



UNITED NATIONS TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL



LIBRARY

JUN 5 1983

Distr.
GENERAL

T/PV.1555
6 June 1983

ENGLISH

Fiftieth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 26 May 1983, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. MARGETSON (United Kingdom)

Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended 30 September 1982: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (continued)

Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda (continued)

Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, 1982 (continued)

Report of the United Nations Visiting Mission to observe the Plebiscite in Palau, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, February 1983 (continued)

Dissemination of information on the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System in Trust Territories: report of the Secretary-General

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 A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza.

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 11 a.m.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1982: TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/1853; T/L.1235 and Add.1) (continued)

EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS LISTED IN THE ANNEX TO THE AGENDA (see T/1852/Add.1) (continued)

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, 1982 (T/1850) (continued)

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS VISITING MISSION TO OBSERVE THE PLEBISCITE IN PALAU, TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS, FEBRUARY 1983 (T/1851) (continued)

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has familiarized itself with the report of the Administering Authority on the situation in the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Micronesia, and with the policy conducted by the United States toward that Territory. We have also listened attentively to the statements of the delegation of the United States and to those of the petitioners. The contents of the report, the various statements, and the information furnished by visiting missions of the Trusteeship Council, as well as other numerous types of data on the state of affairs in Micronesia, which are well known from the press, speak to the fact that the United States is continuing its illegal actions in violation of the Charter regarding the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Micronesia.

These actions of the United States of America as Administering Authority of the Pacific Islands, appointed by the Security Council in 1947, have been undertaken under cover of the Trusteeship Agreement in a continuing effort to fragment the Trust Territory even further, to perpetuate American domination over that entity, and transform it into a colonial appendage and a military-strategic beachhead of the United States in the western Pacific.

It should be recalled that, in accordance with Article 83 of the United Nations Charter,

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

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

"The primary objectives [of trusteeship] set forth in Article 76 shall be applicable to the people of each strategic area" -

[inter alia, the Pacific Islands].

Therefore, the Security Council - which, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, bears major responsibility for ensuring peace and security, and which is endowed with the exclusive right to implement all United Nations functions towards the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands - and the United Nations as a whole cannot stand idly by in the face of crude violations by the Administering Authority, the United States, of the Trusteeship Agreement pertaining to the Pacific Islands, and of the major goal of the trusteeship system which the United States has undertaken to promote, pursuant to Article 76 of the Charter and other United Nations resolutions.

At the present time, the United States is trying to complete and carry out its fragmentation and annexation of the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the rubric of neo-colonial formulas such as co-operation and free association. The United States is planning to present the United Nations with a fait accompli and is trying in every way possible to induce the United Nations to legalize its annexationist plans.

These expansionist actions of the United States aimed at removing Micronesia from international jurisdiction and at imposing its own undivided dominion over that Territory are being undertaken in violation of the United Nations Charter, the Trusteeship Agreement, and the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Moreover, United States plans to transform that Territory into a military-strategic beachhead in the western Pacific pose a serious threat to the security of peoples, not only in Micronesia but also in the countries of Asia and Oceania, and can lead to the creation of a new hotbed of tension in the world.

The one-sided actions of the United States towards Micronesia cannot be called legal and cannot have legal force. In accordance with the United Nations Charter, any change in its status as a strategic Trust Territory must be carried out solely by decision of the Security Council. The fate of the people of Micronesia is an integral part of the problem of decolonization and it is the duty of the United Nations not to allow any legalization of the United States de facto annexation of Micronesia. In accordance with the numerous resolutions of the General Assembly,

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

the United Nations must continue to bear responsibility for that Territory until it achieves genuine freedom and independence.

The Soviet delegation to the United Nations has repeatedly informed the Secretary-General and various United Nations bodies of its position in this regard. It has also drawn attention to the illegal actions in violation of the Charter perpetrated by the United States Administering Authority against the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and has insisted on the immediate cessation of such actions.

In connection with the Decolonization Committee's discussion of the question of Micronesia in 1982, as well as in the Fourth Committee during the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, the delegation of the USSR brought to the attention of members of the Committee the abnormal situation existing in the Territory. On 10 August 1982 the United Nations Decolonization Committee adopted conclusions and recommendations on Micronesia, which were submitted to the United States representative to the United Nations, to the attention of her Government and to the Presidents of the Security Council and Trusteeship Council.

Those conclusions and recommendations stressed the importance of ensuring that the people of Micronesia fully and freely implements its inalienable rights and that the Administering Authority duly carries out its obligations. It was also noted that the Declaration on decolonization is fully applicable to the Trust Territory.

Those conclusions and recommendations once again reaffirmed the Administering Authority's obligation to create conditions that would permit the people of the Trust Territory, freely and unfettered, to implement its inalienable right to self-determination and independence.

The situation existing today, as has been demonstrated by discussion in the Trusteeship Council, obliges us once again to bring this matter to the attention of the Trusteeship Council, the Security Council and other United Nations bodies which have responsibility for the situation in the Trust Territory, and to note that, as a result of the 37-year-long administration by the United States of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, that Territory, which in the past was united, has been fragmented by the Administering Authority into four separately-administered entities with a definite political goal - to weaken the resistance of the people of Micronesia through the neo-colonialist and annexationist policy of the Administering Power. As is well known, the United Nations General Assembly, in its Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, declared that

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

"Any attempt aimed at partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations." (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), para. 6)

The first victim of the United States policy of divide and conquer was part of the Trust Territory, the Mariana Islands, to which the United States in 1975 gave the status of a so-called community within the framework of a political union with the United States. In so doing, it transformed that part of the Trust Territory into an American possession. As has been recognized in the United States itself, the Northern Marianas became the first territory which the United States has swallowed up since 1914.

In assessing these actions of the American Administration, the American newspaper the Washington Post was obliged to recognize that this was an openly expansionist fact.

Taking advantage of the total dependence of the islanders, who, under American trusteeship, had lost all possibilities for self-sufficiency, the United States exerted pressure on the Micronesians and intimidated them through a propagandistic use of the communist threat and through attempts to impose economic assistance.

At the present time, similar measures of fragmentation have been undertaken by the United States regarding two other archipelagos of the Trust Territory - the Carolinas and the Marshall Islands, imposing on them the status of that notorious free association with the United States, which for practical purposes is tantamount to their annexation by the United States. Moreover, a propaganda campaign has been waged to cover up the policy of open expansionism in the Pacific and to make it appear as a manifestation of the will of the Micronesians and as an act of self-determination on their part.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

The last example of the shameless manoeuvres on the part of Washington is the Palau Plebiscite, which was carried out on 10 February of this year. The inhabitants of Palau, as we all know, were supposed, first of all, to come out for or against the imposition by Washington of a new colonial status which is under the label of free association with the United States. Moreover, in the course of the campaign it was made clear that a vote against association with the United States meant a cessation of American economic assistance - that very assistance which, holding back the development of the economy of Palau, has put that Trust Territory in a position of full dependence on its overseas Trustee.

As another example of crude pressure by the Administering Authority on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, we could cite as an example the banned referendum in the Marshall Islands. Making use of its right as the administering Power, Washington, in negotiations headed by the Personal Representative of the United States President, Ambassador Zeder, cancelled the referendum planned for 17 August on the question of the future status of the Marshall Islands.

As Members of the Council will recall, at the last session of its Trusteeship Council the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Marshall Islands, Anton A. DeBrum, declared that a referendum would be held in the Marshall Islands and he gave the dates for its implementation. It was even announced that that part of Micronesia was acquiring independent political status and that, within that status, it would enter into free association with the United States. Moreover, it was understood that the Marshall Islands would preserve their independence in matters of foreign and domestic policy, but the United States was given the right for 50 years to ensure its security in the military sphere. In the Plebiscite, which was cancelled by the United States, the local authorities of the Marshall Islands, in submitting for approval the Compact of Free Association, kept as an alternative for the population the option of full independence.

The United States was clearly not satisfied by such manifestations of freedom on the part of the Trust Territory because of the Pentagon's questionable use of Kwajalein, one of the major atolls of the Marshall Islands. "The traditional leaders and other inhabitants of those islands are not in agreement with the provisions of a treaty which for 50 years to come gives the United States the right to use a missile range on Kwajalein", according to the Sydney Morning Herald.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

The Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Marshall Islands, Anton A. DeBruin - who last year, as in previous years, was a member of the United States delegation to the Trusteeship Council - on the last day of the work of the Council, having come back from negotiations in Washington, frankly stated in the Council: "It turns out that we can choose only between forms of colonial power and nothing more than that."

Apparently the Administering Authority was no longer able to reconcile itself to public statements by the Special Advisor of its delegation and, as we see, did not invite him to attend further sessions of the Council.

The story of that referendum on the Marshall Islands is not the sole example of such crude manifestations of arbitrary will by the Administering Authority regarding Micronesia: three times now the date has been postponed for that recently conducted referendum in Palau; three times the United States has annulled the results of the Plebiscite on the Constitution of Palau, because it forbade any United States operations with nuclear weapons on those islands.

In linking the fate of the people of the Trust Territory of Micronesia with strategic plans of the Pentagon, the United States is ignoring its international obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement, the United Nations Charter and the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. This neo-colonialist policy and practice has aroused indignation and protests not only among the indigenous population of the Trust Territory but also within the international community.

It is now becoming clearer than ever that in pursuing an annexationist policy towards the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the United States is trying to preserve and strengthen its sole domination over enormous regions of the Pacific Ocean and to expand its military and strategic positions in that part of the globe.

That was clearly stated by the Special Representative of the United States President at the talks on the future political status of Micronesia, Mr. Zeder, on 10 December 1982, at the hearings in the United States Congressional Sub-Committee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs and in the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee. In his words, the primary goal of the United States in Micronesia is to ensure American strategic interests in that area.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

In answering the question of the American senator as to how the United States Defense Department assesses the military and defense links which the United States will have in Micronesia after the establishment of free association between those parts of the Trust Territory and the United States, Mr. Zeder answered clearly and frankly:

"We are working in very close contact with the United States Department of Defense. Inter alia, half of my delegation is from the Defense Department. I believe that the Defense Department is in full agreement with the provisions of the Compact and that the Defense Department co-operated with us very well while working on it - and not only while we were working on it, but also during the talks."

And further he said:

"One of the major aspects in this entire exercise is our defense position in the Pacific Ocean. And here I think the Department of Defense is very satisfied with those provisions which are written into the Compact."

Thus the major goal of the United States Administration is by no means the national interests of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. This goal is to achieve for the United States the right to deploy its land and sea nuclear forces, bacteriological weapons, and other harmful materials in the Trust Territory. The Constitution of Palau, which was accepted two years ago, forbids the use of the territory of the island and the waters surrounding it for these purposes. Once again, Washington has resorted to deceptive manoeuvres.

In the petition submitted to the Council by Mr. Clark, a professor of law, there has been a very clear juridical unmasking of those devices to which the Administering Authority resorted. In the course of the Plebiscite an attempt was undertaken to obtain the agreement of the inhabitants of Palau to a review of the provisions of the Palau Constitution which were unsatisfactory to Washington. However, those attempts on the part of the Administering Authority were in vain. An organizer of the Plebiscite - the Administering Authority - did not manage in the referendum to receive 75 per cent of the votes, the majority required to change the provisions of the Palau Constitution forbidding the establishment of American military bases on the islands, the deployment there of nuclear and other types of weapons, and the basing of American nuclear warships in the surrounding waters.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

The results of the Plebiscite in Palau, which ran directly counter to the military-strategic plans of the United States in Micronesia, give rise to clear irritation on the part of the Administering Authority, which frankly considers the United States Trust Territory of Micronesia as its military-strategic beachhead in the western Pacific. This was frankly stated by a former United States Ambassador to Fiji, who said that the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Pacific Ocean on the basis of strategic considerations is totally unacceptable to the United States.

Therefore, from the point of view of the United States, the results of the Palau Plebiscite were unsuccessful, although Washington spared no money on a propaganda campaign among the population. Now the United States is undertaking measures designed to sidestep those unsatisfactory results of the Palau Plebiscite to facilitate the process of absorbing the Trust Territory, but in so doing to create an appearance of legality in the course of these clearly illegal actions. The United States is thus trying to demonstrate that the Palau authorities must take on themselves the problem of how to reconcile the irreconcilable: the provisions of the Constitution of Palau, which forbid American nuclear and other forms of weapons on the island, and the provisions of the Compact of Free Association which would allow the Americans to deploy such weapons and to maintain their bases there.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

According to an article appearing in the 4 March 1983 edition of the Canadian daily Globe and Mail under the by-line of Richard Swift, writing from Vanuatu, the military thinking of the United States has attached new strategic importance to the Pacific area since the departure of American troops from Indochina. He quotes the report of the Military Academy of the United States Army, which states that in the case of a war in Eastern Asia "the sole possible base doubtless would be in Micronesia, and bases on the island as distinguished from bases in Southeast Asia would remain under continuous control of the United States".

In the assessment of the Pacific Conference of Churches, at any given moment 10,000 nuclear warheads are located or deployed at the island bases, on submarines or on warships in the Pacific. It was predicted at that Conference that in 1985 at least 13 Trident-type submarines - considered first-strike nuclear weapons - would be deployed in the Pacific Ocean.

Even these few facts which I have cited demonstrate that the world community is particularly aroused by the fact that instead of strengthening international peace and security in that part of the Pacific, the United States of America is actively carrying out actions that represent a serious threat to the security of both the Trust Territory itself and the adjacent countries of Asia and Oceania. Indeed, such actions on the part of the United States may lead to the creation of a new dangerous hotbed of tensions in that area.

None of this can promote a strengthening of international peace and security as is required by the United Nations Charter, in particular by Article 76, the Trusteeship Agreement, and other United Nations documents.

The whole world is well aware of the broad use by the United States of America of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands as a testing ground for American atomic and hydrogen weapons. Indeed, that Territory has experienced explosions of more than 100 different types of these monstrous weapons. These tests have had pernicious effects, not only on the health of the indigenous population but also on the atmosphere in a wide area of the Territory and in the waters of the Pacific.

The pernicious consequences of nuclear weapons tests are broadly recognized by the American press and by petitioners in the Trusteeship Council. However, the American Administering Authority has not undertaken active and urgent measures to eliminate these consequences, to ensure medical assistance to victims from Bikini and Enewetok Atolls or to determine the amount of existing radiation in that area.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

All of this testifies to a crude trampling underfoot by the United States of America of the elementary rights and freedoms of the population of the Trust Territory. The Security Council, the Trusteeship Council, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights and other United Nations bodies should give particular attention to that difficult situation now being endured by the victims of American nuclear tests in the Trust Territory. Therefore, for many of the inhabitants of those Pacific Islands the nuclear danger is inextricably linked to colonialism.

The question of the nuclear danger will be the major subject of the conference to be held in June of this year in Vila, the capital of Vanuatu, at which there will be more than 100 representatives from the Pacific islands. That meeting on the banning of nuclear weapons will be the fifth in a series held by the coalition of churches, trade unions, political officials, teachers and people who work in the development area.

Ignoring the legitimate rights, interests and will of the people of the Trust Territory, the United States is preventing the population of the Trust Territory from implementing its inalienable right not only to self-determination and independence as enshrined in the United Nations Charter, but also to economic and social progress. From year to year, the Trusteeship Council receives information to the effect that the economic and social situation of the indigenous population of Micronesia is in a catastrophic state. There is no viable economy on the Trust Territory islands. The dependence of the Territory on external - above all, American - financing is not decreasing but increasing. The low level of living conditions of the indigenous population of the islands and the extraordinarily high unemployment rate make for a reign of poverty and hunger in the Trust Territory. Medical services are in a pitiful state and there has been a widespread increase in illness and in outbreaks of epidemics. After the 37-year-long administration by the United States, the population of the Trust Territory, for practical purposes, is less self-sufficient than it was in the early years of the Trusteeship.

All this is most eloquently attested to by eye-witnesses, by the petitioners from the Territory, and by other evidence, such as documents of the United Nations Committee on Decolonization and of the Trusteeship Council.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

How many just accusations of the Administering Authority have thus been made in previous years in the Trusteeship Council by petitioners from Micronesia and from other countries; by Special Representatives of the Territory who have been part of the United States delegation as Special Advisers; and in the reports of the periodic visiting missions to the Territory? The facts are too numerous for the Soviet delegation to cite here. Hence we shall limit ourselves to only a few of them.

Members of the Congress of Micronesia who have appeared before the Trusteeship Council in the past have charged that the Administering Authority considers the development of the Territory not as part of its duty to ensure the economic independence of Micronesia, but as a means of exerting pressure in order to conclude a favourable agreement on that Territory's future political status. Senator Olter, Special Adviser to the United States delegation, speaking at one of the sessions of the Trusteeship Council dealing with Micronesian development programmes declared that any programme that would allow dissemination of the necessary information to promote the creation of a material infrastructure in Micronesia would make a positive contribution to the welfare of the islands' inhabitants, but that programmes promoting solely the expansion of consumption would doubtless have a negative effect on general development. The Micronesians need assistance in production and not in consumption.

One can hardly make a more forthright statement about American assistance to Micronesia. And similar statements have already been made by Special Representatives of the United States to the Trusteeship Council, the President of the Federated States of Micronesia, Mr. Nakayama; the Governor of the Marianas, Mr. Camacho; and by Mr. Nakamura, Mr. Takasy, Mr. Tenorio and other representatives. Trusteeship Council visiting missions to the Trust Territory have also periodically and unambiguously criticized the policies and practices of the Administering Authority in the economic and social spheres.

It will also be recalled that the representative of France to the Trusteeship Council has stressed the need for the economic development of Micronesia. In his view, the Trusteeship Council should direct its efforts not solely at guaranteeing full implementation of the political rights of Micronesia,

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

but also at ensuring that the Administering Authority grant the Territory the economic and social means necessary for its development, and in so doing make it possible to eliminate excessive economic dependence on the United States in the future. I refer here to document S/12971, paragraph 213.

At the same session, the representative of France noted that the Trust Territory was excessively dependent on subsidies from the Administering Authority, and was concerned over the dependence of the Trust Territory on external deliveries of milk, meat, fruits, and even of tinned fish.

The delegation of the Soviet Union, for its part, emphasized that in the course of submission to the Council of development plans prepared in 1976 by the Congress of Micronesia with the assistance of the United Nations Development Fund (UNDP), it became even more obvious that the economy of Micronesia still remained at a total standstill and that practically no attention was being devoted to exploitation of its resources. The total lack of economic development and the standstill in the economy were attested to by photographs shown to the Council by petitioners. Even those industrial sites which at some point were being developed in the Territory had been abandoned and forgotten by the present leaders.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

Regarding living conditions on the Marshall Islands, the Washington Post wrote the following on 3 September 1982:

"The approximately 2,000 Americans who work at the missile-testing range live with their families on Kwajalein, the largest island in that atoll, which has modern service facilities, laboratories, a hotel, a commercial airport, a golf course, and all kinds of recreational facilities. Two miles away, across the bay, 7,000 Marshall Island inhabitants live on Ebeye, a 65-acre island on which there are no paved streets - just a garbage dump and dirty water."

In commenting on these reports at the request of the Chairman of the Senate Sub-Committee, Ambassador Zeder said:

"There are not 7,000 but 8,000 persons living on the island of Ebeye, which covers 65 acres, and the island is a horrible dump. Only 10 per cent of the population of Ebeye work at the missile range and receive a salary considerably higher than the average wage in Micronesia. We are wondering what it should do about this in the years to come."

Ambassador Zeder went on to say:

"I took my first trip to Ebeye in 1975 when I was director of the Territory under the Ford Administration. When I once again visited it recently there was apparently no significant progress. The situation on Ebeye is revolting" - Mr. Zeder concluded in answer to that question.

American journalists who rarely visit the islands of the Trust Territory nevertheless write a great deal about the fact that these three and a half decades of Trusteeship over Micronesia not only have failed to create a modern economic base but have, in fact, been totally destructive of the economic and social infrastructure which existed there earlier. The local population is not even able to feed itself now. "We only exist on handouts from the Americans", bitterly complained the Micronesians.

In answer to a Senator's question regarding the prospects for development of a self-sufficient economy in Micronesia, Ambassador Zeder stated frankly:

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

"Unfortunately, their interest in agriculture has fully disappeared. Incidentally, until the time of World War II, it was often said that Micronesia was the bread-basket of Japan. They had great harvests and a well-developed vegetable production. But under United States Trusteeship the people apparently preferred to buy food products in stores - products which are brought in from California, New Zealand and Australia. Therefore, they have lost the desire to work in agriculture."

According to Ambassador Zeder, Micronesia once had a well-developed billion-dollar-a-year industry, in terms of today's prices. On Palau there was exploitation of bauxite. But all this has died out in the last 35 years.

Based on an analysis of the economic and social situation in Micronesia, the delegation of the USSR has often stated that the Territory's lack of a developed economy and its continued backwardness are the result not only of the Administering Authority's failure to honour its direct obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement, but also of a definite social policy aimed at a special kind of "preparation" of the Trust Territory of Micronesia by the United States to force it to request association with the United States. Incidentally, this has been mentioned in the American press.

The Administering Authority is now trying to present the matter to the Trusteeship Council as if the United States were going to allocate much more money to all parts of the Trust Territory after they sign the Compact - as if the United States were going to render far greater assistance to Palau, the Marshall Islands, and the Federal States of Micronesia after they become self-governing nations associated with the United States.

Micronesian leaders, traditional chiefs, petitioners, and members of the Trusteeship Council would have become more familiar with the arithmetic of the Administering Authority if they had studied the report submitted by Ambassador Zeder to the hearings - namely, the financial report on the Compact, with a very detailed explanation as to what was going where, under the heading "Compact of Free Association - Assistance by the United States to Palau, the Marshall Islands, and the Federal States of Micronesia".

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

The United States is using its Security Council Trusteeship Mandate over the strategic territory of the Pacific Islands as a smokescreen for its virtual swallowing up of the Trust Territory, despite the legitimate rights and interests of the Trust Territory peoples. In so doing, it is crudely violating the United Nations Charter, the Trusteeship Agreement, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which should be fully and immediately implemented in all colonial Territories - inter alia, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The delegation of the Soviet Union believes that the plebiscite in Palau on the Compact of Free Association was imposed on the Micronesian people but that, even under the difficult conditions of the plebiscite, the Micronesian people demonstrated courage and actively expressed their protest against the United States use of their Territory for military purposes, against its transformation into an American testing range, and against a role for Micronesia in American militarist plans.

The Compact of Free Association is designed fully and totally to absorb the Trust Territory and to deprive it of the future possibility of requesting assistance from the international community. It is precisely for this reason that the Compact, far from being a step forward in the development of the Trust Territory towards freedom and independence, represents a step backwards, in so far as the Micronesians will have nowhere to seek protection from the other powerful members of the Association, and in so far as the Compact states nothing to the effect that its younger and, in all respects, weaker members have the right regularly to appeal to the Trusteeship Council and to the United Nations as a whole for assistance in solving disputes in conflict situations.

The delegation of the USSR understands that the people of Micronesia have been in a complex situation as an unequal partner in talks with the United States, which continues to exert pressure in all areas. The Compact prepared for the Micronesians by the United States Administration and the Pentagon is designed to deprive the Micronesian people of the practical possibility of eventually obtaining independence and national sovereignty, to reduce that long-suffering, courageous and freedom-loving people which has suffered for many centuries under the colonial yoke to the permanent status of dependent nationhood.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

The Soviet delegation considers this situation inadmissible. Does the people of Micronesia have any less a right to freedom, national independence and sovereignty than other small peoples of the world - any less a right, for example, than the people of Fiji or Nauru or anybody else?

During the last 20 years, a great number of States in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania, large and small, have acquired independence and national sovereignty and have received the opportunity to decide on their own ways of life. Those States have become full-fledged Members of the United Nations. Does the people of Micronesia have any less a right to national independence and to the creation of its own State?

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

Total independence without any kind of conditions or reservations on the part of the administering Power is the only way of guaranteeing the national rights of the Micronesian people. There is no doubt that the division of the Territory into several parts by the trusteeship Power makes even more complex the already complex struggle of the Micronesian people for independence, self-sufficiency and social progress.

The Soviet delegation understands and reacts with sympathy to the immense suffering inflicted on the Micronesian people by American nuclear tests. We condemn these crude violations by the Administering Authority of the fundamental rights and freedoms of the Micronesian people, which is trying to live in peace and struggling doggedly against the deployment on its Territory and its waters of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and harmful materials, which has been imposed on it.

It is well known that the Soviet Union supports the efforts of peoples to establish nuclear-free zones. We favour the conclusion of an international agreement banning the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present and the further build-up of such weapons in those countries where they are already deployed. We also support the demand of the Micronesians that the dumping of nuclear wastes in waters adjacent to Micronesia cease immediately.

The delegation of the USSR draws attention to the fact that in trying to secure further special privileges for itself in the Pacific Ocean the United States is trying to strengthen its illegal claim to the Trust Territory of Micronesia and consequently to the waters around it. Furthermore monopolies and American corporations have had their eye on this Territory for quite some time now.

In their Political Declaration adopted in Prague on 5 January 1983, the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty state, inter alia:

"An essential factor for economic stability and the improvement of the international political climate is the elimination of underdevelopment - the gradual bridging of the gap between levels of economic development and the ensuring of conditions for the harmonious growth of international contacts

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

in the sphere of economics, science and technology. In this connection the participants in the session reaffirm their stand favouring the restructuring of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis, the establishment of a new international economic order, and the safeguarding of the full sovereignty of the countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania" -- I stress "Oceania" -- "over their natural resources." (A/38/67, p.12)

Of course, in the final analysis it is not these unequal conditions imposed by the United States on the Trust Territory of Micronesia under the Compact of Free Association that will define the future destiny of the Micronesian people. That destiny will be defined by the struggle which will inevitably lead the people of Micronesia to independence, just as the struggle of other colonial, dependent peoples of the world led them to full independence. For in our era even small peoples not only struggle for but achieve their independence. No matter how stubbornly the colonial Powers resist, in the end they are forced to yield to those fighting for independence.

The actions of the United States in Micronesia, the purpose of which is the annexation of that Territory, have been condemned by the world community. The Inter-Parliamentary Union, the world parliamentary organization, at its session in Oslo in April 1981, condemned the actions of the United States in the Trust Territory as:

"aimed at the fragmentation and militarization of the Territory and at transforming it into a colonial appendage, all of which constitutes a crude violation of the United Nations Charter".

The policy of the United States vis-a-vis Micronesia represents a violation of the international obligations which the United States has taken upon itself. We cannot accept the attempts by the United States to face the United Nations with a fait accompli by completely absorbing the Trust Territory of Micronesia and transforming it, under the banner of so-called co-operation and free association, into a new colonial possession.

The delegation of the Soviet Union looks with sympathy on the struggle of the peoples of Micronesia to ensure progress towards development of their Territory, self-determination and independence. The Soviet Union is convinced of the need for the peoples of Micronesia, like the peoples of other colonial territories, to exercise as soon as possible their inalienable right to genuine self-determination and independence.

In conclusion, we wish to reaffirm once again the unswerving position of the Soviet Union in support of the Charter of the United Nations and its application to the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. In particular, we reaffirm our full support for Article 83 of the Charter, which states that changes in the status of strategic Trust Territories may be made only on the decision of the Security Council. Consequently, changes in the status of that Territory cannot be undertaken unilaterally by the Administering Authority.

The PRESIDENT: In the general debate we have now heard speeches by the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. It remains in this debate to hear the closing statements, first of all, of the Micronesian members of the United States team and then of the High Commissioner, Mrs. McCoy, and the United States representative, Ambassador Sherman. When does the United States representative expect the Micronesian members of his team to be ready to deliver their closing statements?

Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America): We have been in contact with most of the members of the team, and it is my understanding that they will not be able to be back in New York and prepared to speak before tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDENT: I must confess that is a disappointment to me, because I wanted to press ahead with the general debate. In the light of that, however, it would seem inevitable, that we leave until tomorrow morning the speeches of the four Micronesian members and the speeches of Mrs. McCoy and Mr. Sherman.

As we cannot make any progress on that particular item, I would like to move to items 8 and 9 of the agenda, which the Council will recollect I said last night that we would consider today. With the Council's agreement, I shall take item 9 first, as Mr. Masha, the representative of the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat is on the platform.

DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE INTERNATIONAL TRUSTEESHIP SYSTEM IN TRUST TERRITORIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL RESOLUTION 36 (III) AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 754 (VIII)) (T/1854)

The PRESIDENT: First I wish to call on Mr. Masha, representative of the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat, who will make a statement briefly outlining the activities of our Organization in dissemination of information on the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. MASHA (Department of Public Information): It is an honour and a pleasure for me to appear before the Trusteeship Council again this year to introduce the annual report of the Secretary-General on the dissemination of information in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the report contained in document T/1854. As in past years, the report before you is in the form of a summary on the measures undertaken by the Department of Public Information (DPI) to maintain an adequate flow of information in the Trust Territory and to create a better awareness among the people of the Territory concerning the United Nations and the International Trusteeship System.

The Department of Public Information has over the years developed a system of information on the Trust Territory which today is characterized by a three-pronged approach: first, the Information Centre in Tokyo which remains the most valuable tool for ascertaining the local needs, identifying the priorities and recommending policy options. Once again last year, the islands were visited by the Director of the Information Centre in Tokyo, as well as by the Information Officer there. The outcome of those missions is outlined in the report before the Council. The Centre is also continuing to mail to the Territory pamphlets, booklets, posters and relevant public information materials. Let me mention here that, in response to requests from the Governments in the Territory, particular emphasis has been placed on sending material relating to development issues. The publications of the United Nations and the specialized agencies are listed as an annex to the report before the Council.

(Mr. Masha, Department of Public
Information)

The second approach to disseminating information in the Trust Territory is that of United Nations Headquarters. Based on recommendations from the United Nations Information Centre in Tokyo regarding the needs of the Territory, the Department of Public Information dispatches press releases, weekly news summaries and the tapes of radio programmes directly to the Trust Territory. Relevant publications on decolonization are also distributed to the Territory. During their missions to the Territory, the staff of the Information Centre in Tokyo have ascertained that the United Nations radio programmes are regularly broadcasted throughout the Territory. DPI headquarters also maintains and constantly updates its mailing list of recipients of United Nations information material in the Territory.

The third approach of disseminating information in the Territory is that of the Information Centre in Washington. It keeps the non-governmental organizations and the media abreast of the developments in the Council by providing them with the documents and information materials. In addition, the Centre welcomes visitors from the Territory, briefing them on the work of the Organization and its activities in the Trust Territory.

DPI will continue to play its role as mandated by the General Assembly of providing information to the people in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands on the principles and objectives of the International Trusteeship System. In this regard, we will continue to count on the co-operation of the Administering Authority.

I wish to conclude by expressing our appreciation for the co-operation which we have received from the secretariat of the Council.

The PRESIDENT: Are there any comments either on the report of the Secretary-General, which members have in front of them, or on the very interesting statement made by Mr. Masha?

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I shall broach this point with the dissemination of information in the Territories in mind. Before I do so, allow me first to say that my delegation listened with keen interest to the statement delivered in the general debate by Ambassador Oleandrov who heads the delegation of the Soviet Union in this Council. We noted with pleasure that this lengthy statement, pertinent in many regards did not contain the slightest bit of criticism of the Visiting Missions that went to the Territory. I should like to make a point of emphasizing that.

To move on to the items before us, I should like to draw the attention of the Secretary of the Trusteeship Council, on the one hand, and of the Department of Public Information (DPI), on the other, to paragraphs 628, 629 and 630 of document T/1850. The fact is, the Visiting Mission that spent five weeks in the Trust Territory noted, not without regret, that no one among those people who attended our public meetings was apprised of the contents of the various reports we are issuing. We were compelled at certain times to give public readings of pertinent paragraphs of the report, notably with regard to problems of daily life that directly affect the people involved. I am thinking particularly of war damages and other such things. I therefore believe that we told the secretariat of the Trusteeship Council that it would be highly desirable for the Tokyo Centre not to function in a vacuum but to work very closely with the secretariat of the Trusteeship Council. For several weeks, we compiled lists of the names of people who wish to have reports of the Visiting Mission or certain Trusteeship Council documents. Have the Secretariat and DPI been able to update the list of the people who receive documents of the Council?

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Masha.

Mr. MASHA (Department of Public Information): I have made a note of the paragraphs which the representative of France has referred to in the report of the Visiting Mission and, as you will notice, in document T/1854 we have listed in the annex the kind of publications which we mailed or sent to the Territories. The documents of the Trusteeship Council are indeed not listed there. I was informed by my office earlier that these are not public information materials. Our role is to deal with the public information materials. None the less the few documents

(Mr. Masha, Department of Public
Information)

which are available to our Information Centre in Washington are made available to them. I will need some time to look into who actually is responsible for distributing these documents and to see how they are actually distributed, but I have to acknowledge that it is very obvious, even from the report which we have submitted, that we do not distribute the documents of the Trusteeship Council to them, at least not in DPI. I will need some time to look into this problem and identify where the responsibility lies. This may be something that we may have to clear up internally within the Secretariat. Some of the documents which are available in our information centres as reference documents are also available. The members will remember that in the report there is a reference to one of the colleges in the area being a repository of some of this information. I assume that, as a repository of our United Nations information material, they would be receiving the documents there but these documents would not be distributed as public information documents for the kind of audiences with which the Visiting Mission would have been in contact. But if a fuller answer is required, I will be glad to supply it.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I revert to my question, which is this: have the Department and the secretariat in general been able to up-date the list of those who receive Council documents, in particular reports of the Visiting Missions, for which we were asked at all our public meetings? It would appear that it has not, therefore I should like to ask a question of the secretariat of the Trusteeship Council. Would it not be possible - with the agreement of the Administering Authority, of course - for the secretariat of the Trusteeship Council to send documents directly to all the municipalities visited throughout the five weeks and to those individuals who asked for them? I am convinced that the political officers of the secretariat have taken note of those who asked for the report. Would Mr. Abebe, in agreement with the Administering Authority, send a copy of the report of the Visiting Mission to everyone who asked for it?

The PRESIDENT: Could I just ask a question for factual clarification? The representative of France referred just to the report of the Visiting Mission to the Trust Territory in 1982, that is T/1850. Did he also intend to refer to the report of the other Visiting Mission to observe the plebiscite in Palau, T/1851?

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): At certain of the meetings held by the Visiting Mission during the plebiscite scheduled for 10 February in Palau, a number of people came to me at the end of public meetings, notably when we were visiting Babelthuap - I am thinking of a meeting attended by the representatives of Fiji - who are here today - and asked us to provide them with the report of the Visiting Mission. As far as the Palau Islands are concerned, therefore, we have some names of individuals and institutions, the Senate, for example. Many people requested copies of the report. I am asking a very simple question. Would it be possible for Mr. Abebe and the Administering Authority to agree that these reports be sent direct to the people who have asked for them instead of being sent through Tokyo or Washington and arriving in a bundle in the postboxes of certain establishments?

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Abebe.

Mr. ABEBE (Secretary of the Council): I was in contact with the distribution section of the Department of Conference Services about a month ago and was assured that official records of the Trusteeship Council, including verbatim records of the meetings of the forty-ninth session, the annexes and supplements of the forty-eighth session, including the resolutions of the Council and the reports of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council had been forwarded to the addresses given by the United Nations Information Centre in Tokyo to all concerned. I assure the representative of France that we will forward the pertinent reports of the Visiting Missions to the individuals and institutions that have indicated a desire to receive them.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): On the basis of these clarifications, I gather then that the Trusteeship Council secretariat is preparing to forward these reports. When will they be forwarded?

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): This is a question not to the representative of the Department of Public Information but to the representative of the Administering Authority. It is the duty of the Administering Authority to ensure the dissemination of information in the Trust Territory and this is clear from the Secretary-General's past sessions and his report to the present session on the dissemination of information in the Trust Territory. This indicates that the Administering Authority is responsible for the dissemination of information and that information on the work of the Trusteeship Council should be disseminated by the Administering Authority. Therefore, in order to have a full and clear picture of the position, we should be interested in knowing what data the Administering Authority has regarding the scale of dissemination in the Trust Territory of material on the work of the Trusteeship Council and related material.

Mr. KINNEY (United States of America): Before addressing the question, I want to make sure that the representative of France has received an answer to his last question.

The PRESIDENT: I was going to call on Mr. Abebe, our Secretary, to make a statement summing up the action he intends to take on the basis of the representative of France's question, after giving him a few moments to marshal his thoughts on that subject. Meanwhile I thought we could deal with the question from the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. KINNEY (United States of America): I will proceed then. We note the commendably thorough system of the Department of Public Information's co-operation with the Trust Territory Administration detailed in the report before us. Mr. McPhetres of the Trust Territory Administration - to whom I would like to turn in a minute, with your permission, Sir - met in April with Mr. Exley of the Tokyo Information Centre and reviewed the distribution system for all United Nations materials within the Trust Territory. We fully support and will help implement the additional distribution suggested by the Chairman of the Visiting Mission.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. McPhetres.

Mr. McPHETRES (Adviser): I met in April with Mr. Exley and we reviewed, as was stated, the complete distribution system for all United Nations documents. We also reviewed the documents that are being distributed within the Trust Territory - a fairly large number of periodicals, reports and studies. We receive a fair number of them at headquarters, break them up into smaller packages and redistribute them in some cases to all the Governments directly. In other cases the mailings go out from Tokyo directly to addressees in all four of the Trust Territories.

I would like to call attention to the paragraph on the distribution of information on page 76 of the annual report in which we note that a great deal of United Nations related information is distributed throughout the Trust Territory.

The PRESIDENT: I think that the representative of the Soviet Union wanted an indication of the scale and you used, in your reply, the words "fairly voluminous". Is it possible to quantify that? I personally would also be interested to know. Are we talking about hundreds or thousands or what? Could you give us some examples? It would be very helpful.

Mr. McPHETRES (Adviser): I think we are talking in terms of hundreds - of each publication - because in each of the Governments the addressees include elementary and secondary schools, public libraries, the public information offices, the offices of the presidents and legislatures. In some cases there are multiple mailings to each of those addressees. So if we multiply all this by four, plus the number that we receive at the headquarters office, we are talking of several hundred copies of each of these documents going out.

The PRESIDENT: Since that seems to complete that question, I should like to ask Mr. Abebe to complete the answer to the previous question of the representative of France and to tell us what action he has in mind.

Mr. ABEBE (Secretary of the Council): The Visiting Mission of 1982 has already requested the Department of Public Information to co-ordinate with the Secretary of the Trusteeship Council so that widespread distribution of Trusteeship Council documents will be ensured. I intend to get in touch with my colleagues in the Department secretariat and co-ordinate the distribution activities as effectively as possible. In the meantime, I should like to assure the representative of France that, in view of the forthcoming mission to the Federated States of Micronesia, it may, with the agreement of the Council, be possible to carry as many reports as possible of the Visiting Missions, as well as the records of the Trusteeship Council, to the Territory so that it may be possible expeditiously to distribute these documents to individuals, institutions, schools and other organs of the States concerned. In addition, it would be possible to expand the list of distribution of United Nations Trusteeship Council documents in the Trust Territory and, if the Council agrees, the secretariat of the Trusteeship Council may again co-ordinate its activities, its conference services, with the Department of Public Information, in order to do this.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I find the proposal offered by the Secretary of the Trusteeship Council a very useful one and I believe that a forthcoming visiting mission to the Territory might take along a certain number of documents that could be distributed. This brings me back, none the less, to my question, namely, that I feel it would be useful, for example, for the secretariat of the Council to disseminate some weeks or months before to all members of the Council a list of the individuals or institutions to which the reports of the last two Visiting Missions would be addressed, as a result of the requests made to us last February. I think this would be one way to satisfy the legitimate curiosity of these individuals and institutions and the interest they have in the work of the Council. It would be very easy for us to draw up a list that could be reproduced and disseminated to all members of the Council. At the next session we could find out whether indeed that list had proved useful or not. If the exercise proved useless, we would eliminate it and, since a number of people at the end of these public meetings asked to have the benefit of such a delivery, I think we should accede to their request. I fully subscribe to the idea of taking and distributing these documents during the next visiting mission to the individuals who asked for them.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Abebe.

Mr. ABEBE (Secretary of the Council): I would be pleased to prepare the list as requested and have it distributed to members of the Council for their information.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I listened very attentively to the explanations given by the representative of the Administering Authority in connection with the dissemination of materials and documents of the Trusteeship Council in the Trust Territory. To judge from those clarifications, the Administering Authority is showing concern for the dissemination of information and we have rather a big difference here as regards what in fact the Visiting Mission from the Trusteeship Council found in the Territory. I do not know whether I should quote the paragraph from the report

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

of the Mission which clearly says that the population of the Trust Territory knows of the existence of the Trusteeship Council but does not have information, documents or the records of its sessions. The inconsistency as regards the materials is rather alarming and the Trusteeship Council should find some means - not merely partial or fragmentary means - of delivering those documents to the Trust Territory. Naturally, we welcome the idea that, if a mission goes to the Territory it can take along some of the materials, but the possibilities that such a mission may have to transport materials to the Territory is not a fundamental solution to the question of dissemination of information, but simply a solution in one single case, as I understand it. The Trusteeship Council should find some more comprehensive way of solving this question and it seems to me that, first of all, the Council should entrust the President of the Council with the delivery of information to the Trust Territory. The President of the Council, together with the Council secretariat, should think of some ways and means of organizing such supervision. Perhaps we should ask the Information Centres in Tokyo and Washington from time to time - if not once a month then perhaps once every two months - to inform the Council secretariat about the quantity of materials and what materials were sent to the Trust Territory. If there were any other separate lists of addressees receiving materials, they could be made available to the Council secretariat, which could follow them up and respond quickly to requests that come in or could expand such lists. I think that would be easy to do.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

There should be some kind of orderly programme for the dissemination of information. The Department of Public Information (DPI) at Headquarters sends materials out and thinks that is the end of its task, ignoring the fact that it is a rather lengthy business for the materials to get from New York to Tokyo and from Tokyo to the Territory. Then still more time is needed for dissemination of the materials within the Territory.

We need to establish some order and control regarding the disposal of materials to the Territory, otherwise what happens is that the report states that everything is fine, a certain quantity of material is being sent, and when the Visiting Mission begins asking the people of the Trust Territory it turns out that they do not know about these materials and even if they are interested in them they cannot get them. Moreover, I understand from the report of the Visiting Mission, that it is not just ordinary members of the public in the Trust Territory that are involved here; it is people who are directly involved in political matters in the Territory.

Such a situation cannot be tolerated, particularly after three decades of trusteeship. Every year this same problem arises - that the materials do not reach the addressees and, if they do, according to the report the quantity is totally insufficient. Therefore we should increase the quantity and send not 50 copies but 100, perhaps; not 80 but 160. We should look at what the need is in the Territory, particularly since we see from the report that every year the representative of the Tokyo Information Centre goes to the Territory. While he is there he could carry out an on-site assessment of the situation to see how well supplied with materials the Territory is and whether people know about them and have access to them. Consequently it seems to me that the DPI at Headquarters should request reports from the Information Centres in Tokyo and Washington on how the dissemination of information is being carried out in the Trust Territory.

I particularly want to stress that we should determine the procedure in such a way that the Administering Authority, in its efforts to ensure the dissemination of information in the Trust Territory, does not rely on appropriate action by the information centres while the DPI is relying on information being supplied by the Administering Authority. I think that here we should have, if not parallel, at any rate joint efforts, which, I emphasize again, should be properly controlled. In other words, the picture should be quite clear as to what is in fact going on.

The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union made a particular suggestion that I should, as President, take some part in this by what was interpreted as 'control' of the information work. I do not wish to duck any particular responsibility put on me by the Council, but I should like to say first of all that I have enormous faith in the work of the information department of the Secretariat and its representatives, particularly, in this case, in Tokyo, and I think the detailed responsibility for the information work lies there and it would be somewhat inappropriate of me to interfere in this. The general overall responsibility I would maintain rests with the Council and not with the President. For that reason we have had this interesting report to consider and the very helpful introductory remarks of Mr. Masha. What I think is interesting is that as a result of this one particular aspect of the information work has been shown to be capable of some improvement. The representative of France made a positive suggestion and this will be acted on by our secretariat. I am very pleased that our discussions have had a rather positive result in this particular field, but I thought I should react to the representative of the Soviet Union's suggestion.

Has any other member any comment to make in this particular point?

Mr. KINNEY (United States of America): My delegation shares your faith, Sir, in the work of the Department of Public Information (DPI). I should like to note that a system already exists, as detailed in paragraphs 618 and following paragraphs of the report of the Visiting Mission. The Administering Authority, for its part, stands ready to support the next Visiting Mission by a special distribution in the Federated States of Micronesia and also to support the mailings suggested by the representative of France, and any other supplement to the commendably thorough DPI and Trust Territory administration system reviewed by my delegation and detailed in the report of the Secretary-General now before us.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to refer to your reaction, Mr. President, to what I had just said. We are not talking about the Council's confidence or lack of confidence in the actions of the Department of Public Information (DPI). If I gave that impression, I should like to correct it. Let us consider the United Kingdom Mission to the United Nations. If the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

United Nations supervises or keeps a check on your work. that does not mean that he does not trust you, that he controls your work. As the Permanent Representative he monitors your work, in the same way as the Permanent Representative of my Mission monitors my work. That does not mean that he is controlling my work. it does not mean he does not trust me; he is trying to find out what the people working in his Mission are doing in order to know what the position is.

It was precisely in that context that I raised the question. We are not speaking of a lack of trust or confidence, we all fully trust and have confidence in that work that is being carried out by the DPI at Headquarters, in the Information Centres and on site.

(Mr. Berezovsky, USSR)

But this does not mean that all of that work has to be assessed only once a year, because in assessing it only once a year, we run into facts such as those we are now encountering and then must regret the time we have lost. And if continuous control is carried out over the dissemination of information, then apparently that would only promote the most effective possible functioning of that area.

Thus, we are not talking about interference by the President of the Trusteeship Council in the affairs of the Department, but merely of a normal, business-like and effective informing of the Trusteeship Council - and, in particular of the President of the Trusteeship Council - for the simple reason that the President is the head of that body for one year. It is in that context that I made my proposal.

I do not think we should just sweep that proposal aside: we should give it some thought and take a look at it, because every proposal has its rational aspects which could be used in the interests of the matter at hand.

The PRESIDENT: As I understand it, the representative of the Soviet Union has proposed that I, as President, should undertake continuous control of the dissemination of United Nations information in the Trust Territory.

I do not know if I have recorded his proposal correctly. I attempted to use his exact words: "The President should undertake continuous control of the dissemination of United Nations information in the Trust Territory." I have commented on that myself. Are there any other comments on this?

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): We are indeed facing a problem here concerning the reports of the Visiting Missions: it appears that people are asking us questions that we intended to take up at public meetings.

The Administering Authority, for its part, also distributes many copies of reports: several hundred, as the figures show. The Tokyo Centre, similarly, distributes reports, as does Washington.

Thus, the problem as I see it is not one of quantity of information disseminated. It would appear that everything is being disseminated. The problem of information on the work of the Council, and on the United Nations

(Mr. Poudade, France)

in general is one of readership - although that has not posed a problem here. According to the report,

"Most Micronesians appear to attach importance to their special relationship, as inhabitants of a Trust Territory, with the United Nations. However, this relationship could well be eroded and the prestige of the United Nations undermined if the inhabitants of Micronesia come to believe that the world Organization is either uninterested in the Trust Territory, or impotent." (T/1850, para. 631)

There are thus a number of possibilities, and the representative of the Soviet Union has formulated one of them.

I do not think this is a question, Sir, of your shouldering a new burden. Since the Department of Public Information (DPI) updates lists, and Mr. Abebe works with the DPI and/or publishes a list of institutions or individuals who receive copies, perhaps you could be informed of what is being done in this matter - without, however, being obligated every month or every two to carry out a task that is not part of your responsibilities. But, without going so far as to make a formal proposal for controls, I believe the President of the Trusteeship Council could be regularly informed of progress made in this matter. That would be useful to us. That is the first point.

The second point is this. Just as the arrival of a visiting mission is made known to the inhabitants of a Trust Territory in a speech broadcast by the head of the visiting mission, would it not similarly be possible, to publicize the issuance of an important report - for example, after a session or after a visiting mission? Could the information service or the press in Ponape, Majuro or Koror not make a short, three-minute announcement on the radio? In this regard, we might get some help from the Administering Authority, as well as from the special representatives. The announcement would merely be to note that the latest report or a new film has arrived and can be seen at the library of the College of Micronesia. I am sure people will be interested in such news. I am not saying that everyone will want to read those reports, which are sometimes written in United Nations jargon, but people are sometimes very happy to know that questions that they have raised or presented to the Administering Authority, as we sometimes emphasize, have been solved. And I think it is in the general interest of the United Nations to publicize what it has accomplished.

(Mr. Poudade, France)

Hence I would suggest that the Administering Authority and its Special Representatives, upon the arrival in the Territory of an important document or film, briefly announce over the local radio station that that material is available for viewing.

My third point is this: I do not know whether this falls within the purview of item 9 on our agenda, but let me raise the question and leave it to you, Mr. President, to decide whether it does or not. If you do not think it appropriate, there need be no reply; if you do think it appropriate here, however, I should like to have a reply - today, if possible - from DPI. Here is what is involved.

When I had a conversation with the Under-Secretary-General Mr. Akashi on a quite different matter, I happened to learn of a round-table of journalists that had been organized by DPI in Manila on northern Pacific problems. On that occasion Mr. Akashi asked me if I knew any journalists from the Trust Territory who could be invited. First, I think that such a conference is of great interest to the Trusteeship Council. Let us not forget that the Trust Territory occupies a major portion of the northern Pacific. I think it would have been desirable, in addition to journalists, to have invited a member of the Council to take part as an observer and to voice the thinking of the Council.

Apparently, however, DPI did not deem that useful. Could we not, at least for the next session, have a brief report by DPI on the Manila round-table regarding that portion of the Pacific?

If you, Mr. President, feel that this does fall within the purview of information dissemination, that is fine. If you deem it otherwise, I withdraw my question.

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps I could ask Mr. Masha to comment on that last point.

Mr. MASHA (Department of Public Information): What the representative of France said is correct in connection with the discussion he had with Mr. Akashi on the preparations for the Manila round-table. Unfortunately, at the time those discussions took place, most of the preparations were in an advanced stage. But

(Mr. Masha, Department of
Public Information)

at future round-tables I am sure it should be possible to include somebody - perhaps from the Council - who can discuss the Trust Territory. Otherwise we can look into the possible participation of a journalist from the Territory.

These mass-media round-tables that have been organized by the Department do not focus on merely one particular item. Decolonization is just one of many subjects that are discussed at those round-tables; therefore, the spread of journalists who come is much broader. In principle, however, I do not see any difficulty to considering this at a future date.

As to whether we should present a report of the Manila round-table to the Council, obviously, Mr. President, we would do so if you thought it necessary. However, since the round-table is not restricted to matters dealing with the trusteeship system, I am not sure how valuable such a report would be to the Council.

(Mr. Masha, Department of
Public Information)

So perhaps, to look into the future, there is the possibility of inviting someone from the Council or inviting a journalist from the area.

While I am on this subject, I should like to make another comment in connection with the possibility of making announcements on radio of the arrival of material, as suggested by the representative of France. Perhaps the Administering Authority would like to address this question also, but for our part I would point out that public announcements - at least, on commercial radio stations - are quite an expensive affair, and we have in most cases shied away from that kind of approach. If the Council wishes us to explore this, however, including its financial implications, we shall be glad to consider the question, although the Administering Authority might perhaps be in a better position to comment on this.

If I understand correctly, the problem is not with information material for the general public but with information material that is directed to the Territory; both the report and, I think, our statement, as well as the report of the Visiting Mission, for example, clearly state that United Nations radio programmes reach these areas and are aired very regularly. We have indicated that the public information material available to us or which we produce is also made available to these areas, and the Administering Authority has explained its part of the work. We have a very healthy dialogue with the Administering Authority as to the mechanics of getting some of this material into the area. The problem apparently - and I say "apparently" on the basis of the report of the Visiting Mission - is not with the public information material as such but with the specific documents of the Council. As I said earlier, sometimes we tend to make the distinction in the Department that certain materials of a substantive nature are handled by the secretariats, unless we have translated them for popular usage in the media. We have indicated how these particular substantive documents are channeled and the secretariat of the Council has said how it wishes to undertake this in the future. Perhaps the problem is that these have been going to central points in the Territory, where they then have to be distributed. I cannot tell what quantities have been sent, but we know for sure that some of these documents have been reaching the Territory.

(Mr. Masha, Department of
Public Information)

Perhaps they are not sent in sufficient quantity for wide distribution, I do not know, but certainly, with the indications just given by the Secretary of the Council and the apparent willingness of the Administering Authority to co-operate, it should be possible to eliminate that problem.

I should like to conclude by saying how much I appreciate your statement of confidence in the Department of Public Information, Mr. President, as well as that of the representative of the United States and, by implication, the confidence in the DPI expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. KINNEY (United States of America): We are, indeed, now issuing news releases and radio programmes from New York. We could, as Administering Authority, indeed use more broadcast and print materials. There is a problem of quantity, especially as regards Trusteeship Council documents. We could use and would welcome larger quantities and we would ensure the widest possible distribution.

We should also be pleased to pursue the matter of announcements of United Nations documentation, as suggested by the representative of France. If cost is a problem as regards commercial radio, there are, as Mr. Poudade knows, the non-commercial radio nets operated by the four Governments, and we should be pleased to pursue Mr. Poudade's suggestion with them.

The PRESIDENT: Is the representative of France content with those two points?

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I think the representative of the USSR was just going to speak and I shall speak after him.

The PRESIDENT: We have one or two things going at the same time, and I just wanted to try to dispose of your particular points about the round-table conference and the radio announcements. If the representative of the Soviet Union wishes to speak on those points he should by all means do so. If not, I should just like to make sure that we have disposed of those two points to your satisfaction before going on with the matter still before us, which is the Soviet proposal.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): As to the round-table, I think Mr. Masha did not fully understand me. Perhaps it was a question of the interpretation, but I never said that the round-table of journalists in Manila was entrusted with taking up trusteeship issues. There are enough problems in the Pacific -- fishery problems, for example, or the political situation there, or the problem of economic development. I think that round-table dealt with the Pacific generally. Here, in the statements of delegations, in the report of the Administering Power and in the statements of the petitioners we touch on a whole range of problems in the Trusteeship Territory, which covers a vast area, an area equal to that of the United States, so I think the Trusteeship Council or its secretariat could associate itself with this. It is not necessary to have a written report, but I think the Department Mr. Akashi heads makes a summary of the round-table, and it would be of interest to us to see what interests the journalists and to understand what problems are most on their minds. That, I think, would shed light on our work as well.

As for the second issue, it is not a question of the United Nations buying commercial air time. I am too concerned about the Organization's expenditure, since my country helps to finance it, to suggest that. But -- as the representative of the United States said -- there exist in the capitals of the different entities governmental broadcasts of the times of arrival and departure of boats, and so on. Within the framework of such broadcasts, which are free and run by the Governments, I think it would be quite easy for us to announce that a very good United Nations film on a certain subject had arrived and that interested institutions could get it from the College of Micronesia. I am sure that the Governor of Ponape, who is a former President of the College of Micronesia, would be very happy to lend the film or to say that a report had been received and copies could be obtained at a given address.

The problem is that these reports arrive in the islands, but by some bureaucratic detour they end up in completely inaccessible places. Miss Harden, who participated in the work of this Council for a very long time, said that one day she unearthed from a drawer a dust-laden package, still tied with string, containing the report of the previous Visiting Missions. Thus, the problem is one not of the arrival of documents but of their distribution and the way of getting them to the public.

Mr. Kinney's suggestion is a good one, that announcements that certain material had arrived and was available for those who wanted it should be included in governmental broadcasts.

The PRESIDENT: As I understand it, on the question of radio announcements, both the Administering Authority and the United Nations information experts will be taking action in accordance with the useful suggestion made by the representative of France.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I merely have a question to ask Mr. Masha, the representative of the Department of Public Information. The question is specific: what is the number of copies of the Charter of the United Nations sent to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands during the past year?

As far as I can see from the report of the Secretary-General, there is no mention made of even a single copy. Perhaps that is a misunderstanding or a mistake; in the addendum to the report no mention is made of such a fundamental and important document as the United Nations Charter.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Masha.

Mr. MASHA (Department of Public Information): Obviously, since we have provided the entire list of the materials that we sent to the Territory and this does not appear on our list, it means that we did not send any copies of the Charter during the year. That does not mean that we have not sent copies of the Charter in the past. If I remember, I think we sent several copies a while ago. I do not know the exact number. If the representative of the Soviet Union is interested, we can check it and give him an answer to his question at a later time.

We did, indeed, send copies of the Charter and this was reflected last year in document T/1838. The first listing in the annex of that document was the Charter of the United Nations and the Statutes of the International Court of Justice. The exact numbers are not available to me at the moment, if that is what the representative of the Soviet Union is interested in, but we have sent copies of the Charter to the area and we will be glad to send more. I suspect that the Administering Authority does likewise.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I believe, so far as documents as fundamental as the United Nations Charter are concerned, we must ensure that there is a steady supply of them. We cannot confine ourselves to saying that only a short while ago, we sent a number of copies and would ignore the rest.

I do not think this is a normal state of affairs. We have to watch over this and ensure that the Charter does arrive in adequate quantities, with a quantity known to the Trusteeship Council not every few years but every year according to need.

I am sure that, if I now address a question to the representative of the Department of Public Information, to find out what the need is in terms of copies of the Charter, I will be backing him up against the wall and he will not be able to reply for the simple reason that we do not know how many copies we sent last year, nor what the needs really are in terms of numbers of copies after an entire year has gone by.

The PRESIDENT: As there are no further comments on this report of the Secretary-General, may I suggest that the Council decide to take note of the report of the Secretary-General contained in document T/1854?

It was so decided.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I do not wish to open a discussion on our decision. I am in favour of it, namely, of taking note of the report of the Secretary-General. But we should perhaps point out that a useful discussion has taken place here today concerning this report and go on with our work, while taking note of the situation that emerged in the course of the discussion, taking into account the proposals that have been put forward during the course of the discussion.

I am certain that some of those proposals are wanting in terms of effectiveness. We could take a fresh look at them and find out why and then pursue our work on that basis. I think the mere fact of taking note of the report will not suffice. I believe we must highlight in our documents the fact that the Trusteeship Council did discuss the matter and intends in the future to have a more wide-ranging discussion to contribute to information on the Trusteeship Territory.

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps I could just make a comment on that. It seems to me that the very interesting points raised and the positive response to them would certainly be reflected in the recommendations and conclusions which will be drafted. There was one proposal - namely, the one by the representative of the Soviet Union - which I thought he was not going to press. But if he wishes to press it, I think it is for the Council to take a decision.

Before I call on the representative of France, I wonder if I might just repeat what I said. I think he was out of the room when I responded to the Soviet proposal. In brief, what I said was that, although I would not, as President, shirk any task assigned to me by the Council, my reaction was to say that the particular responsibility for this information work seemed to fall on the information department of the Secretariat and, particularly, our representatives in Tokyo and that I had great faith in the execution of their work. And the general responsibility seemed to me to lie not with the President, but with the Council. With those remarks, I then referred the subject to the Council. So you have heard the proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union and my reaction to it.

Mr. POUDADE (France) (interpretation from French): I believe there is a minor misunderstanding. I do not know whether I am correctly or incorrectly interpreting what the representative of the Soviet Union said to us, but I do not believe the problem is that of taking a decision. I believe simply that, as you, Sir, have yourself suggested, in the recommendations at the end of the report, we could, indeed - and I have no doubt the drafting group will do this job conscientiously - indicate that this very thought-provoking discussion on these issues took place and that various measures were envisaged aimed at improving the effectiveness of the procedures for bringing these issues to the knowledge of the Micronesian public. I think the Administering Authority is ready to help and I think in this connection what has emerged is that the general thrust of the debate was that no one objected to including in the conclusions some short sentence to the effect that this report was the subject of interesting debate and a number of methods for improving dissemination were suggested.

(Mr. Poudade, France)

I am not sure whether I correctly interpreted the representative of the Soviet Union and yourself, Sir. I think that is the point we have reached. I do not think the matter goes so far as to make a decision necessary. We could leave it to the secretariat to include some reference to this. This is an important issue, and I was able to note that all the people who took part in various Visiting Missions to the islands over a number of years have been complaining about this, notably Miss Harden who, as the Council knows, has for a long time been closely following the proceedings of the Council.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First, let me thank my colleague from France for having correctly interpreted from Russian to French the ideas articulated by the Soviet delegation. Let me add just a few points to what the representative of France said.

What I said does not appear to have been expressed very clearly to you, Sir. I did not mean that any responsibilities should be transferred from the Department of Public Information to the President of our Council as far as the dissemination of information is concerned. What I had in mind was that adequately detailed and specific information should be made available to the Council - not just the President, as the head of the Trusteeship Council.

Let me add that, among the thoughts that I offered the Council today, I was not talking only about that aspect. What I proposed was a whole series of further or other measures that might improve the effectiveness of the dissemination of information throughout the Trust Territory. If it is difficult at present for the President to follow up and sum up all these ideas, it will be easy to find them once we have the verbatim records of our meeting today. Then, in a calm and reflective atmosphere we can think about the proposals made by the Soviet Union, which have not yet been expressed in any particular formula ready for a decision. We were offering our ideas simply from a desire to be useful, not in order to cause the President of the Council any difficulties by burdening him with additional responsibilities. That was not at all the thrust of what we were saying.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I would say that the remarks by my Soviet colleague are well taken. There can be no institutional organization in the United Nations or, indeed, elsewhere that cannot benefit from greater rationalization for greater efficiency in work procedures. I would suggest that the constructive suggestions that have been put forward here this morning should be taken into account next week in drafting our conclusions and recommendations and that in the light of those draft conclusions and recommendations, we could perhaps return to the subject in the final week, when we discuss our report to the Security Council.

The PRESIDENT: I see that that proposal meets with the agreement of all. I shall now turn to Mr. Masha again, because he now has the precise figures that the representative of the Soviet Union was asking for, of the number of copies of the Charter sent to the Trust Territory.

Mr. MASHA (Department of Public Information): Perhaps I should refer the representative to document T/1838/Add.1 of last year, in which we indicated all the documents we sent to the Territory and the films which are available there. The first listing is the Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice. Eighty copies were sent. If the representative knows of any people over there who wish to receive more copies of the Charter, we will be glad to send more. We did not send any this year because the Charter has not been revised and we did not know of any requests for more copies of the Charter.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.