



## Trusteeship Council

Distr.  
GENERAL

T/PV.1658  
25 July 1988

ENGLISH

---

### Fifty-fifth Session

#### VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Tuesday, 19 July 1988, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. GAUSSOT (France)

- Resumption of the fifty-fifth session
- Adoption of the report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council  
(Security Council resolution 70 (1949) [12] (continued))
- Closure of the session

---

This record is subject to correction.

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

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

RESUMPTION OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH SESSION

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I declare resumed the fifty-fifth session of the Trusteeship Council.

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL (SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 70 (1949)) (continued)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Members of the Council will recall that, at our 1657th meeting held on 27 May 1988, the Trusteeship Council decided, in accordance with its customary procedure, to suspend its session and to meet again at a later date to adopt its draft report to the Security Council.

That draft report was distributed to all members on 17 June in English, and on 23 June in French and Russian. In my letter of transmittal, I asked the members of the Council to send me, by 5 July, the changes or comments that they wanted to make on the first part of the report, entitled "Organization and activities of the Trusteeship Council". That section of the report is based essentially on the verbatim records of our meetings. The changes received were communicated to members in my letter of 12 July; the revised text thus approved was distributed to the members of the Council in English, French and Russian on 15 July.

In addition, certain changes proposed by the Soviet delegation this afternoon were distributed in French (original Russian) to members of the Council just before the beginning of this meeting, and they will very soon be distributed in English.

If I hear no objection to the changes submitted by the Soviet Union, I shall take it that members now all agree on the text of the first part of the report.

Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I wish first of all to greet the President and the other members of the Trusteeship Council and to say how happy I am that we have come together again to

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

conclude the work of our session. To that end, we shall be considering the Council's draft report to the Security Council.

With your permission, Mr. President, I should like to ask you a question. You referred to minor amendments proposed by our delegation to the draft report before us. It is not clear to me, first of all, where Part I of the draft report ends and Part II begins. Secondly, I should like to know the fate of the proposed amendments, since I do not believe they have all been distributed.

This may be a formality, but, from my experience, to avoid even typographical errors we usually go through the paragraphs and sections for comments. Since, as I said, it is hard to see where Part I ends and Part II begins - I am being told that the second part starts on page 24 of the Russian text - I should still like to go through the paragraphs so as to have clarification on a few points, which should be easy to give. This may be explained by the fact that this is the first time I have participated in the consideration of the Trusteeship Council report.

If other members have no objection we would examine everything together - for example, Part I A, B, C and so on - and go quickly through the pages until we get to the relevant comments that have been submitted and can be stated here. The advantage of this procedure is that we would not have to attend to it later. For example, in the text I have, instead of "representative of the Soviet Union" it says representation of the Soviet Union".

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): As to the first question raised by the representative of the Soviet Union, I think it is clear that Part I of the report is entitled "Organization and activities of the Trusteeship Council" and that Part II, "Conclusions and recommendations", begins on page 42 of the English-language draft text. As members will recall, the Council considered and adopted Part II at its 1657th meeting last May.

(The President)

As to the second point raised by the representative of the Soviet Union, I would point out that the Council has never in the past proceeded in the way he proposes. All delegations have had sufficient time to read carefully through the draft text in its various language versions: I recall that the draft text was submitted to all members in English on 17 June and to the Soviet delegation in Russian on 23 June. I think therefore that there would be little point in going through now what delegations have already accepted, subject to the incorporation of the changes they requested. Those changes have been taken into account.

As to the latest changes requested today by the Soviet delegation, I think that, unless any other delegation has an objection, these too can be incorporated into the final version of the report.

I invite comments from members, but for my part I feel that we would be wasting a good deal of time by going through the draft text from beginning to end, as delegations have had plenty of time to peruse it.

Mr. SMITH (United Kingdom): As regards your remarks concerning our organization of work, Sir, my delegation quite agrees that it would indeed be a waste of time to go through the draft report page by page since we have already read it and by and large approved it.

As regards the amendments just now submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union, my delegation has one question on which we should like to have clarification. Unfortunately, we do not have in front of us a copy of the verbatim records of the meetings to which those amendments refer, but I wonder whether the President or the Secretariat staff has had an opportunity to compare the amendments now being proposed with the verbatim records.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Soviet delegation's requests for amendments were received just now, and we have not had time to compare them with the verbatim records.

Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In response to the representative of the United Kingdom, I wish to point out that the newly proposed amendments are intended merely to have our report reflect more accurately what was actually said at our meetings. We are proposing a minimal approach: although there are things which have remained in brackets, hence unconsidered, the report should reflect at least minimally what was said by my delegation.

True, I am a newcomer to the Council, but I still have the right to ensure that what was said by the representative of the Soviet Union is duly reflected. This should not cause any difficulties or disrupt the balance in any way, I am sure. I have examined the report closely and wish to stress that my comments on certain sections relate not to what was said per se, but to how it has been reflected.

Why did I say it would be useful to go through the report? It is a simple matter of only five minutes, but it is very important. Let us look at page 40 of the English text, for example. We introduced no changes, but there are distortions and inaccuracies. Look at the following reference to our statement:

(spoke in English)

"... in particular and especially in article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights."

(continued in Russian)

First, there are no articles in the Universal Declaration; secondly, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights says nothing about the right to self-determination. My delegation mentioned a completely different instrument - the International

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

Covenants on Human Rights. That is a factual mistake. Why write what we did not say? As I have said, the word "representative" appears as "representation".

It is not my purpose to redo the report; I do not intend to propose specific amendments. I should merely like to have clarification from Council members, or from the President or the Secretary, on parts of this section because it is structurally unclear.

I do not see any difficulty if we look at page 6 and say "no comment", and then at pages 7, 8, 9: wherever I or someone else has a question we can ask it. Perhaps everyone will be satisfied by the answer to the question.

So as not to delay discussions I shall not insist on my proposal, provided that the specific comments made today are included in the report, wherever they are proposed, and in the form proposed, and provided that the aforementioned glaring technical errors are eliminated from this part of the report.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I do not quite understand whether the changes the representative of the USSR is thinking of at the moment are included in the document just submitted to the Council or if he plans to ask for additional amendments. If these changes are included in the requested amendments already translated into French, and soon to be available in English, there should not be any problems and delegations will agree most likely to include them in the final text of the report. That is why I do not really see the need to go through the report page by page once again, because, as I said just now, delegations have had more than a month to do that in English, and nearly a month for the French and Russian versions.

Hence, with the inclusion of the Soviet Union's latest amendments I think we now have an approved and final text of Part I of the report. Unless other delegations have objections, the Council could proceed as it does in similar

(The President)

circumstances and dispense with a page-by-page consideration of the report, which has already been the subject of lengthy consideration.

In those circumstances, may I take it that all members of the Council agree on the text of the first part of the report?

Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I think we can come now to some kind of common understanding if our supplementary comments are taken into account and if the comments and proposals submitted by my delegation in writing today are adopted in the relevant paragraphs of this report.

I have already drawn attention to the inaccuracy on page 40 which, I think, the Secretariat itself could have pointed out, rather than I. Instead of "Universal Declaration of Human Rights", it should be "International Covenants on Human Rights".

I think we can thus conclude Part I.

But so as not to prolong discussion in future, I wish to point out that certain sections of part I of the report are not a completely accurate reflection of the discussion. There was a certain sequence of statements. For example, one representative said something with reference to a statement by another; another representative, considering that his statement was not interpreted accurately, reacted to that. In other words, if we want to set out the discussion in sequence, if not chronologically, then this report does not fully correspond to that sequence; it does not fully reflect the course of the discussion.

On the other hand, I know that many reports, in the interests of conciseness, sum up the positions put forward by delegations and actually combine some of them. That is acceptable. However, it is very important, when taking this approach, that subsequent statements in reference to statements made by other representatives be set out in due fashion.

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

For example, the following is stated in paragraph 44 of the revised text:

(spoke in English)

"The representative of the United Kingdom said that contrary to the allegations of the representative of the Soviet Union the people ...".

(continued in Russian)

That is followed by an interpretation of the matter, and it ends there. But my delegation's response to that statement of the United Kingdom representative is not reflected, as if it had never occurred. Since there is no desire to go page by page, I shall not press the point at this stage, although, I must say, the omission does not serve the interests of an accurate reflection of the discussion.

I would like to comment further on Part I. In several places, the exposition of our discussions is inadequate. It does not adequately reflect what was said in our meetings, or how. Paragraph 48, for example, mentions a statement made by the representative of the United States with reference to a question raised by the representative of the Soviet Union, but the question raised by the Soviet Union was somewhat more extensive than what is contained in paragraph 44. Moreover, there was a corresponding reaction.

Given the short time available to us, I should like these comments on the way in which the discussion is set down in Part I to be duly reflected in the record. I shall not insist that we go through the draft report page by page, even though all other United Nations organs, when preliminary draft reports have been distributed and written comments have been made, do, nevertheless, usually go through them quickly, page by page or paragraph by paragraph, or by groups of paragraphs. It is then asked if there are any comments. If there are none, they move on. If there are any, the comments are made then and there. In future, therefore, even if our precedent is somewhat different, I think we should follow the practice followed in all other organs of the United Nations.



The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): Of course the comments made by the representative of the Soviet Union will be included in the verbatim records of this meeting. I say again that the remarks made by the representative of the Soviet Union could have been included in the written comments and amendments he submitted to the Council. In that way the views expressed by the Soviet delegation at earlier meetings of the Council would have been reflected precisely.

Mr. PASCAL (France) (interpretation from French): I think that whatever method is used for consideration of Part I of the Council's draft report - and the President has given us guidelines in this regard - delegations that have comments to make should refrain from attempting to rewrite the draft report. Obviously, since the draft report merely summarizes the discussions, it is necessarily abbreviated and representatives are likely to find that their statements have been modified somewhat. Though I could make further comments, I shall refrain from doing so because, in essence, the draft report faithfully reflects what took place.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I would add that our meetings do have full verbatim records. They provide an easy way of verifying all statements made by members of the Council.

I would recall that at its 1657th meeting the Council adopted Part II of the report, containing the Council's conclusions and recommendations. If there are no further comments at this time, I shall therefore put to the vote, as a whole, the Trusteeship Council's draft report to the Security Council.

The draft report was adopted by 3 votes to 1.

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

Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has voted against the draft report of the Trusteeship Council to the Security Council, and we should like to explain our reasons for so doing.

Speaking at the Council's 1657th meeting on 27 May, the Soviet delegation set forth its reasons for voting against the draft report submitted by the Drafting Committee, which contained conclusions and recommendations for inclusion in the Council's report to the Security Council on the situation in the United Nations Strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The Soviet delegation is once again obliged to stress that the report's conclusions and recommendations do not reflect the views of the delegation of the Soviet Union and are aimed at justifying the Administering Authority's annexationist policy with regard to the Trust Territory, a policy that contravenes the Charter of the United Nations, the Trusteeship Agreement, the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the vital interests of the Micronesian people.

Indeed, we are convinced that the report does not reflect the actual state of affairs in the Trust Territory and that the recommendations fail to take into account the true interests of the people of Micronesia, or to give an objective evaluation of the actions of the Administering Authority. As we have already indicated, the actions of the Administering Authority reflect its obvious desire to replace the Trusteeship Agreement adopted by the United Nations Security Council by a political annexation of the Trust Territory. The situation existing in Micronesia, as a result of the unilateral actions taken by the United States of America in violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, the terms of the 1947 Trusteeship Agreement concerning the Strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the Declaration on decolonization, is a source of serious concern, as has been expressed in the Committee's discussions.

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

The Administering Authority is trying artificially to limit the United Nations monitoring of the Territory. Further confirmation of this policy is the Administering Authority's refusal at the current session of the Council to inform the United Nations fully on the situation throughout the Trust Territory. We are faced with the United States forcibly turning the Territory into its neo-colonial possession and military-strategic bridgehead in the Western Pacific.

Throughout this period the Administering Authority, far from carrying out the tasks and implementing the goals described in Article 76 of the Charter, has artificially slowed down economic development and the creation of a viable independent Micronesian economy. Using economic leverage, the Administering Authority has also shaped the political development of the Trust Territory in a way determined not by the legitimate interests of the Micronesians but, rather, by its own military strategic aspirations.

Unilaterally, in violation of the Charter, the Trusteeship Agreement and the Declaration on decolonization, the United States continues - in exchange for promises of economic and financial handouts - to bind individual parts of Micronesia to one-sided shackling agreements along the lines of "commonwealth" and "free association", thus depriving Micronesians of their inalienable right to genuine self-determination, unity and independence.

If the Micronesians really had the freedom to choose their political status, if no political, economic, financial or other United States pressure were put on them, would they really agree to relinquish sovereignty over questions of security and defence to the United States? Would they voluntarily give up the right to decide on the location, construction and use of military installations, the agreement on the rights to initial use?

As has already been said, what is happening in Micronesia causes serious

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

concern in the world community. What sovereignty and self-determination can there be if any actions of the Micronesians are considered by the Administering Authority, in accordance with the Compact and Covenant, in the light of United States interests? Thus the agreements imposed on the Micronesian people are slave-like and neo-colonialist, and cannot be considered valid.

United States policy towards Micronesia reflects the desire to turn those islands into a military and strategic bridgehead for the United States. Micronesia has been given an important role in consolidating the United States total domination over vast regions of the Pacific and in strengthening its military strategic position in the region.

Article 83 (1) of the Charter specifically provides that all functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas, including the approval of the terms of the Trusteeship Agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the Security Council. From Article 83 it follows that the Trusteeship Council has not given any kind of authority for changes in the Trusteeship Agreement or for its cessation. As is known, the Agreement was confirmed not by the Trusteeship Council, but by the Security Council, and the Security Council did not and cannot give the Trusteeship Council a mandate to consider changing or ending the Trusteeship Agreement over Micronesia, or give any kind of judgement as regards any new status for the Strategic Trust Territory or its individual parts. In accordance with the Charter, the Trusteeship Council can only give assistance to the Security Council, and only at its request, in carrying out those functions which, in accordance with the international trusteeship system, relate to political, economic and social questions and to matters of education in the Territory.

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

As has frequently been stressed here, the United Nations must and will continue to bear responsibility for Micronesia until all the requirements laid down in the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement are met.

The Soviet delegation once again emphasizes that under the Charter only the Security Council - and no other organ of the United Nations, let alone the United States as the Administering Authority - has the right to change the status of the Trust Territory without consideration of this question by the Security Council. Therefore, before a relevant decision is taken by the Security Council, it is the Administering Authority's responsibility to implement the provisions of the Charter and the conditions of the Trusteeship Agreement and thus give the United Nations full information on the situation in the Territory.

For all those reasons, the Soviet delegation could not support the draft report with its recommendations, and was obliged to vote against it. In my view, this clearly will not be the last session of the Council. I am taking part in the Council's work for the first time at this session. I hope that my colleagues on the Council would agree that - at a time when there is a worldwide trend towards consolidating the new political thinking, when the United Nations has adopted the concept of a comprehensive system of international peace and security which stresses in particular the importance of political solutions to problems in international relations, and of negotiated solutions based on the sovereign choice of information concerning paths of development - the Trusteeship Council will have to seek genuine solutions to the problems being considered, in accordance with the fundamental provisions of the Charter, the Declaration on decolonization and the Trusteeship Agreement, and in the interests of the peoples involved.

I believe that the success of our further work will help bring about a situation in which all members listen to one another and to the concerns expressed

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

in the Council - including by petitioners - in order to give the matter proper consideration under the mandate given to us by the Security Council, and act, of course, in accordance with the Charter and other fundamental instruments.

Miss BYRNE (United States of America): I had not intended to speak now, but we have just heard at least the third general-debate statement by the representative of the Soviet Union. I may have lost count; it may have been his fourth general-debate statement. Much of the language he used is in fact already set down in the amendments the representative submitted today at 1 o'clock. Throughout this session, and at earlier ones, his baseless charges have been refuted. This is one more effort to have the last word.

Once again I say that we refute all his charges. The United States has brought the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to self-determination. It will continue to fulfil its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and the Trusteeship Agreement of 1947 between the United States and the Security Council. The United States will continue to fulfil its obligations under the general rubric of bringing the Territory to self-government and self-determination, as required by the basic documents of the United Nations and by some key resolutions of the General Assembly.

#### CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I express my gratitude to the representative of the Secretary-General, to the Council's secretariat, and to all the staff who have contributed to the successful conclusion of this session.

I declare closed the fifty-fifth session of the Trusteeship Council.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.

# United Nations

## Press Release

Department of Public Information • Press Section • New York

Trusteeship Council  
Fifty-fifth session  
1658th Meeting (PM)

TR/2363  
19 July 1988

TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL APPROVES REPORT TO SECURITY COUNCIL  
ON MICRONESIA, CONCLUDES 1988 SESSION

France, United Kingdom, United States  
Vote in Favour of Report; Soviet Union Votes Against

The Trusteeship Council this afternoon concluded its 1988 session, which began on 10 May, by adopting its report to the Security Council on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the last remaining Trust Territory under the International Trusteeship System.

The report, which deals with the Council's consideration of progress in the attainment of self-government in the Territory, as well as economic and social developments there, was adopted by a show-of-hands vote of 3 in favour (France, United Kingdom, United States) to 1 against (Soviet Union).

Statements after the vote were made by the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States.

At its last meeting, on 27 May, the Council adopted the conclusions and recommendations of its report by a vote of 3 in favour (France, United Kingdom, United States) to 1 against (Soviet Union). It recommended that the process of approval of a Compact of Free Association for Palau be completed at the earliest possible date. It also noted that the people of the Trust Territory, in exercise of their right to self-government, had chosen to assume full responsibility for administration in the economic, social and educational fields. It considered that any difficulties over the interpretation of the new status agreements should be resolved bilaterally by the parties concerned. In addition, it noted with satisfaction the assurances given by the Administering Authority that it would continue to fulfil its responsibilities under the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement.

Also known as Micronesia, the Territory was one of the original 11 Trust Territories under the Trusteeship System and was designated a "strategic area" under the United Nations Charter. Because of that status, the Trusteeship Council reports to the Security Council about conditions in the Territory, having been assigned that task by the Security Council. (Under Article 83 of

(more)

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

The Council is composed of five members -- the United States, as the Administering Authority; and China, France, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, who serve as permanent members of the Security Council not administering Trust Territories. China, however, does not participate in the Council's work.

Statements after Vote

DMITRIY V. BYKOV (Soviet Union) said he had voted against the report because its conclusions and recommendations were aimed at justifying the annexationist policy of the Administering Authority towards the Trust Territory, in contravention of the Charter, the Trusteeship Agreement and the Declaration on decolonization. That policy also conflicted with the vital interests of the Micronesian people.

The report did not reflect the true state of affairs in the Territory, nor did it provide an objective account of the actions of the Administering Authority, he went on. The situation in Micronesia was the result of the one-sided actions of the United States, which had tried artificially to limit the monitoring capacity of the United Nations. It had also refused to fully inform the United Nations on the situation throughout the Trust Territory. As a result, one could not help but conclude that the United States was "trying to turn Micronesia into a military strategic interest in the southern Pacific".

The Administering Authority had slowed down the Trust Territory's economic development and had used economic leverage to shape the Territory's political development in a manner which was not in the genuine interest of the Micronesian people, he said. The United States was only concerned with its own strategic aspirations. In exchange for "financial gifts", it continued to bind individual parts of the Trust Territory to "slavery agreements" in a so-called free association, denying Micronesians their rights to self-determination and independence. If they really had freedom to choose their political status, Micronesians would certainly not agree to give the United States responsibility for questions of security and defence. Nor would they give the United States the right to place military installations in the Territory.

What sovereignty and self-determination could be discussed if agreements imposed on the Micronesians were slave-like and neo-colonialist in nature and could not be considered valid? he asked. Only the Security Council, and not the Trusteeship Council or any other United Nations organ, nor the United States, had the right to change the status of the Trust Territory. In future, the Trusteeship Council should seek a real solution to the problems being considered, in the interest of the peoples involved.

PATRICIA BYRNE (United States) said the Council had just heard either the third or fourth general debate statement by the Soviet Union. Throughout the session his baseless charges had been refuted. The United States had brought the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to self-determination and would continue to fulfil its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement and relevant United Nations resolutions.