States that are Members of the United Nations, including Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saint Lucia, Sao Tomé and Príncipe and others.

My third point is that as the Administering Authority the United States violated Article 76 of the Charter, which talks of the need

"to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories".

Indeed, during its 40-year administration of that Trust Territory the United States, which had all the resources to establish conditions that would promote

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

Micronesia's rapid economic development and its becoming an independent State, did not take the necessary measures. On the contrary, its policy was to delay the Trust Territory's development. The Administering Authority did not promote the establishment on the Territory of a viable, independent economy, industry or agriculture which would make it possible to meet the needs of the native population.

As has repeatedly been pointed out in the Council, Micronesia was a food exporter. Today, as a result of agriculture's collapse, the population's food needs have to be satisfied mainly through imports. That clearly shows the deliberate brakes put by the Administering Authority on the Trust Territory. It thereby made it a true ward and deprived the Micronesian people of the chance independently to make their own political choice. In the book Micronesia: Trust Betrayed, the former Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, Mr. Donald McHenry, stated:

"The economic development of Micronesia was a disastrous failure. Politically the social and other programmes in the area of education were not related to the economic realities and potentials."

He also said:

"No promises to guarantee economic assistance to an independent Micronesia at a sufficient level were given by the United States. On the contrary, they clearly made it understood that the closeness of relations and not the needs of Micronesia would determine the level of economic assistance from the United States."

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

And the author concludes further on that

"As a result of this the economy of Micronesia not only does not ensure the simple existence of the population of the Territory, but it is incapable of developing or of even supporting the present standard of living without significant foreign assistance."

One of the main problems, as pointed out in the statements of petitioners during this session of the Trusteeship Council, is the almost universal unemployment. Moreover, there is an ever-increasing number of unemployed who come from the youth sector of the population. In addition, on the island of Ebeye the unemployment rate has reached 82 per cent of the population. Is this not testimony to a policy of mass pauperization of a native population of a Trust Territory on the part of the Administering Authority? The situation in this area is so critical that even the Visiting Mission had to acknowledge that fact. In this connection, we are talking about the violation of one of the main rights of people, the right to work, and consequently the chance to exist on something other than the dole from the Administering Authority.

Fourthly, the United States, as the Administering Authority, has not discharged its obligation under Article 76 of the Charter. This is an obligation to encourage the progressive development of the population of the Trust Territory towards self-government and independence. The Administering Authority, misusing the mandate entrusted to it by the Security Council for temporary administration of the Trust Territory, imposed on the Micronesians the so-called talks on the future political status of separate parts of the Territory. Those talks never were - and never could be - fair ones.

The extremely disadvantageous agreements drafted in the course of the talks and imposed on individual parts of Micronesia, the so-called Commonwealth and free association, had but one goal, namely, to bring the Territory into the hands of the

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

United States and to do everything necessary to ensure that the population of the United Nations Trust Territory would not even dream of the future of their country as a united and independent State. As a result of these agreements, the Micronesians were deliberately split up and deprived of their inalienable right to true self-determination and independence.

The next step in the United States anti-Charter activities was to carry out in Micronesia, which had now been splintered into many entities, the so-called plebiscites and referendums, whose only goal was to cover up the true nature and orientation of those agreements on so-called free association and Commonwealth and to rubber stamp decisions that were advantageous to the Administering Authority. However, the use of these words - plebiscites and referendums - do not mislead anybody. These were propaganda shows, absolute fiction, totally unrelated to genuine and free self-determination of the peoples, which is what is consistently advocated by the United Nations.

As is known, the plebiscites and referendums in Micronesia were preceded by so-called political education campaigns whose main objective was to inculcate into the Micronesians the idea that, if they did not come out in favour of so-called free association with the United States, then economic and financial aid would be cut off. A particularly important point is that the question of the right of the people of Micronesia to genuine independence and the advantages that go therewith was never explained in the course of those campaigns.

Quite indicative here is the plebiscite carried out in February of this year in Palau. The people were given no option other than to vote on the agreement of free association with the United States. The extremely short education campaign came down to convincing the people that the new Compact was supposedly in accordance with the Constitution of Palau and, therefore, did not require a vote in favour by three fourths of the people participating in the vote. In actual fact,

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

this was a major deception of the indigenous population, since the Compact is in conflict with the Constitution of Palau.

In this connection, I should like to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that on 19 May a case was brought to the Supreme Court of Palau against a Special Representative of the American delegation, Mr. Lazarus Salii, as the representative of the Administering Authority in Palau. The plaintiffs in the case indicated in their statement in the Court that the Compact of Free Association, particularly sections 312, 324 and 331, which Mr. Salii and Ambassador Zeder had signed on 10 January 1986, and also the agreements accompanying the Compact enabling the United States and third States invited by the United States into Palau to deploy, use, test, store or dump nuclear, toxic, chemical, gas or biological weapons intended for use in military actions, or to use, store or dump waste products from nuclear installations within the area of the territorial jurisdiction of Palau, was a violation of the Constitution, which specifically prohibits this. There is also section 324, whose provisions permit the Americans not to confirm or deny the presence or existence in Palau of such weaponry. The statement said that these were unconstitutional.

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

The same letter stressed that the political education programme and the 21 February 1986 plebiscite were not carried out fairly and impartially, but rather so as to mislead the citizens and voters of Palau about the main points of the Compact and about the consequences of accepting the Compact of Free Association and its subsidiary agreements.

In this very Chamber, the representative of the United Kingdom has attempted to describe the referendums and plebiscites held in Palau as some sort of indicator of a great democracy. But they were more accurately described in a telegram from a number of Members of the European Parliament addressed to the Trusteeship Council as "an American mockery of democracy". It was not accidental that that same group requested the Council to investigate the intimidation of inhabitants of Palau opposed to the Compact and called on the United Nations to send observers to ensure that the United States complied with its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement. They said that account should be taken of Palau's desire to remain free of foreign military bases and nuclear materials.

Considering the conditions in which the so-called plebiscites and referendums were staged by the Administering Authority, their results cannot be regarded as a genuinely free expression of the will of the population in accordance with the Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

Fifth, the United States has not complied with its obligations under Article 73 of the Charter, which reads in part:

"Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories".

We should reflect on the words "a sacred trust" and then consider the actual situation in the Trust Territory.

The enormous body of data made available at this session and the previous session shows that United States activities in the Trust Territory were not inspired by any concern for the true interests of the population of Micronesia or for the future of that small people. The United States is seeking not the independence of Micronesia, but neo-colonialist control of that Territory with the aim of securing Washington's long-term military and strategic interests.

Making use of the rights the United Nations has granted it as Administering Authority, the United States has for many years used any means whatsoever to establish control over this United Nations Trust Territory. Indeed, as indicated in an earlier United States document, it has acted to make Micronesia permanently dependent on the United States. Development in the Trust Territory has been designed along those lines, to make the Territory's political, economic and social standards conform with its status of so-called free association.

As noted earlier in this Council, the United States encouraged internal tension and divisions among various groups of the indigenous population. When they had brought these to the boiling point, they introduced the question of self-determination. At the Trusteeship Council's session six years ago, a Micronesian, Mr. Tosiwo Nakayama, stated clearly that during the period of the Trusteeship Agreement, the goals of the trusteeship had not been achieved in the political, economic, social or educational spheres.

Since that time, the situation in the Trust Territory has not changed for the better, as we can see from what has occurred at this year's session and from the

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

presentations of the petitioners, including those who came to us from the Trust Territory of Micronesia.

Sixth, the Administering Authority is acting in violation of Article 83 of the United Nations Charter, which states that

"All functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the Security Council."

Never in the course of drafting the provisions of the Compacts for the four separate parts of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands with the goal of ending the trusteeship did the United States go to the Security Council. Nor were the Compacts themselves submitted officially even for consideration by the Trusteeship Council.

The provisions of the Compact imposed on Palau - particularly those relating to duration - create in essence a new form of United States control over that part of Micronesia, ensuring the persistence of neo-colonialism into the twenty-first century.

Seventh, the United States unilaterally violated the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement over the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, specifically article 6 (2), which requires the Administering Authority, in discharging its obligations under Article 76 of the Charter of the United Nations, to protect the people from any loss of their lands or natural resources.

But what is the Administering Authority in fact doing? By the terms of article II, section 322, of the Compact, Palau is to transfer to the United States within 60 days any site required for important purposes unless an alternative site acceptable to the United States can be found. That amounts to confiscation of land by the Administering Authority, which is unambiguously prohibited by the Palau Constitution.

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

It is obvious that if the Micronesians had been free they would never have accepted those extremely unfavourable conditions in the Compact, particularly sections 321 and 322, which consolidate the Administering Authority's right to determine where it will locate its defence installations. It allows it to use them in accordance with agreements on military use rights. In practical terms that means that in future thousands of acres of land and the best fishing areas could simply be seized from the indigenous inhabitants on a decision of the American authorities. As in the case of the people of Bikini and Kwajalein, the people would be driven off their own land.

All that I have said shows quite clearly the neo-colonialist nature of the agreements on so-called free association and commonwealth imposed by the United States on the separate parts of Micronesia, in conditions of the complete political and economic dependence of the population of the Trust Territory on the American authorities.

The results of the plebiscites which were staged under those circumstances in various parts of Micronesia cannot be considered genuine self-determination or the free expression of the will of the population under the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on decolonization.

At the same time, the facts demonstrate convincingly that the Micronesian people - who have suffered all the disadvantages of ownership by the Spanish, the colonialism of the Germany of the Kaisers and pre-war dominion by Japan, which administered the Territory under a League of Nations Mandate, and who are now forced to bear the burden of American neo-colonialism - deserve better. They deserve genuine freedom, unity and independence. Micronesia has never been, and is not, a Territory of the United States. The Micronesian people alone are the sovereign possessors of the sacred right, confirmed in the Charter and the Declaration on decolonization, to independence.

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

The United States has received from the United Nations the functions of Administering Authority, and its duty is to prepare the people of Micronesia for self-determination and independence. The unilateral, arbitrary and unlawful actions of the United States against Micronesia cannot be recognized as lawful or as having legal force. The Soviet news agency TASS stated on 14 February this year, inter alia:

"The future of the people of Micronesia is an integral part of the problem of decolonization. It is the duty of the United Nations and of all Members of the United Nations not to permit any attempt to be made to present the world with the fait accompli of the United States having devoured the Territory. The United Nations must ensure implementation by the people of Micronesia of their natural right to establish a single, independent State."

The Soviet Union has more than once stated its position to the United Nations - that includes statements in the Trusteeship Council - on matters relating to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. It has drawn the Secretary-General's attention to the unlawful actions of the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory and has urged an immediate halt to such unlawful actions. The Soviet Union's position of principle on Micronesia is well known. We have stated it on several occasions in the Trusteeship Council and elsewhere. We continue to advocate full compliance with the conditions of the Trusteeship Agreement and implementation of its objectives under the Charter and the Declaration on decolonization. We have always maintained that the Administering Authority must take action along those lines.

That would be in keeping with the short-term and long-term aspirations of the Micronesians. Micronesia must become a stable region of peace and security, not a bridgehead from which to threaten peace and security. The Micronesians, like the

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

peoples of other dependent Territories large and small, are entitled to expect to be able to establish their own independent, sovereign State, without any outside interference. The question of Micronesia's future is an inalienable part of the problem of decolonization for all colonial countries and peoples, which have the right to self-determination and independence. The United Nations must maintain its responsibility for the Territory until it attains true independence.

The programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which was adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly in 1970, states:

"Where resolution 1514 (XV) has not been fully implemented with regard to a given Territory, the General Assembly shall continue to bear responsibility for that Territory until such time as the people concerned has had an opportunity to exercise freely its right to self-determination and independence in accordance with the Declaration." (General Assembly resolution 2621 (XXV), para. 9)

That important provision was fully reaffirmed in the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (resolution 35/118), adopted at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly in 1980. Under the Declaration on decolonization, the people of Micronesia, like all the peoples of the world, has a right to freedom and independence. What the United States is doing in Micronesia reveals its intention unilaterally to violate the provisions of the Charter and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and to determine, as it sees fit, the fate and future of the people of Micronesia and its territory.

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

However, under the Charter of the United Nations any change in the status of a strategic Trust Territory - and Micronesia is such a strategic Trust Territory - is to be carried only pursuant to a decision by the Security Council. Therefore, a unilateral action by the American Administration in Micronesia, however it attempts to justify it, cannot from the viewpoint of international law be recognized as legitimate or having legal force.

Under the Charter of the United Nations, the Trusteeship Council must not approve any measures that can be used by the Administering Authority to legalize its unlawful actions in the Territory. Micronesia must exercise its right to self-determination and independence. The rights of the Micronesians to an independent existence must be guaranteed.

Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom): I have already extended my delegation's thanks to the Micronesian representatives for their impressive and invaluable contribution to the work of the Council. I should also like formally to thank the many petitioners who were heard by the Council. We did not agree with everything they said, but the hearing of petitioners is a measure of the openness and care which have characterized the supervision of Trust Territories by this Council on behalf of the United Nations, and it is a practice my delegation has always supported. We found the statements by the Micronesian petitioners particularly helpful.

Only last year I sat where you, Mr. President, are now sitting. The presidency of the Trusteeship Council is something of an education. One is at least partially removed from the rough and tumble of debate; one has time to reflect. By this stage of last year's session, I was thinking that we diplomats were perhaps inadequately equipped to deal with practical matters that directly affect peoples' daily lives. The problem is, of course, that in our profession we concern ourselves with means rather than ends, with concepts more often than with

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

concrete issues. Little wonder then that it sometimes seemed to me that statements in the Council owed more to theory than practice and reflected preconceptions about models of political and economic advancement rather than a realistic understanding of the unique phenomenon that is Micronesia. In short, I felt that our debates tended to become ends in themselves rather than vehicles for achieving the objectives of the Trusteeship.

The statement just made by the representative of the Soviet Union is an excellent example of what I mean. It was a parade of stale ideological preconceptions and wholly ignored what has in fact been happening in the Trust Territory in the past three decades or more. The Soviet Union has long argued the same three things about United States administration of the Trust Territory: that the United States has fragmented the Territory in order to achieve its basic aim of annexation, that it has exploited and neglected its people and that it has militarized the area. Those charges are serious. They are also baseless and motivated by anything other than the realities of the situation and the interests of the Micronesians.

It is impossible not to conclude that, for the Soviet Union, the problem about Micronesia is not the manner in which the Trusteeship has been carried out, but the identity of the Administering Authority. Is it not extraordinary that, as far as the Soviet delegation is concerned, the United States has done not one single thing right? Its record in Micronesia is supposedly one of unmitigated and unrelieved wrongdoing.

Let us take the fragmentation theory first. The argument goes that, contrary to the wishes of the people, the United States has divided up Micronesia into more easily controllable parts the better to pursue its imperialist ends. This is seen as a classic example of colonial divide-and-rule strategy and as being in defiance of General Assembly resolutions.

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

Now, it is of course obvious to all that what was originally one Territory has indeed come to consist of four separately administered entities. We have never been particularly happy about that. In our view, the decentralization of authority in a group of islands isolated from each other in an enormous expanse of ocean reduces administrative efficiency. We have long made clear in this Council that we would have preferred it had the Micronesians decided to face the future as one united federation. But that is irrelevant. What we would have preferred does not matter, any more than it matters what the Soviet Union would have preferred. The question is whether the so-called fragmentation of Micronesia was carried out for the selfish ends of the United States or whether it reflects the wishes of the inhabitants.

If indeed the Americans had wanted to annex the Trust Territory, they would have been well advised to retain the virtually unlimited powers granted them under the Trusteeship Agreement. But, as is well known, political-status negotiations were opened as long ago as 1969 with a view to encouraging a greater measure of self-government on the part of Micronesians. In so acting, the United States was fulfilling the obligation in Article 76 (b) of the United Nations Charter concerning progressive development towards self-government.

But it very soon became clear that the unity of the Trust Territory was more apparent than real. Different parts of the Territory had their own sense of separate identity and their own ideas about constitutional advance. Add to that the many linguistic and cultural variants to which Micronesians wished to give political expression, and it is easy to understand why the notion of a single, unified entity was never likely to endure.

As the Permanent Representative of Vanuatu, speaking in the Council on behalf of all members of the South Pacific Forum, pointed out with regard to the peoples of Micronesia:

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

"Their diversity of history, culture and society is reflected in the different forms of political institutions they have chosen for themselves." (T/PV.1612, p. 6)

I repeat, "chosen for themselves." As is well known, in 1975 the Northern Marianas voted to become a Commonwealth of the United States upon termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. Three years later, in 1978, the Marshall Islands, Palau, Kosrae, Yap, Truk and Ponape voted on a proposed constitution for what would become the Federated States of Micronesia. Were those islands forced to knuckle under and accept what the United States had concocted for them? Well, if that was the American plan, it did not work: both the Marshall Islands and Palau rejected the constitution in plebiscites which were observed by the United Nations. The Marshalls adopted their own choice of constitution that same year. Palau did the same two years later, in 1980: a constitution for an island with a population of 13,000 souls, and a non-nuclear one at that. Where else in the world, apart from the dependent Territories administered by the United Kingdom, do you find a tiny island with 13,000 people and with its own constitution? And to think that the adoption of the Palau Constitution should have been allowed by the imperialist American super-Power with its supposed militaristic designs on the area!

And to think that the Soviet representative can bring himself, in these circumstances, to allege that the Americans have deprived the Micronesians of the right to determine their own political future. It shows how ideological and political prejudice can drive out unwelcome facts.

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

It must be obvious to even a casual observer that the so-called fragmentation of the Trust Territory, far from advancing some selfish American objective, has caused the United States only administrative inconvenience and complicated the ending of the Trusteeship Agreement. If the United States determination was to maintain its colonial grip on the Territory, as claimed by the Soviet Union, would it not have been simpler to govern the Territory through a plenipotentiary governor appointed by Washington with representatives in each of the islands? The fact is that the Administering Authority has gone to great lengths to encourage democratic freedoms in Micronesia, including the fullest political participation by the local people in the affairs of the Territory. The articulate and forthright way in which the Special Representatives of the four Territories have put across their views in this Chamber testifies to this and is a feature of Trusteeship Council sessions of which the Administering Authority can be proud.

Thus it is clear that it was the people of the Trust Territory themselves who chose, in freely conducted plebiscites observed by United Nations visiting missions, to divide the Trust Territory into four political entities; and that this was in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

The second hardy annual nurtured by the Soviet Union is the "militarization" theory. In some ways this is even odder than the notion of "fragmentation". The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is as big as the United States. Yet, as Mrs. McCoy told us last week, in the whole of Micronesia there are only 65 United States officers and men, plus a Coast Guard detachment. Most of those servicemen are members of Civic Action Teams, engaged on civil engineering projects of benefit to the local economy. We have nevertheless heard in this Chamber and read in letters from petitioners claims that the United States plans to create "military bases" in the Territory, especially in Palau. There has even been a suggestion

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

that Trident submarines will be stationed there. The idea is of course laughable: the shallow, reef-strewn waters render the territory unsuitable for large-scale naval deployments; and the islands themselves are much too small to accommodate the sort of strategic bases of which Soviet representatives talk.

What, then, are United States plans as far as military activity in the Territory is concerned? Ambassador Byrne has told us that they have none at present but that they do have defence and security responsibilities under the Compact. The islands of Micronesia have too often been the scene of bloody international conflict. It does not seem to us unreasonable that the Compact should embody an element of military contingency planning. Micronesian Governments themselves, concerned as they rightly must be about their post-trusteeship security, would surely require nothing less.

The quintessence of United States military involvement in the area is, of course, summed up in the phrase "strategic denial", to which a number of petitioners alluded last week with a degree of misgiving which I found surprising. What, after all, is meant by "strategic denial"? Is it not merely another term for a policy of keeping the area free, as it now is, from war, and protected from conflict elsewhere in the world? Is it not in the interests of the international community and the duty of Trusteeship Council members to ensure that as far as possible these islands are not allowed to become a battlefield again? The preamble to the Charter itself begins with the pledge:

"to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind".

Micronesians will appreciate the significance of that more readily than most. Those words might indeed even have been written with Micronesia in mind.

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

The third horseman in the Soviet Union's apocalypse is that the United States has exploited the islands and their inhabitants and failed to fulfil its obligations concerning economic and social development under the Trusteeship Agreement. Now, we are the first to agree that the economic situation in the Trust Territory leaves much to be desired. We have frequently said so and we say so again. The first priority of the Micronesian Governments in the immediate post-trusteeship period must be to develop the economic infrastructure of their states, particularly as far as communications are concerned, and to encourage inward investment into the Territory. Only in this way can Micronesia generate the capital needed to sustain real economic growth. We were delighted therefore to hear of recent successes in the development of the private sector.

To criticize economic under-development of the area is by no means the same thing as accusing the United States of pursuing a policy of exploitation. The fact is of course that Micronesia contains little in terms of natural resources to exploit, still less to deplete. Its population is tiny and spread over a vast area - hardly suitable material for dragooning into the service of United States monopoly capitalism, as the Soviet Union might like us to believe.

In reality the Territory is faced with all the traditional difficulties that island economies face, only magnified many times by the enormous distances between the islands. Gradual decentralization of administration of the Territory has not, in our view, helped in that it has encouraged unco-ordinated economic development planning - and proper co-ordination is the sine qua non of successful economic growth.

Nor can economic under-development be explained away by any lack of American financial assistance to the Territory. In fact vast sums have been pumped into the Territory over the years in order to make up for the Territory's many inherent

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

disadvantages. This flow of funds has reflected both the traditional generosity of the American people and, if I may say so, their fundamental dislike of their unaccustomed role as colonial-style administrators.

One must distinguish between economic under-development and economic deprivation. The fact is that the Trust Territory is not unprosperous: in comparison with many parts of the world, the people are well fed and adequately housed. They are by no means impecunious: people have money for leisure and the shops are full of goods, even if these are expensive. But this prosperity is artificial and would not be maintained without a substantial subsidy from the United States. In short, the United States can be faulted for a generosity that has created material dependence and even a dependent mentality; but it cannot be pilloried for parsimony and neglect.

The case of the Bikini islanders and the Kwajalein landowners seems to me to illustrate this "dependency" point very well; both were discussed at length the week before last. The case of the Bikini islanders is tragic; nothing will compensate them for the loss of their atoll. But the amounts paid to them hitherto - some \$150 million - when taken together with the monies to which they will be entitled under the Compact, surely go some considerable way to making redress. We are talking here about very large sums of money, even by Western industrialized standards, for a very small group of people. It is therefore with a certain sense of unreality that one sits in the Council and hears from their skilful and articulate legal counsel that, far from having enough, the islanders need more.

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

Incidentally, I do not suppose that such highly qualified legal representation comes cheaply.

Someone told me when I was less familiar with the politics of the Territory that every bachelor in the Marshalls wanted to marry a Bikini girl. I assumed this was because they were unusually good-looking. I am beginning to think now that there may be more material reasons.

I mentioned the Kwajalein landowners. Here, too, one is left reeling at the sums involved: \$68 million between 1963 and 1985 for the lease of one island; about \$7 million per annum since; \$14.7 million in development funds since 1982. The landowners' legal counsel also argued eloquently on their behalf for a better deal. But in answer to our questions we were told that none of this money was accounted for, and worked out at \$11,200 per annum per family, a figure ten times higher than the average income in the Trust Territory. As Mrs. McCoy put it with her usual understatement, there do indeed to be two sides to the Kwajalein story.

Some petitioners that have spoken focused on the need for greater self-sufficiency for the Trust Territory. I do not want to appear pessimistic, but I do not believe for a moment that Micronesia will ever or can ever be self-sufficient. It will always be to some extent dependent on the outside world for its well-being. This is nothing to lament: it is merely a fact of life. My own country, to name but one, has to import 50 per cent of the food it consumes. What is needed in the Territory is not more self-sufficiency, but a greater sense of self-reliance, the sense of responsibility that comes from coping with one's own problems. It seems to me that this sense of self-reliance can best be encouraged by bringing to an end the necessarily paternalistic relationship embodied in the Trusteeship Agreement and replacing it with something more akin to a partnership in which the territorial Governments exercise real control over their economic and political future.

(Mr. Maxey, United Kingdom)

Which brings me, in conclusion, to the central, unmistakable theme of this session: the call for termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. Once again this year we have heard the elected representatives of Micronesia speak of their unanimous wish for termination, indeed, of their view that Micronesians no longer believe that their interests can best be served by continuation of the trusteeship. We have heard this echoed in the Chamber by all the United Nations Member States from the Pacific region and by a non-governmental organization, the Pacific Islands Association - surely an organization with better credentials than most to speak about the needs of Pacific peoples - and we have heard it from the United States representatives themselves. It is time for the Council to respond to the overwhelming demand and, to use General Walters' words, to "recognize that the time has come to terminate the trusteeship" (T/PV.1609, p. 8). United Nations observed plebiscites in all parts of the Trust Territory have confirmed that the vast majority of Micronesians are of a similar mind.

We are therefore glad to be one of the sponsors of the draft resolution which was circulated yesterday and which I introduced this morning, believing that this reflects the wishes of the Micronesian peoples and is in their best interests.

We are conscious that we are on the threshold of a momentous event, not merely the termination of a Trusteeship Agreement, but the termination of the last of the trusteeships that have helped literally millions of people to make the transition from dependence to self-government or independence, as intended by the United Nations Charter. It is a process in which my country is pleased to have played a major part, and the members of the United Kingdom delegation feel particularly honoured and privileged to have participated in what we hope will be this Council's final act.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): We have just heard the last statements in the general debate of the Council.

(The President)

I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation as always listened carefully to the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom who spoke in the highly unenviable role of a lawyer to justify and defend the neo-colonialist policy of the Administering Authority. This is substantially different from the position that its Government and its predecessor took in 1948. If we are to speak about the essence of the statement made by the United Kingdom representative it was incapable of overturning the provisions of the statements of the Soviet delegation which, step by step and in a comprehensive way, studied the non-implementation by the Administering Authority of the obligations it undertook with regard to the Trust Territory. In connection with a comment made by the United Kingdom representative to the effect that it did not seem to matter how much money the Administering Authority had spent, I should like to say in response that there are things far more valuable than American dollars. What kind of freedom and independence is it? Now with regard to specific arguments put forward by the United Kingdom representative they could best be described in Shakespeare's words.

(spoke in English)

"His reasons are as two grains of wheat hid in two bushels of chaff: you shall seek all day ere you find them, and when you have them, they are not worth the search." (The Merchant of Venice, Act I, scene 1)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of the United Kingdom, who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom): I would just like to say briefly that we are well aware of the views of the Soviet delegation. They were set out before us this morning at some considerable length and I am surprised that our Soviet colleague felt it necessary to repeat any of them. But in case there is any doubt about it, I should like to make it very clear that I was speaking solely on behalf of my own delegation and Government.

I would just like to add that I always enjoy our Soviet colleague's quotations from Shakespeare. I wish I could match him, but I am not as much a master of Shakespearean plays as he obviously is.

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, 1985 (T/1878, T/L.1250) (continued)

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO OBSERVE THE PLEBISCITE IN PALAU, TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, FEBRUARY 1986 (T/1885, T/L.1251) (continued)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): To make good use of the time left to us this morning, I should like members, as I indicated this morning, now to take up the two draft resolutions we have had at our disposal for several days on the Visiting Mission reports we have been examining for some time. The draft resolutions are contained in documents T/L.1250 and T/L.1251, both issued on the same day.

With regard to the first draft resolution (T/L.1250), which concerns the report of the Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory, the representative of France has asked to speak, and I now call on him.

Mr. ROCHER (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation had the honour at the beginning of the Council's session to introduce the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands last July. The report is in document T/1878. I shall not speak on its contents.

The Council has to take a position on the draft resolution introduced in document T/L.1250, dated 22 May. Members of the Council will see that it is a traditional United Nations resolution and speaks for itself. It requires no lengthy comments, but I would emphasize the two main operative paragraphs reflecting the activities of the Mission within the mandate set by the Council.

Paragraph 1 takes note of the report of the Visiting Mission; paragraph 3 invites the Administering Authority to take into account the recommendations and conclusions of the Visiting Mission, as it has done whenever Missions have gone to the Territory.

My delegation trusts that this draft resolution will be unanimously supported in the Council and we would request a vote on it.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The representative of France has introduced draft resolution T/L.1250 on which he has requested a vote. The Council will now proceed to vote on draft resolution T/L.1250.

Draft resolution T/L.1250 was adopted by 3 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I now call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation voted against draft resolution T/L.1250, taking note of the report of the Visiting Mission of the Trusteeship Council to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in 1985, and also expressing its appreciation of the work accomplished by the Visiting Mission. The position of the Soviet delegation on this report was set forth in detail at an earlier meeting. In particular, the Soviet delegation noted that the United States, as the

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

Administering Authority, did not carry out its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and the Trust Agreement. It violated the mandate entrusted to it to administer the Territory and it acted in violation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

This is the objective situation which has not been duly reflected in the report. The report does not contain a really objective assessment of the situation in Micronesia. The Mission did not draw conclusions that would be directed towards a real change in the situation in Micronesia in the true interests of the Micronesian people.

The conclusions contained in the report of the Mission are designed basically to support the actions of the United States in respect of the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The Mission did not draw conclusions regarding the situation of full political and economic dependency of the people of the Territory on the United States.

The so-called plebiscite or referendum cannot be regarded here as the freely expressed will of the Micronesian people. The people of the Territory were, in fact, deprived of an actual opportunity to choose a truly independent path to development.

As the Soviet delegation noted earlier, the report of the Visiting Mission totally ignores military activities of the United States and its plans to militarize Micronesia by turning the Trust Territory into a military and strategic bridgehead. Those plans, if implemented, would lead to the establishment of a new hotbed of international tension and a threat to international peace and security.

Thus, the report of the Visiting Mission is basically intended to cover up the arbitrary, high-handed actions of the Administering Authority against the people of the Pacific Islands under cover of the flag of the United Nations. This is specifically why the Soviet delegation voted against draft resolution T/L.1250 on the report contained in document T/1878.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): If there is no objection, I would propose that the Council now take up the second draft resolution before us today (T/L.1251). The representative of the United Kingdom has asked to introduce it.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): It is my privilege to introduce the draft resolution contained in document T/L.1251. Fairly obviously, it requires little introduction. It is short - and I hope sweet. Its purpose is merely to take note of the report of the Visiting Mission that we have discussed earlier in this session and to express the Council's appreciation for the work accomplished by the Mission on behalf of the United Nations. I see no reason why this draft resolution cannot be adopted by consensus. If, however, that proves impossible, I suggest we move immediately to a vote.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I shall now put to a vote draft resolution T/L.1251 on the Visiting Mission to Palau.

Draft resolution T/L.1251 was adopted by 3 votes to 1.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Does any delegation wish to speak on this resolution?

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation would be prepared to speak at a later meeting on this subject. However, if you insist, Mr. President, and would like us to speak now, we are prepared to do so.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I would like the representative of the Soviet Union to speak now. We have discussed the draft resolutions at some length, so I think we can extend the meeting for a few moments to enable him to make his statement.

Mr. KUTOVOY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation voted against draft resolution T/L.1251, which takes note of the report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to observe the so-called plebiscite in Palau, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, that took place in February 1986. The report also expresses its appreciation of the work accomplished by the Visiting Mission.

The fundamental position of the Soviet delegation in this regard is clear and precise. The discussion of the report of the Visiting Mission in the Council and the material presented by the petitioners have convincingly demonstrated that the Mission was politically directed in order to hide the illegal actions of the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory and to help it turn Palau into a nuclear springboard for the United States and to circumvent Palau's Constitution.

The plebiscites and referendums in Palau referred to in the report were a cover for the anti-Charter illegal actions of Washington in the strategic United Nations Trust Territory of Micronesia. In the so-called plebiscite in Palau in February 1986 the populations of the islands did not have the opportunity freely to choose their political status. As was pointed out by the Soviet delegation earlier, the so-called educational work done among the Palauan population boiled down to an effort to convince the people to vote to approve a neo-colonialist agreement with the United States which would deprive the people of Palau of the right to independence and turn Palau into a component part of the military strategic springboard in that area.

The Soviet delegation assumes that the so-called Compact of Commonwealth and Free Association, signed by that people is a flagrant violation of rules and principles and an abuse of the Administering Authority's power. It cannot be

(Mr. Kutovoy, USSR)

acknowledged as effective and legal; and they certainly cannot be viewed as some kind of free expression of the will of the people or of its self-determination. The plebiscites and referendums were organized to approve a neo-colonialist agreement.

The conclusions contained in the report of the Visiting Mission to Palau pursue clear goals to which the Soviet delegation has already referred. That is precisely why the Soviet delegation voted against approval of the report of the Visiting Mission in document T/1885.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Since there are no further comments, I shall consider that the Council has concluded its consideration of agenda items 6 and 7.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.