



UNITED NATIONS
TRUSTEESHIP
COUNCIL

ANNUARY

JUN 7 1985



Distr.
GENERAL

T/PV.1594
31 May 1985

ENGLISH

Fiftieth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND NINETY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 24 May 1985, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. RAPIN (France)
(Vice-President)

later: Mr. MAXEY (United Kingdom)

Examination of the annual report of the Administering Authority for the year ended
30 September 1984: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

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.

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.

85-60472 1688V (E)

51P.

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

EXAMINATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTERING AUTHORITY FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1984: TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (T/1871) (continued)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Council will now hear the last speaker in the general debate.

MR. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First, I should like to express satisfaction at the fact that I am able to speak now, bearing in mind that at the appropriate time during the last meeting I had to be elsewhere.

The Soviet delegation, as in the past, has carefully studied the annual report of the Administering Authority on the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. We have listened carefully to, and studied, the presentation made by the delegation of the United States, the Administering Authority. The Soviet delegation has also carefully listened to the statements of the petitioners, both Micronesians and United States citizens. We have drawn attention to the serious nature of the statements and the great concern expressed in them. We are grateful to the petitioners for making additional information available to the Council and for their concern for the situation in Micronesia. Their statements significantly supplement the information made available to the Council by the Administering Authority and provide us with valuable material for an objective assessment of the Administering Authority's policy in Micronesia.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

At this time a historic event is being commemorated everywhere: the fortieth anniversary of the great victory of the peoples over fascism in the Second World War. That victory was achieved through the joint efforts of the peoples and armies of the anti-Hitlerite coalition. A decisive contribution to defeating the forces of fascism and aggression and to saving mankind from slavery was made by the Soviet Union. The Soviet people pay a tribute also to the peoples and armies of the United States, Great Britain, France, China and other States of the anti-Hitlerite coalition for the weighty contribution they made to the achievement of this joint goal. It is completely proper and right that this anniversary should be noted in an appropriate manner here in the United Nations as well, because this Organization was established as a result of the victory over nazism and fascism. The United Nations was born of the victorious struggle of the peace-loving forces over fascism. The United Nations has made an important contribution to the liberation of the oppressed people of the colonies and the Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories.

Of the greatest importance in this regard has been the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the General Assembly on the initiative of the Soviet Union. The twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of that Declaration is being widely commemorated this year. In the Declaration, adopted on 14 December 1960, the General Assembly solemnly proclaimed "the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations". (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), twelfth preambular paragraph)

Since the United Nations was established, approximately 100 colonial and Trust Territories have attained freedom, independence and sovereignty. They include a number of colonial Territories of the Pacific which are close to Micronesia, both in the size of their population and in the size of their territory. They are now full Members of the United Nations. Today, however, 25 years after the adoption of the declaration, for many Territories still under colonial domination and for the Trust Territory of Micronesia this Declaration remains unimplemented. It is the duty of the United Nations to implement it.

The colonial Powers, which do not want to give up their colonial possessions, constantly come up with new, sophisticated forms of colonial dependence, trying to camouflage neo-colonialism under various kinds of labels: commonwealth, free association, and so forth. A convincing example of this is the policy and practice of the United States, the Administering Authority for the strategic Trust Territory

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

of the Pacific Islands - Micronesia. The Security Council in 1947 entrusted that Territory to the temporary administration of the United States. Under the Trusteeship Agreement, which was unanimously confirmed by the Security Council, the United States, as Administering Authority, undertook the obligation to create conditions making it possible for the people of Micronesia to exercise, freely and without any interference from outside, their inalienable right to self-determination and genuine independence, on the basis of the maintenance of the unity of the Territory. In fact, however, throughout the 40 years of its administration, the United States has designed every one of its activities in the Territory to deprive the Micronesian people of their right to genuine freedom, unity and independence. Since the very end of the Second World War, the United States has obstinately pursued one goal, and one goal only, in Micronesia: the perpetuation of United States domination of the Mariana, Caroline and Marshall Islands - in order to consolidate the strategic position of the United States in the Western Pacific basin and, therefore, to have ready access to the Asian continent. To that end, the United States has openly disregarded the legitimate interests and inalienable rights of the people of Micronesia. Yet the United States voluntarily undertook the obligation, under the Trusteeship Agreement and the United Nations Charter, to implement for the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands the basic objectives of the International Trusteeship System, as set forth in the Charter. Those basic objectives, which remain unimplemented, are the following:

"to further international peace and security,

"to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence ...

"to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion ...".

Moreover, the United States has grossly violated the mandate given it by the United Nations to administer the Trust Territory. It is carrying out in regard to the Territory an annexationist policy that is in contradiction with the Trusteeship Agreement, the United Nations Charter and the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

For a long time now the United States has had plans to annex Micronesia and turn this Trust Territory into a military, strategic bridgehead of the Pentagon in the Western Pacific. One need refer only to the documents of the Cairo Summit Conference of the Western Allies in 1943, and the documents of the San Francisco Conference that drafted the United Nations Charter, as well as the statement by President Truman of the United States at the United Nations General Assembly session in London in 1946. One can refer also to a memorandum by the Secretary of Defense of the United States, Henry Stimson, to the Secretary of State of the United States, as well as to observations of other United States leaders. The leitmotif of all those documents and statements is the same: the Micronesian Islands "must belong to the United States; the United States must have absolute authority in the consolidation and the administration of these islands". That quotation is taken from a book written by Henry Stimson and McGeorge Bundy and entitled "In Active Service In Peace And War".

Based on that policy, the United States - even before it had been entrusted by the United Nations with the administration of this Trust Territory - had turned part of Micronesia into its own nuclear testing ground, its own nuclear laboratory. The negative consequences of these unlawful actions by the United States are now bearing fruit. They have brought suffering to the indigenous inhabitants of Micronesia and will continue to do so for a long time to come.

The real goal of the United States administration of the Trust Territory has not been to prepare the people for self-determination and independence, as provided in the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement, as well as in the decolonization Declaration. The real goal of United States trusteeship was set forth formally and officially by President Kennedy of the United States on 18 April 1962 in Memorandum No. 145, entitled "Actions to Ensure National Security". That Memorandum, signed by President Kennedy, set forth as United States policy the linking of Micronesia to the United States by permanent ties within a United States political framework. That is the goal that the United States Administration, as well as United States diplomacy in the United Nations, has worked to achieve in Micronesia since April 1962 - not the implementation of the obligation solemnly undertaken by the United States before the United Nations and its Security Council under the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

In the introduction to the report of his well-known mission,
Mr. Anthony M. Solomon wrote:

"In accordance with the well-established goal of the United States, Memorandum No. 145 called for the rapid development of the region in order to bring its political, economic and social standards into line with a future permanent association".

The Solomon report set forth the reasons why the United States Administration was obliged at the time to take steps to accelerate actions designed to perpetuate United States consolidation of Micronesia. The report said:

"For various reasons, during the almost 20 years of United States control of those Territories, the living conditions in many respects have further deteriorated. As a result, criticism of the United States Administration there is constantly increasing in the United Nations and the United States and among the Micronesians."

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

The author of the report on the mission sent by the United States President to Micronesia puts forward the detailed reasons why the United States was taking measures to annex Micronesia once and for all. He writes in this regard:

"Despite the lack until very recently of serious concern for the fate of this Territory, Micronesia - it is claimed - is extremely important to the United States for security reasons. We cannot give this Territory up. At the same time, the United States has less and less time in the sense that soon we may remain the only country still administering a Trust Territory. The time may come - and will very soon - when pressure in the United Nations on the issue of ending the status of Micronesia will come about and will prove to be more than just discouraging for the United States."

Indeed, in recent years the United States has become the only Power which has not granted independence to its Trust Territories. But at that time, 20 years ago, the plans for annexing Micronesia were carefully worked out and carried out by Washington without the knowledge of the United Nations and by getting around the Security Council and the Trusteeship Council, with the quiet connivance of the allies of the United States which were members of the Trusteeship Council.

In the report of the Solomon mission of 9 October 1963, a whole series of methods is set forth that were subsequently carried out with respect to the Trust Territory by United States diplomacy. This led to the state of affairs in which today the Territory has been split up into four territorial entities, upon which neo-colonialist status has been imposed.

The statements by United States representatives in the Trusteeship Council to the effect that there are anti-Charter activities going on in the Trust Territory which are somehow in the interest of the Micronesian people, as expressed during the so-called referendums and plebiscites staged by the Administering Authority, do not stand up to any kind of criticism. All this is a propaganda show and neo-colonialist fiction, and is very far from a genuine manifestation of the will of the Micronesian people and has nothing whatsoever in common with free self-determination for the people of Micronesia.

To confirm this, it should suffice to look at several recommendations of the President of the United States from the report of the Solomon mission to Micronesia in 1963.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

One of these says, for example, that it is necessary to increase the annual United States Congress allocations to Micronesia. However, this should be done in such a way that "the programmes in Micronesia and the related expenditures do not lead to any significant development of self-sufficiency in this Territory".

Is this not yet another convincing indication that the United States, as Administering Authority, intentionally and artificially held up the economic, political and social development of the Trust Territory and thus intentionally undermined and disrupted the vitality of the traditional Micronesian economic sectors.

It was noted very correctly at this session of the Council by a petitioner from the United States National Committee for Radiation Victims resulting from United States nuclear tests in the Trust Territory, that:

"Today in the Trust Territory, with more than 90 per cent of Micronesia's economy deriving from annual congressional appropriations, it is hardly a mystery that the recommendations contained in the Solomon Report have become a de facto reality." (T/PV.1584)

The Solomon report to the United States President noted with regret that "both American and Micronesian officials are still thinking in terms of the independence of Micronesia and evidently very few efforts have been made to teach the Micronesians to think in terms of permanent future ties to the United States."

This process of teaching the Micronesians to get used to the thought of the inevitability of their countries being swallowed up by the United States has been systematically continued over the last 20 years.

The Micronesians themselves and United Nations bodies have constantly noted that the Micronesian people has become less self-sufficient than before American trusteeship. Fishing in the lagoons of Micronesia is in the hands of American and other foreign companies; agriculture on the islands has deteriorated because it is more profitable for foreign companies to bring in ready-made products to the Trust Territory.

One of the Micronesians speaking in an earlier session of the Trusteeship Council openly stated that the Administering Authority considers the development of the Trust Territory not to be its own obligation, in terms of ensuring the economic

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

independence of Micronesia, but rather considers it to be a lever for exerting pressure for the conclusion of an agreement on the future political status of Micronesia.

The New York University faculty member, Ms. Katrin Lutz, speaking in a sub-commission of the United States Congress in September 1984 stated that the policy being carried out by the United States of holding up the development of the Territory has led to a situation where many inhabitants of the Territory are no longer involved in fisheries or the economy, but are forced to exist solely by means of subsidies granted by the United States Government.

The deputy head of the organization "Doctors for social responsibility", Mary Lord, stated before the same sub-commission of the United States Congress that throughout Micronesia

"the physical infrastructure of roads, hospitals, energy and water supply systems and sanitary systems has so far not even reached the level existing before the Second World War. The lamentable state of the water and sewage systems creates a serious threat to the health of the population, which suffers from such nineteenth-century diseases as cholera and tuberculosis."

The Administering Authority and its representatives in the field, in accordance with Memorandum 145, have constantly instilled in the inhabitants of Micronesia the thought of the futility of prospects of their own independent economic and cultural development and the inability of the people to have an independent existence without integration with the United States.

The international community is familiar with the fact that for many years the people of Micronesia have been waging an unrelenting struggle to be the masters of their own fate in their country. In the talks about the future status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands which have been going on for a number of years between the United States and a delegation from the United Congress of Micronesia, Washington has been trying to impose on the Micronesians the sort of status which would establish full control by the Americans over the Trust Territory. The United Congress of Micronesia at that time rejected the form of association with the United States according to Puerto Rican model and unambiguously came out in favour of maintaining the unity of the Marshall, Caroline and Mariana Islands.

When the first attempt made by the United States to impose its will on the Micronesians was unsuccessful, then the American trustees dissolved the United Congress of Micronesia and applied to the Trust Territory the old, well-tried dictum of the colonizers - divide and rule.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

Further talks on the future status of the Trust Territory were imposed by Washington on the Micronesians and they took place in an atmosphere of overt pressure diktat by the United States and completely ignored the vital interests of the Micronesians. At Washington's demand, these negotiations were secret in nature, and even today talks between Palau and Washington continue to take place in an atmosphere of strict secrecy.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

They were carried out with an unequal situation in the cases of both parties to them, without any agreement and without even participation on the part of the United Nations, the Trusteeship Council, the Special Committee on Decolonization or the Security Council.

After Washington's failure to impose conditions on the Micronesians which would be advantageous to the Americans, the United States decided to dismember the single Territory of Micronesia and to swallow it up piecemeal. In assessing the actions of the United States at the negotiations on the future political status of Micronesia, one of the representatives of the islands, Bailey Olter, stated publicly:

"Who can seriously believe that it is better to have six or seven Micronesian mini-States rather than a single integrated Micronesia? We, the Micronesians, were unable to resist the policies of the United States which were aimed at dividing up our Territory. We have been unable to avoid this division solely as a result of the actions of the United States."

The Soviet Government has frequently put forward its position regarding the policy of the United States towards Micronesia and has spoken out against its actions virtually to annex the strategic Trust Territory of the United Nations, the Pacific Islands. In a Tass statement of 12 August 1983, inter alia, it stated:

"The neo-colonialist status which has been imposed on individual parts of Micronesia under the guise of a so-called commonwealth for the Mariana Islands, a so-called free association for Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands, is simply an illegal attempt to decide the fate of the peoples by methods which are characteristic of the worst times of colonial sway, which have decidedly been condemned in numerous decisions of the United Nations."

The Soviet Union has also frequently had occasion to draw the attention of the United Nations and its Secretary-General to facts attesting to illegal anti-Charter activities on the part of the Administering Authority in the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. It has demanded that they be stopped and that the people of Micronesia be guaranteed its unimpeded right to genuine independence and freedom in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on decolonization. This fundamental position of the Soviet Union has also been expounded in statements which have been published as official documents of the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The illegal actions of the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory are in flagrant contradiction with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

Colonial Countries and Peoples, which was adopted by an absolute majority of Members of the United Nations, and in particular with the paragraph which reads:

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

World public opinion has evinced particular concern over the military plans, activities and undertakings of the United States which affect both the present and future of these Territories. Washington has not concealed its desire to acquire exclusive rights to military presence in those Territories. The United States has imposed on the populations of individual parts of the Trust Territory compacts and long-term military agreements, according to which the Pentagon can create, maintain and expand testing grounds for testing missile technology on the islands, naval bases, strategic airbases, and other military sites, and create stockpiles of nuclear, chemical and other types of weapons of mass destruction.

In other words, the entire policy of Washington towards Micronesia is aimed at permanently maintaining and strengthening the military control exercised by the United States over tremendous regions of the Pacific Ocean and at strengthening its military and strategic position in that part of the world.

The militarization which has already been and still is being carried out by the United States in Micronesia, and particularly the plans to make military use of these Territories in the future, by locating nuclear, chemical and other forms of weapons of mass destruction there, represents a direct threat to Micronesia and to the entire Pacific region, and also runs counter to the active desire and aspiration of the Pacific States to create a non-nuclear zone in the southern part of the Pacific Ocean.

All this represents an instance of the United States flouting one of the fundamental tasks of the trusteeship system which, according to the Charter of the United Nations, is to further international peace and security. How can international peace and security be furthered when the island of Tinian, which is part of the Mariana Islands, from which the American bombers took off to drop atom bombs on the Japanese towns of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, is now being turned by the Pentagon into a stockpile of nuclear warheads and other means of mass destruction and when the Pentagon is modernizing another airbase in Saipan which is also located on the Mariana Islands?

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

Another part of the Trust Territory, the Marshall Islands, has been turned, against the wishes of its indigenous population, and in accordance with the desires of the American trustees, into an American nuclear testing ground. The result of this has been that part of the islands has been completely wiped from the face of the earth, and in the atolls of Bikini and Enewetak there is such a high degree of radioactivity that, as studies have shown, it is impossible for the indigenous population to engage in agriculture. This will continue during the lives of at least two generations, that is to say, for 30 to 60 years, and it will take no less than 125 years to decontaminate Bikini and the other atolls from the radioactive waste. The spectre of death continues to hover today over many Micronesians and no one knows how long this will continue.

The Kwajalein Atoll, with its laguna and numerous islands, has been converted by the Pentagon into the main military base on the Marshall Islands and is being used by the military as a testing ground for testing intercontinental ballistic missiles launched from the West Coast of the United States, and is already being used in Washington's plans for the preparation of the so-called Star Wars.

Those who took part in the session of the Trusteeship Council as advisers to the United States delegations of Micronesians said that the people of Micronesia suffered privations during two world wars, when its Territory was turned into a battlefield, and that now it wishes to rid itself of the threat of war.

Do these Micronesians realize that all their privations during the Second World War will prove to be microscopic in comparison with the danger which is inherent in the location on their Territories of up-to-date American nuclear, chemical and other forms of weapons of mass destruction?

The simple fact that there was a breakdown of a nuclear reactor at Three-Mile Island in the United States created a threat to the people's health and radioactive contamination over a wide area. Nuclear weapons, on the other hand, are a thousand, if not a million times more dangerous.

Did this ever occur to the Micronesians who, under pressure from the American authorities, signed the Compact and the accompanying military agreements? The Micronesians in Palau valiantly continue their struggle against nuclear danger. The United States is planning to create a major base for atomic submarines and for the stockpiling of nuclear, chemical and other weapons of mass destruction in its Territory and also intends to set up a testing ground for carrying out military exercises and manoeuvres, for which purpose tremendous parcels of land have been seized from the population of Palau.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

The American Admiral, David Birt, who is lording it over the Palau archipelago, unabashedly stated that, if necessary, all 14,000 inhabitants of Palau would be deported, as were the inhabitants Bikini, Enewetak and Kwajalein.

In case there is today one representative left in the Trusteeship Council or the United Nations as a whole who has any doubt about the range of United States military plans in the Trust Territory of Micronesia, we shall quote some excerpts from statements made only a month ago by James Kelly, United States Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, in various committees of the United States Congress. He said:

"As we have had occasion to state previously, the Compact is in accordance with the strategic interests of the United States, since it contains military clauses which we believe are most important for us. For an unlimited length of time it would prohibit other countries from making use of the territories and waters around the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia. It would also guarantee the further utilization of the missile testing ground in Kwajalein.

"Furthermore, if Palau accepted it, the Compact would also give us unlimited rights in the case of Palau. Those rights may prove to be important if we are refused access to the bases in the Philippines."

He also said the following in sub-committees of the United States Congress:

"Your sub-committees are aware of the tremendous importance of our programmes for strategic missiles and studies in the field of anti-missile defence. To a large extent, these programmes depend on the testing ground in Kwajalein for development and testing, including the periodic testing of the effectiveness of the older systems. Our activities in Kwajalein are regulated by the interim use agreement, which will expire in September of this year. It is essential that before then the agreement is confirmed, since it and the agreements connected thereto will ensure us access for the next 30 years.

"We assume that the testing ground will be necessary also in the next century, since it is located at an optimum distance from California, has excellent observer posts, a shallow lagoon from which recoverable parts of the missiles can be retrieved and positions for the launching of interceptors. It is impossible to reproduce such a combination anywhere else in the world. In any event, if the important equipment were transferred elsewhere that would entail tremendous expenditure - approximately \$560 million of non-recurrent expenditure and \$200 million of recurrent expenditure.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

"If the testing ground is required after the expiration of 30 years then, as we see it, we can draw up an agreement to prolong the use of Kwajalein by the United States. What we need now is a guarantee that we can use the site without the necessity for the question of granting us access to be reviewed every few years."

That is not the only admission made in the United States Congress. The same representative of the Pentagon said:

"It is possible that our security interests may be satisfied on the basis of other agreements, including independence."

I should like to emphasize that - including the possibility of independence.

"But it is quite clear that free association gives us firmer guarantees that those interests will be respected on a long-term basis."

By the way, they constantly seek to convince the Micronesians that something threatens them and that they need to be protected. However, he says:

"At the present time, I do not foresee any specific threats. However, I know that in the southern part of the Pacific there are a number of areas of political ambiguity; therefore, we need to have long-term prohibitions in the agreement and also allied agreements.

"In conclusion, on behalf of the Department of Defense, I urge you to approve the Compact as quickly as possible, as it was drawn up in the course of the negotiations and approved by those who took part in voting among the representatives of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands."

Those statements by an official of the United States Department of Defense quite clearly refute the hasty statements made by United States representatives in the Trusteeship Council to the effect that there is no military activity by the United States in Micronesia; that there are simply a few engineering units there, 13 persons who are building bridges and roads, and a coast guard unit consisting of a few seamen.

It is quite obvious that large-scale United States strategic military interests are heavily involved in Micronesia in connection with military preparations and even the star wars programme. Thus, the military activities now being carried out and those planned for the future in the Territory of Micronesia indicate that the United States intends to maintain and further strengthen its

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

control over vast tracts of the Pacific and to strengthen its military and strategic position in that part of the world, not only up to the end of the 20th century but for the unforeseeable future.

Such military activities by the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory, which is under the temporary administration of the United States, run counter to the interests of the people of Micronesia and the main purpose of the entire International Trusteeship System enshrined in Article 76 of the United Nations Charter - that is, to strengthen international peace and security. There can be no doubt that they run counter also to the active aspirations of the Pacific Island States to create an area of peace and a nuclear-free zone in the southern part of the Pacific.

The Soviet Government has frequently stated that those United States activities represent a serious threat to the security of peoples not only to Micronesia but to the countries of Asia and Oceania which are contiguous to that area, and might even lead to the creation of a new and serious source of tension.

One of the Micronesians who spoke in the Trusteeship Council as advisers in the United States delegation - clearly carrying out the task of praising the Compact - described that document as a magna carta. How can we react to that? The Compact treaty, the purpose of which is to deprive the people of Micronesia once and for all of their independence and turn that Territory into a testing ground for and storage place of American nuclear weapons, can really be regarded as a magna carta of neo-colonialism for Micronesia. According to that charter of neo-colonialism, the United States would maintain control in questions of defence, external relations and the finances of Micronesian formations. The Compact treaty is accompanied by separate mutual security pacts between the United States and the Marshall Islands and between the United States and the Federated States of Micronesia which, in conjunction with the military clauses of the Compact, make it virtually impossible for those parts of Micronesia to free themselves from the cage that the Pentagon has constructed around them or to change their neo-colonial status in any way - which is tantamount to United States annexation of those territories.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

Furthermore, the United States maintains its right to exercise a veto over all areas of life in Micronesia, over internal affairs, trade, external relations and even development programmes, if it deems such programmes to be in conflict with its security interests. The decision as to what is or what is not consonant with its security interests is also the prerogative of the United States. The opinion of the Micronesians is to be totally disregarded.

Such a situation completely nullifies even that limited degree of autonomy Micronesia now enjoys and that are merely mentioned in the Compact documents. Naturally, the Compact contains no provision at all to indicate that when it expires, or even before, the United States will help to facilitate the Micronesians' accession to sovereignty and independence. The Compact, in short, is a treaty of annexation and was signed under conditions of coercion or duress that reflect the flagrantly unequal and inequitable standing of each contracting party. The administering Power has violated the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement, article 6 of which makes it incumbent upon it to promote the economic advancement of the Trust Territory. Thus it has not created the conditions necessary for a genuine act of self-determination on the part of the population of Micronesia. All this corroborates the legal invalidity and, indeed, the illegality of the Compact and the plebiscites held on it under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the norms of contemporary international law.

The process of the dissolution of the colonial system after the Second World War could not bypass Oceania. In that area of the Pacific Ocean a number of countries gained independence and won their sovereignty: Western Samoa, Nauru, Tonga, Fiji, the Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Kiribati, Vanuatu and Papua New Guinea - whose representative was recently elected Chairman of the Fourth Committee at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

The question of Micronesia is an integral part of the problem of decolonization and the granting to peoples of their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. However, the question of altering the status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, which has been recognized in the agreement between the Security Council and the United States as a strategic area, cannot simply be determined according to the unilateral wishes of the Administering Authority and behind the back of the Security Council. According to Article 83 of the Charter,

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

"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."

In light of that, any unilateral action by the United States in Micronesia aimed at giving neo-colonialist status to certain individual parts of that Territory in the form of commonwealth or free association with the United States is unjust and without legal force.

It should also be noted that the programme of action for the full implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session in 1970 contains the following language:

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

That is an important provision, and it has been given broad support both in the 1970 programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration on decolonization and in the Plan of Action for the Full Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the Assembly at its thirty-fifth session in 1980.

On the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the creation of the United Nations and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Soviet delegation would like to reiterate that the United Nations and its Trusteeship and Security Councils should take urgent and effective steps to remove all the obstacles that have been set up by the Administering Authority aimed at preventing the political, economic and social development of a single, unified Micronesia and to create the conditions necessary to guarantee full freedom and independence to the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The PRESIDENT: The Council will now begin the hearing of closing statements by representatives of the Administering Authority. I call first upon Mr. Epel Ilon, Adviser to the Administering Authority from the Federated States of Micronesia.

Mr. ILON (Adviser): My Government would like to thank the President and all the members of the Council for giving us an opportunity to participate in the important work of the Council. Our attendance here each year gives us an ever-greater understanding of the functioning of the United Nations and interrelationships between nations. It is a valuable learning experience for our young nation and one which will prove quite useful as we enter into our new status in the international community. We are very appreciative of the Council's continuing dedication to the interests, welfare and future of our people. We would also like to acknowledge the assistance given to us by the United States Mission to the United Nations and, of course, the unqualified support of the Council's Secretary, Mr. Abebe, and his staff.

During the past two weeks our delegation has listened with great care and interest to the questions, comments and debate by and between the members of this Council. We have also listened to the sharp criticisms and concerns expressed by numerous petitioners in their exhaustive presentations.

With respect to the latter, Ambassador Feldman of the United States and some of the other members of this Council have attempted to correct many of the far-too-numerous errors and misinterpretations presented by the petitioners. I will not undertake another detailed examination and rebuttal of these errors and misinterpretations. We would, however, like to associate ourselves with the efforts made to set the record straight.

Frankly, we were appalled by many of the remarks made by petitioners. We were called minorities suffering from discrimination. We were compared to inhabitants of bantustans and slaves. We, in fact, are not minorities, but proud peoples with effective control, even today, over our own lives and islands. We were told that in the opinion of the petitioners free association - as originated by us and now embodied in the Compact of Free Association and ratified by the clear, strong and free choice of our people - does not meet United Nations requirements in order to terminate the Trusteeship. We have been told that we are not ready for free association and termination of the Trusteeship because our economy and health and education status have not been sufficiently developed, again in the opinion of the petitioners. We have been told that the Compact negotiation process has divided the Micronesian people into antagonistic factions - while I have sat in this room next to my close friends and neighbours from Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Northern Mariana Islands and we have looked at each other in bewilderment.

(Mr. Ilon, Adviser)

Who are these self-appointed guardians of the Micronesian Islands? They are not Micronesians. They have not been elected or appointed by the Micronesian people as our representatives. They claim to be our protectors, but against whom? Do they wish to protect us from the United States, which we have freely chosen as our friend and future partner in free association? No, it is something more. They wish to protect our people against their own duly elected Governments and leaders, and even to protect our people against themselves. They seem to care more about their preconceived notions and philosophies, using this forum to voice their concerns on international issues without the legitimate standing to do so. They do not choose to focus on the real needs and aspirations of the Micronesian people. In fact, it is obvious that they have little real familiarity with our islands and people. As we have said before, those who truly desire to assist the Micronesian people in their efforts to achieve a better life and international status must begin by standing with us in support of what we have worked so hard to achieve during the last 20 years.

Perhaps we have been too harsh in our criticisms of petitioners. Many may believe in their own hearts that they are doing the right thing for the Micronesian people, and we understand this Council's commitment to giving a full opportunity to all who wish to speak, but we, the Micronesians, sometimes feel almost disregarded by this body; isolated, behind closed doors, alone. Sometimes we feel that the Council gives a disproportionate amount of time, attention and credence to petitioners, time which should be spent listening to the Micronesians, who, better than anyone, can tell the Council what is best for ourselves. Again, I apologize if I have seemed too harsh and direct.

I would like to turn briefly to the question of the Compact of Free Association in relation to the several United Nations resolutions and international law precedents mentioned during this session. Our own analyses over a number of years have led us to a different conclusion from that expressed by some petitioners. Ambassador Feldman's definition of the attainment of self-governing status - that the one absolute, fundamental international criterion for self-government is freedom of choice - coincides with our own feelings on this matter. Our people have made their choice. In the 1983 plebiscite, observed by this body, they strongly approved the Compact of Free Association as an act of self-determination and with a full understanding of the meaning of free association and the other alternatives available to our people.

(Mr. Ilon, Adviser)

This Council should continually reflect on the fact that the plebiscite was the culmination of a long and careful process of analysis, negotiation and political development by the Micronesian people. In the mid 1960s the various options for our future political status were carefully considered and widely discussed throughout Micronesia. Finally, in 1969, our Joint Committee on Future Political Status informed the United States that the Micronesian people wished to pursue a free-association relationship and articulated four fundamental principles for this relationship: first, that sovereignty in Micronesia resides in the people of Micronesia and their duly constituted Government; secondly, that the people of Micronesia possess the right of self-determination and may, therefore, choose independence or self-government in free association with any nation or organization of nations; thirdly, that the people of Micronesia have the right to adopt their own constitution and to amend, change or revoke any constitution or government plan at any time; and, finally, that free association should be in the form of a revocable compact terminable unilaterally by either party.

The Compact of Free Association was supported by our people largely because of its consistency with these four fundamental principles.

We think that our choice of free association is the right choice, the best alternative for our young nation at this point in its development. Some observers have said that independence is the only logical, acceptable alternative for the Micronesian people. Full independence was an alternative available to us, is an alternative available to us now, and will be an alternative available to us in the future. That is a decision and choice for future generations of Micronesians to make. Again, as our representative said earlier, whether or when the Federated States of Micronesia wishes to become fully independent, that is our choice and no one else's.

In our opening remarks we reported on progress being made in the United States Congress in ratifying the Compact of Free Association. Even as this Council has been meeting, progress has continued on the ratification process. On 14 May the House Committee on Foreign Affairs reported favourably on the Compact. Dissatisfaction has been expressed about the formal absence of the Compact document before this body. We agree. We must once again urge the United States Congress expeditiously to complete its ratification process so that we can initiate the last step in the process necessary to give full recognition to our act of self-determination.

(Mr. Ilon, Adviser)

During this session much has been said about the level of economic, social and educational development in Micronesia. As we ourselves have said, the Federated States of Micronesia has not progressed to the level possible or desirable. Some have used this status of development to argue against termination of the trusteeship until our development is completed. Others have argued for amendments to the Compact of Free Association. Still others have said that our act of self-determination was perhaps flawed, since our present economic dependence on the United States may have precluded meaningful consideration of political alternatives.

Development is an ongoing process. One of the primary reasons our people voted for the Compact of Free Association was our economic dependence on the United States, not - I repeat, not - because we were forced to accept free association as a result of our economic dependency, but because the Compact puts the means within our grasp to reduce and soon eliminate this dependency.

(Mr. Ilon, Adviser)

As one petitioner observed, free association can stimulate economic development or it can create even more dependency, depending - and I stress "depending" - on Micronesian and United States implementation of the Compact. We think that that observation is accurate. The decision is ours. Let me assure this Council that the Federated States of Micronesia and the United States are fully committed to increased economic development in the Federated States of Micronesia and reduced dependency on the United States. It will not be an easy task and it will take time, but ultimately we shall achieve a far more substantial level of economic self-sufficiency.

Let us not use economic and social conditions in Micronesia as a pretext for denying the political status and the means for achieving the better life that my people have chosen. Some have observed that economic conditions in Micronesia are far worse in 1985 than they were prior to the formation of the trusteeship. This is simply not true. For, however long it has taken, the basic infrastructure necessary for economic development has been completed or is under construction or planning. What is more important is that the Administering Authority has put us squarely in control of our own development, and it is we who will reap the benefits of that development.

Reference was made in our opening statement to our first national development plan, which was adopted in January of this year. The plan contains a wide range of development programmes and projects in areas such as fisheries, agriculture, mining, forestry, industrial development, transportation and tourism. These plans are realistic measures based on sound economic planning and will be achievable through our own efforts and the financial contributions to be made by many, including the United States under the Compact. We are already beginning to see the fruits of our efforts in the increased interest shown by private investors. We would also like to acknowledge past and anticipated contributions to our development from other countries, particularly Japan, in the form of support for our agriculture and fisheries development programmes.

We subscribe to the proposition that economic development goes hand in hand with social development. While we have certain shortcomings in the areas of health and education, we will have the means to continue improvements in these priority areas, and our ability to do so has been clearly demonstrated.

Finally I should like to make some brief comments on the working paper entitled "Outline of conditions in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands". The report is of course quite comprehensive, but, as with all attempts to catalogue

(Mr. Ilon, Adviser)

progress, it has been overtaken by rapid events. For example, since the time-frame in which the report was written, State constitutions have been adopted by the people of Kosrae and Pohnpei, and a draft constitution will be put before the voters in Truk early next year. The State Court in Kosrae has been organized and is fully operational, completing our governmental organization at both the State and national levels. Also, as we remarked earlier in this session, substantial improvements have been made in our capability to collect, compile and analyse statistical data, which is an essential foundation for sound economic planning and management decision-making. We hope that the final report will reflect these and other matters of significant progress.

In closing, I should like to repeat the request we made last year and on the opening day of this session. We strongly urge this Council to begin making preparations now for termination of the trusteeship.

In his opening statement President Nakayama said that he was more confident than ever that our Governments and our people were ready for termination of the Trusteeship and entry into full self-government in free association with the United States. "They have spoken", he said,

"with a strong and clear voice in the plebiscite, and with a full understanding and commitment to the future which they desire. We have a full, functioning constitutional Government, and now, with completion of the Compact negotiations, we have the means within our grasp to ensure sustained economic growth and social progress.

"...

"The trusteeship was not intended to last for ever, and its purposes have been fulfilled. It is now time to terminate the trusteeship, for our people to regain full control over their lives and destinies, and for our country to take its proper place in the community of nations.

"...

"We now request your support in taking the next logical step in our progress towards our goal." (T/PV.1581, p. 20)

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Herman Guerrero, Adviser to the Administering Authority for the Northern Mariana Islands.

Mr. GUERRERO (Adviser): As usual, it has been worth-while and enlightening to be present at a session of the Trusteeship Council. We are pleased to have been able to be here to offer our remarks to the Council, to hear the

(Mr. Guerrero, Adviser)

remarks of other Micronesian representatives, to learn of the concerns of the several petitioners that appeared, and to listen to the questions and responses of the Council members.

The Administering Authority recommended that a United Nations mission visit the Micronesian entities this summer. The people of the Northern Mariana Islands look upon such visits with enthusiasm.

In closing our presentation before this Council, we wish to express our complete confidence that this body will develop and implement effective responses to the concerns and issues presented here with the same thoughtfulness and dedication that this Council has traditionally brought to matters before it. We have told the Council that in the seven years since we entered into a political status agreement with the United States of America the economy of our islands has prospered, that we have been able to improve and expand Government services and that we have been able to support a steadily increasing portion of the costs of such developments from local revenues. The successes to date can and should be attributed to the combination of the democratic principles of self-government and the strategy for development and political interaction which are embodied in our Covenant with the United States.

As the Council is aware, the popularly elected Government of the Northern Mariana Islands, both the legislature and the administration, are responsible under United States law and our Commonwealth Constitution for almost all spheres of government, the well-known exceptions being foreign affairs and defence. This very important local autonomy - planned, negotiated and now implemented - has made it possible for us to develop and implement sound laws and policies that are responsive to local concerns and conditions and which foster social and economic growth at a pace and in a manner appropriate to the needs of the people of the Northern Mariana Islands.

None the less, we are neither totally autonomous nor completely dependent. We have in fact entered into a close relationship with the United States. This relationship was widely acclaimed by our people at the time of the plebiscite of June 1975, and it is still widely acclaimed. It is a political relationship that depends for its continued success on the procedures for interaction being embodied in our Covenant with the United States.

Several difficult and complicated issues have developed for our people over the past few years. They were referred to in some detail in the opening remarks to this Council of Lieutenant Governor Pedro Tenorio on 13 May.

(Mr. Guerrero, Adviser)

The subjects involved include alternatives to the internal revenue code as our local system of taxation, local control of immigration and importation of skilled alien workers, control and management of local fishery and seabed assets, adjudicated but unpaid war claims, third-country economic assistance and exclusion of local garment products from the duty-free and quota-free provisions of the tariff schedules of the United States. Our political status agreement with the United States provides several procedures for addressing and resolving such issues. It is those procedures which, along with self-government, to which we have just alluded, provide the basis of our continued successful development.

Earlier this month, we invoked one of those procedures, specifically that part of Section 902 of the Covenant providing for the designation of special representatives by our Governor and the President of the United States. We are pleased that our initial soundings of United States officials indicate that our request will receive a sympathetic hearing.

It is the serious and conscientious good faith effort of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the United States to implement such mechanisms established in our political status agreement that gives real and practical meaning to that agreement.

With regard to another very important agreement that has been discussed a great deal during this session of the Council - the proposed Compact of Free Association - we wish to reiterate what we have said before. We unequivocally support the speedy adoption of the Compact by all concerned. We believe it will usher in a new era of prosperity and greater recognition of the goals of political self-determination envisioned in the objectives of the United Nations Trusteeship Agreement.

Finally, the Northern Mariana Islands join the leaders of the Federated States of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands in urging the Council to address the matter of the Trusteeship Agreement. We in the Northern Mariana Islands drafted our political status in anticipation of a closer relationship with the United States. We firmly believe that it is the right of the people of Micronesia to determine their own political status. We therefore ask the Council to support and, above all, respect the freely expressed wishes of the Micronesian people.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Oscar DeBrum, Special Adviser to the Administering Authority from the Marshall Islands.

Mr. DeBRUM (Special Adviser): We thank the Council for the opportunity to make a concluding statement. We were asked to reply in this statement to the issues raised by the petitioners and members of the Council concerning the Marshall Islands. Simultaneously, we will also make a strong statement in joining other members of the freely associated States in the Northern Marianas asking that the Council respect our determined goals of home rule and free association with the United States and to that end terminate the last Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. We also urge the United States Congress in the strongest possible terms to approve the Compact of Free Association. I will go paragraph by paragraph and question by question so as to simplify my responses for the benefit of the Council.

Two issues were raised by the counsel for the people of Bikini, Mr. Jonathan Weisgall. One concerned Ejit Island in Majuro Atoll. This matter was also raised by the representative of France. Mr Weisgall stated that the Bikinians residing now on Ejit were resettled there because the island was "viewed as public land".

This is incorrect. In 1978, the Administering Authority determined that Bikini Atoll was unsafe for continued habitation and that those living there would have to be relocated. At that time, several Bikinian families were permitted to settle on Ejit Island. Those families had refused to resettle on Kili Island because of an internal dispute with the Bikini-Kili Council. For that reason, permission was granted on a temporary basis for them to reside on Ejit Island.

These families would have preferred to reside on Kwajalein Atoll. However, there was no land available for them there. After they were settled on Ejit Island, many of their extended family members joined them, increasing their numbers to what it is today, approximately 200.

We have requested that the Administering Authority confirm that Ejit Island is public land. However, they have been unable to do so. According to the attorney of the Administering Authority, Ejit Island appeared on the Trust Territory public land inventory lists; however, further research is required before they can state with certainty that Ejit Island is or is not public land. According to a legal opinion prepared by an attorney for the Administering Authority, the traditional land-owners may have a colourable claim to Ejit Island. Notwithstanding the uncertainty of the title, it has been and remains the policy of the Government of the Marshall Islands to return public lands to those having rights to the land under Marshallese traditions and customs. We do this because the previous administering authority acquired public land by some dubious means.

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Adviser)

In the case of Ejit, our Government has taken no action to date to transfer title to those who would claim to be the traditional owners. It is the intent of my Government to resolve the issue in a fashion which could protect the interests both of those who own the land and of the Bikinians who need a temporary place to live until the Bikinis can be made habitable.

In this connection, we note that those whose lands are being used for the relocation of persons displaced under the nuclear testing programme can receive compensation from the Section 177 tribunal. We also note that, as we explained in our opening statement, the Bikinians, in March of this year, were able to reach a litigant-to-litigant settlement with the Administering Authority regarding the rehabilitation and resettlement of Bikini Atoll. Progress in the rehabilitation of Bikini Atoll may render the Ejit issue moot. At any rate, we believe that this matter is an internal one to be resolved in accordance with our constitutional process.

Another matter raised by Mr. Weisgall concerned the Section 177 Agreement and the Bikinians' lawsuit in the United States. It was stated that the Bikinians did not sign the Section 177 Agreement, which would settle their claim against the United States for \$75 million. We cannot emphasize too strongly that the Compact of Free Association, which incorporates the Section 177 Agreement, is an agreement signed by the Government of the Marshall Islands on behalf of all its people and approved by the people of the Marshall Islands in the United Nations observed plebiscite held in the Marshall Islands in September 1983. Hence the question of one special interest group signing the agreement does not arise. What is required and what occurred was that prior to the signing of the Agreement, the Government of the Marshall Islands consulted the affected people, and the people of the Marshall Islands approved the Agreement in a fair and open plebiscite. In fact, representatives of the people of Bikini, as well as those of Enewetak, Rongelap and Utirik, were included in our Government's delegation to negotiations of the nuclear claims agreement.

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Adviser)

Some attorneys have counselled our people to reject the Section 177 Agreement in favour of lawsuits. Our Government asked each of these attorneys if he was prepared to guarantee that he would be successful in securing at least \$150 million from the lawsuit. In each case the attorney evaded the question and failed to provide the requested guarantee. Our Government was faced with the choice of either gambling on the lawsuits or accepting a guaranteed settlement under the Section 177 Agreement. Our Government and the people of the Marshall Islands chose the Agreement. If the lawsuits had failed, there would have been no funds to care for those affected by the United States nuclear testing programme in the Marshall Islands.

The attorney for the people of Enewetak, Mr. David Anderson, raised the issue of Enewetak's not being able to do without the agricultural and food supplement programmes now provided by the United States Government. Under the Section 177 Agreement the people of Enewetak will receive funds to continue these programmes. As we informed this Council last year, the people of Enewetak will receive \$3.25 million annually during the first 15 years after implementation of the Section 177 Agreement, to a total of \$48.75 million.

Pursuant to an agreed minute developed by Mr. Anderson, the people of Enewetak may elect to assign their right to receive that stream of money for a present payment. This present payment would provide the people of Enewetak with at least \$25 million upon implementation of the Section 177 Agreement. Of this amount, \$10 million would go to pay claims; \$5 million would be set aside for a trust, the income of which would be used to continue the food supplement programme and the agricultural maintenance programmes now administered by the United States; and the remaining \$10 million would be available for the establishment of a perpetual trust, called the Enewetak fund. Seventy to 80 per cent of the interest generated by the Enewetak fund would be available for current use by the people of Enewetak during the first 15 years. At an annual interest rate of 10 per cent, this would produce between \$13 million and \$13.8 million for community projects or distribution directly to the people of Enewetak, as they deemed appropriate. Further, as a result of reinvesting 20 per cent to 30 per cent of the interest income from the Enewetak fund, the fund would grow to between \$13.4 million and \$15.5 million by the end of the first 15 years. This amount would be available for the needs of future generations.

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Adviser)

The present population of Enewetak is estimated to be 800. The expected population growth rate in the next 15 years is about 4 per cent per annum and the average family size is eight persons. With this information, we can estimate that from the \$10 million in claims money and the interest distributed from the Enewetak fund, the average annual per capita income of the people of Enewetak could be approximately \$1,454 during the first 15 years after implementation of the Section 177 Agreement. The average annual family income would be \$11,629. This is a considerable amount compared to the average annual family income of only \$1,926 for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, excluding the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as estimated by the 1980 census of the United States Government.

Although more work remains to be done, significant efforts have been made by the Administering Authority to replant Enewetak Atoll. We whole-heartedly sympathize with the problems faced by the people of Enewetak in restoring the productivity of their island. However, contrary to what Mr. Anderson stated, the reality is that the lost 1947 subsistence economy of Enewetak cannot be brought back. The population of Enewetak has grown eightfold and the dynamics of the economy have completely changed. Nowhere in the world has the pure subsistence economy survived or been reintroduced, however much the idealists may romanticize it. A more realistic and challenging task for the Enewetak people would be to harness the assistance they will receive under the Section 177 Agreement to strengthen their social, economic and political institutions to achieve greater self-reliance.

Mr. Anderson also alleged that our Government had issued a statement to the effect that the Enewetak people would not benefit from the \$30 million available under the Section 177 Agreement for medical services. This allegation is not true. No such statement has been issued or will be issued. The people of Enewetak, as well as all other Marshallese affected by the nuclear testing programme, will benefit from the medical services funded with this money on a non-discriminatory basis.

Senator Ataji Balos, from the Marshall Islands, raised three issues in his statement. First, he said that he preferred that the Marshall Islands enter into a closer association with the United States in the form of a commonwealth. This matter also was the subject of a question by the Council. In this connection, we wish to point out that over the last few years Mr. Balos has advocated with equal fervour free association, independence and commonwealth status. We believe that

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Adviser)

Mr. Balos is now calling for a commonwealth in hope of gaining favour with certain factions of the United States Government. We do not believe Mr. Balos has any genuine desire for commonwealth. We wish also to point out that the people of the Marshall Islands voted decisively in favour of the Compact of Free Association at the plebiscite held in September 1983. While 58 per cent of the voters voted in favour of the Compact of Free Association, less than 5 per cent voted in favour of a commonwealth.

A second point raised in the statement of Senator Balos related to the issue of whether the Republic of the Marshall Islands would be able to sign agreements with international agencies after the Compact came into effect. Contrary to what Senator Balos stated, our Government has not agreed under the Compact that the United States will handle the question of accession to international agreements and membership in international organizations, and this is not what the Compact provides. As Ambassador Feldman stated earlier, in free association with the United States we shall be able to sign the Treaty on the Law of the Sea and other international conventions and agreements.

In this connection, we would point out that if Senator Balos sincerely desired that our Government be in a position to enter into international agreements he would not advocate a commonwealth. Under commonwealth status the United States Federal Government would be responsible for all foreign affairs matters.

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Adviser)

A third point raised by Senator Balos referred to article IV of the Status of Forces Agreement subsidiary to the Compact. Senator Balos alleged that this clause "threatens both our present Marshallese workers and future employment opportunities" (T/PV.1583, p. 28)

on Kwajalein. That is not true. We wish to emphasize that under section 1 of article IV of the Agreement provision is made to require that preference be accorded to Marshallese in the recruiting of employees for the Kwajalein missile range.

Senator Balos also stated that under the Compact our civil aviation would be operated as part of the United States domestic system. Again, that is not true. Our own civil aviation authority, which now regulates civil aviation in the Marshall Islands, will continue to do so.

In his statement to the Council, Mr. Glenn Alcalay expressed his fear of the Marshall Islands Government's not being able to handle the functions of the nuclear claims tribunal. In response, we wish to point out two things. First, the Marshall Islands Government will have \$45.75 million from the interest of the \$150 million nuclear claims trust fund established under the Section 177 Agreement to pay claims adjudicated by the tribunal during the first 15 years, and the Government will have \$7.5 million to establish and operate the tribunal. No parallel can be drawn with the tragedy in Bhopal, India, where funds have yet to be identified to compensate the affected population for loss of life and damage to persons and property.

Secondly, the severe, health, economic, social and political problems which Mr. Alcalay alleged were faced by the Government of the Marshall Islands are no more than any newly independent Government in the world would face. Many countries which have become independent over the past four decades faced such problems before independence, and continue to face them. They, however, were not denied the opportunity to become self-governing nations because of them. To use a Marshallese analogy, a baby has to crawl before it can walk, and fall before it can walk properly. One does not carry the baby around for ever simply because of its having to go through those natural stages of human development. We showed ample evidence in our opening statement that the Government of the Marshall Islands is meeting those challenges squarely and has shown continuous progress in coping with them.

Mr. Alcalay also referred to the 1983 plebiscite and stated that in it "uninformed Marshallese voters were asked to vote 'blindly'" (T/PV.1584, p. 17). That was hardly the case. On the contrary, a comprehensive programme of political

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Adviser)

education was conducted throughout the Republic, and was available to all eligible voters, before the plebiscite was held. That was confirmed by the Visiting Mission of the Council which observed the plebiscite. We wish to quote the following excerpts from the Mission's report, which was later adopted by the Council:

"A lively political campaign accompanied the plebiscite. It was fought fairly; there was no violence; and everyone was able to express his or her views freely and openly ...

"The political education programme was most impressive both in planning and in execution ... Largely as a result of the work of the political education programme, the Marshallese were able to cast their votes with a knowledge of the major issues involved ...". (T/1865, paras. 51, 53)

We note also that Ambassador Feldman cited ample evidence earlier to show that, as part of our political education programme, particular efforts were made to bring to the attention of the voters the effect of the nuclear testing programme and the section 177 settlement.

Mr. Alcalay also raised the question of the procedure of payments to Kwajalein landowners under the Compact of Free Association. He asked that those payments be made directly to the landowners. That matter also came up earlier as a question from the representative of the United Kingdom. We wish to point out the following. First, the Compact of Free Association is an agreement between two Governments. Nowhere in the world has a foreign Government entered into direct contracts with individual citizens of another country to establish a military base in that particular country. Moreover, the money that our Government will receive under the Compact in respect of the use and development of Kwajalein Atoll will be paid to the Kwajalein Atoll landowners and the Kwajalein Atoll Development Authority, as set forth in the land use agreement and implementation agreements entered into by my Government and the landowners. Those agreements and their predecessors have been in effect since 1979. To date my Government has followed them to the letter, and not a penny of those funds has been diverted to other uses.

In this connection, I note also that my Government maintains the Kwajalein funds in separate trust funds prior to their distribution, as will be done in respect to the nuclear claims fund. In both situations, funds are provided to our Government by the Government of the United States and passed on to the appropriate recipients through a distribution mechanism established by our Government in accordance with its constitutional processes. Contrary to what Mr. Alcalay stated, the section 177 funds will not be paid directly to the individual recipients by the

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Adviser)

United States. Those funds will be paid to the Marshall Islands Government, which has established a mechanism for their distribution. Hence, there is no legal precedent for direct payment, as Mr. Alcalay claims. The distribution of such funds is the proper responsibility of the central Government.

Furthermore, we note that our Government has protected the interests of all the Kwajalein Atoll landowners, and would not permit one group of people to control funds belonging to others. The Kwajalein Atoll Corporation (KAC), represented before this Council by Senator Balos, has repeatedly attempted to gain control over funds due to the independent landowners - the Ten-Ten Group - who represent 20 per cent to 25 per cent of the Kwajalein landowners. The KAC has sought control over funds due to the Ten-Ten Group in order to deduct from them a percentage of its considerable administrative charges. The Ten-Ten Group has resisted such efforts by the KAC because it is not part of the KAC and does not benefit from KAC activities, and because the KAC has not been able satisfactorily to document its administrative expenses.

My Government is concerned that those funds going to the Kwajalein Atoll Corporation for further distribution to the people are not being used in the best interests of all the Kwajalein landowners. For example, in a recent court case it was revealed that the KAC had incurred high administrative costs for which it could not provide audited records. Further, we are informed by many Kwajalein landowners that the KAC is deducting as much as 50 per cent of their land-use payments for administrative expenses. My Government will renew its efforts to ensure that those funds are not misspent.

Mr. Alcalay referred to the existence of an export economy in Micronesia during the Japanese administration. It is hardly necessary for us to comment on that, as we agree with the remarks made by Ambassador Feldman earlier in respect of the matter. Mr. Alcalay alleged that a deliberate attempt had been made by the Administering Authority to develop a dependent economy in Micronesia. We are not aware of any such deliberate attempt. If in fact Mr. Alcalay believes that that was the case, he should be the first to support the Compact of Free Association, which provides funds for the enhancement of self-reliance in our economies. The fact of the matter is that over the last 100 years all countries have become economically dependent upon one another. Hence, what we have today is interdependence rather than dependence, not only in Micronesia, but in the world as a whole. I note also that we are making every attempt to reach our pre-war copra production levels through replanting and rehabilitation of our coconut groves.

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Adviser)

In our statement to the Council last year, we explained in full the specific provisions of the Section 177 Agreement and the dollar amounts to be distributed to the people of Bikini: \$75 million; Enewetak: \$48.75 million; Rongelap: \$37.5 million; and Utrik: \$22.5 million - as well as the funds available to be awarded by the Section 177 claims tribunal: \$45.75 million; the funds to operate the tribunal: \$7.5 million; and the funds available to our Government to purchase technical assistance from the United States to include in our health-care programmes and services related to the consequences of the United States nuclear testing programme in the Marshall Islands: \$30 million. The Section 177 Agreement does not cast our people adrift as Mr. Alacalay suggests, but provides for their needs. Further, we are not aware of any efforts by the Administering Authority to delete the Section 177 Agreement from the Compact of Free Association. We would oppose any such efforts.

We are very pleased to witness the concern shown for our welfare by some of the non-Micronesian petitioners, such as the representatives of the Micronesian Coalition, the United Methodist Office and the Minority Rights Group. However, we wish to point out the following to those groups.

First, the Compact of Free Association is a relationship which our people have chosen freely and through a democratic process. To quote the report of the Visiting Mission of this Council which observed the plebiscite of September 1983,

"We shall all long remember the patient queues of people at Majuro and Kwajalein waiting sometimes for hours in the sun and sometimes late into the night to cast their votes. There could be no more eloquent testimony to the faith of such people in the democratic election process and their determination to play their part in it". (T/1865, para. 59)

Moreover, in respect to the Marshall Islands the relationship of free association with the United States is fully compatible with the United Nations Charter, in that free association was freely chosen by the people of the Marshall Islands. That principle was reaffirmed by this Council last year.

Also last year, the Trusteeship Council reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Micronesia to self-determination. We wish to exercise that right and request that these special-interest groups operating in the United States respect us and our right to self-determination.

Secondly, we are not aware of any attempt on the part of the Administering Authority to divide the people of Micronesia as Mr. Alacalay and others suggest. On

(Mr. DeBrum, Special Adviser)

the contrary, under the administration of the Administering Authority the people of Micronesia were united for the first time under a single administration. Under the League of Nations, even the Japanese Government administered these countries as separate entities. It was also the Administering Authority which attempted to keep Micronesia one unified political entity. The reality of the situation is that the people of Micronesia differ from one another in language and culture and are separated by vast expanses of ocean. It is appropriate for us to recognize that and not force an artificial amalgamation on the peoples of Micronesia.

Despite those differences in heritage, we have mutual respect for each other and we have shown that we can work together. One example of such regional co-operation is the agreement we achieved in the Saipan Accords to pool our resources and efforts to ensure essential air service for our countries and to provide for other co-operative efforts.

Thirdly, we in the Marshall Islands are not a minority group as was suggested. We speak for the majority group in our country, which is almost 99 per cent of the population, and we see no parallel at all between our situation and that of the South African bantustan policy.

In this connection, we agree with the views expressed by Ambassador Feldman earlier. We wish to add that, much as we condemn the apartheid policy and sympathize with the cause of the Black majority in South Africa, we see no way in which the situation in Micronesia can be compared with the bantustan policy of South Africa.

Mr. Robert R. Solenberger in his petition requested enhanced United Nations technical assistance for the Micronesian countries. We whole-heartedly agree with this request, which supports our case for such assistance as set forth in our opening statement.

Finally, we wish to reiterate that we have reached the political, economic, social and educational standards to take on the responsibilities of determining our own destiny. If we were to wait until we reached the material standards of the Western world or the unreasonably high and subjective standards that the petitioners advanced, or until all the possible adverse consequences of the nuclear testing programme were known, we might have to wait until the end of time before we were able to reach our goal of self-determination. We will not wait. We ask that the trusteeship be terminated this year. We thank the Trusteeship Council for helping us in our determination to achieve that goal.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Victorio Uherbelau, Special Adviser to the Administering Authority from Palau.

Mr. UHERBELAU (Special Adviser): Palau's closing statement will be brief as we spoke at some length the other day following Ambassador Feldman's remarks in response to certain issues raised by the petitioners.

Before proceeding, however, my delegation wishes to extend its appreciation to members of this Council for expressing confidence in the ability of our elected government leaders to manage our constitutional Governments.

Certain issues have been raised during these past two weeks which we feel we must touch upon as well.

At the outset, the Palau delegation wishes to acknowledge with sincere gratitude the Administering Authority's repeated assurances in this Chamber that the United States never intended, nor does it have future plans, to use, test, dispose of or store nuclear, chemical or biological weapons or other harmful substances in our Micronesian vicinity. We are equally encouraged to learn that the Administering Authority does not intend to use the Micronesian ocean as a dumping ground for radioactive nuclear waste materials.

Questions have been asked regarding military or defence agreements subsidiary to the Compact of Free Association between the United States and the would-be freely associated States of Micronesia. Micronesia, by definition, is made up of tiny islands. And, as the Marshalls Chief Secretary stated yesterday, we are small and we admit we are weak militarily. We indeed are defenceless against any outside military aggression, or threat thereof, and depend upon foreign power to protect us.

(Mr. Uherbelau, Special Adviser)

Those who framed the Palau Constitution recognized Palau's incapability in defence and security matters. Accordingly, they wrote into our Constitution a provision for the delegation of certain governmental powers to another foreign country or international organization. My Government has concluded an Agreement regarding the Military Use and Operating Rights of the Government of the United States in Palau, pursuant to Title III of the Compact of Free Association. This was done not only in implementation of the Constitution but also in compliance with its provisions.

Just as my people have freely chosen to enter into a free association relationship with our current Administering Authority, so they have designated the United States, and no one else, to protect Palau militarily.

I submit that a security pact or arrangement between an Administering Authority and its former Trust Territory is not an uncommon occurrence after Trusteeship termination. This Council has witnessed similar arrangements between Western Samoa and New Zealand in 1962 and in the case of Papua New Guinea and Australia as well.

Lengthy discussions were held on criteria, norms or standards for a State, independence, self-determination, self-government or sovereignty. Relevant Chapters, Articles and sections of both the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement, including relevant General Assembly resolutions, were also cited.

Needless to say, this Council is the final judge, the ultimate arbiter of what those standards, norms or criteria are. The question is whether or not the Administering Authority has dispensed of its trust responsibilities accordingly and whether or not we, emerging nations in Micronesia, have fulfilled the steps or requirements necessary for self-determination. It should be clear by now that in both instances, the answer should be in the positive.

After all, we Micronesians have been preparing ourselves for self-government over the past 38 years with a full and clear understanding as to what is expected of us. Acts of self-determination for our people with respect to our future status preference have taken place. Our respective peoples have freely chosen free-association relationship with our current Administering Authority over other status options open and available to us. We ask, therefore, that that choice be recognized and respected.

(Mr. Uherbelau, Special Adviser)

As the British representative said this morning, this fifty-second session of the Trusteeship Council is a historic one, one during which the Micronesian Government representatives have informed the Council of their intent and readiness for a change of status. What remains, however, is a ratification of the Compact of Free Association constitutionally required by both the Administering Authority and our Government. Partial termination of the Trusteeship may be requested of this Council before the year ends for the Northern Marianas, for the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and for the Federated States of Micronesia. I wish I could say the same for Palau. But as we said in our opening statement, our time will also come, and we are confident that, working co-operatively with the Administering Authority, it will not be too long.

Some discussion was held also on the question of economic development, as though it were an overriding prerequisite to self-government or independence.

The pace of economic development in Palau has perhaps been slow. In the eyes of others, it may be inadequate at this point in time. But I must submit that economic development, like development in other fields, is a relative term and it is equally difficult to pinpoint as to when and at what stage a given country's economic development is sufficient. Every developing and underdeveloped country, including Palau, aims to achieve as high a level of economic self-reliance as possible. But economic development, in and of itself, should not be used as pretext to delay political autonomy and self-government.

When the Compact of Free Association takes effect in Palau, we will have steady and predictable levels of financial assistance from the United States for each of the 15 years. It will be up to the leaders of my Government to apply, utilize or otherwise invest such funds efficiently for government operation, for infrastructure development projects, and also to build a sound economic base for Palau's future growth. In other words, we will have the opportunity to make our own policy decisions, to establish our own priorities, to be master of our own ship. If we should fail in our developmental efforts, at least we would have learned from our own mistakes and have no one else to blame.

The present level of Palau's economic development is indeed adequate as a take-off point from which my Government can launch itself into the future.

(Mr. Uherbelau, Special Adviser)

Members of the Council are also concerned over regional co-operation amongst Micronesian States during the post-Trusteeship era. Let me assure the Council that co-ordinated efforts are indeed under way even now. Next month, representatives of freely associated States will be meeting in Guam to finalize an agreement for the establishment of a Micronesia-wide shipping commission. The primary duty of this commission will be to review applications from various shipping companies that wish to provide shipping services in the area. Similarly, discussions are ongoing for establishment of an air transportation authority for air services within the Micronesian region. The membership of that authority would include the Territory of Guam as well. Other co-operative efforts in the fields of tourism, fisheries and immigration are also being taken.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to inform the Council that my Vice-President, Mr. Oiterong, had to leave early for Washington to attend to other government business. He wanted me to extend to you and to members of the Council very best wishes for a productive session. We would also appreciate the Council extending an invitation to countries in the South Pacific, as it has done in the past to Fiji and Papua New Guinea, to accompany your Observer Mission to Micronesia sometime this year.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mrs. Janet McCoy, Special Representative of the Administering Authority and High Commissioner for the Trust Territory.

Mrs. McCOY (Special Representative): Once again we have come to the moment where we are to sum up our feelings and the conclusions resulting from the Trusteeship Council hearings.

This year the session has been a bit different from the three previous sessions which I attended. I have sensed more positive feelings of co-operation and sympathy from members of the Council and even many of the petitioners.

I should also like to express my very warm feelings to all members of the Trust Territory delegation who have faithfully remained throughout these two weeks and contributed so much to the understanding of the Council. Especially, I want to underscore the very strong feeling of unity of purpose which has come across through the discussions in this Chamber. We have seen all four constitutional Governments through their representatives here endorse a rapid termination and felt their sense of co-operation towards that end. I believe that it should be quite clear what it is that the people of Micronesia want: early termination according to the status agreements which they have negotiated and which were approved by their electorate.

We also look forward to resolution of the political status issue in Palau and gratefully acknowledge its representatives' support for termination for the other three entities in the interim. I believe that this positive, constructive attitude on the part of all these representatives of Micronesia should be clearly noted by the Council.

I wish to make a short comment about this year's petitioners. Many of them, some quite perennial in this Chamber, have voiced the same or similar complaints heard here over the years. They have again refused to recognize that the Micronesians themselves are making decisions according to democratic principles embodied in their own freely approved Constitutions. At the same time, I wish to acknowledge the changes that have taken place in the attitudes of some of the petitioners. Some now have come to the conclusion that termination is inevitable and that, while they still have reservations, they must recognize that they can no longer hold back the tide. We applaud this and look forward to their constructive assistance under terms to be determined by the Micronesians people themselves.

I think that the present political status goals of the peoples of the Territory contradict very strongly the allegation that the United States is trying to annex the islands. Free association is a free, friendly relationship, which can, in fact, be terminated by either or both parties. As far as the Marianas is

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

concerned, the people there have worked towards union with the United States since the early 1950s. In sum, we have living proof that the policies outlined in the Solomon report never became official policy.

We thoroughly concur with the statement made by the representative of France that communications are at the heart of any development plan. I simply wish the record to show that each of the Government centres at this time has a completely functioning commercial satellite communications system linking the islands with the outside world. In addition, work is moving along on improving internal telephone communications. Communication with the outer islands has been improved enormously, as we reported last year, through the use of solar-powered short-wave radios.

The Capital Improvement Program has made the improvement of docks and shoreside facilities a priority and, as I noted in my opening statement this year, there are international standard airports throughout the islands, along with many smaller ones either completed on outer islands or under construction, according to the priorities of the local constitutional Government. I am certain that the Visiting Mission will be quite impressed with the progress made in this field.

As I said in my opening statement, my office is continuing its efforts to reduce its size to the point at which we are able to continue to fulfil the legal requirements of the Trusteeship Agreement and applicable Federal laws until termination. Let me assure the Council that it is our intention to comply with our basic obligations while at the same time continuing our encouragement of the new Governments in their nation-building efforts.

I should like to take a moment to address several issues which were either overlooked or require additional comment.

Much to my surprise, the Administering Authority was not interrogated to the same degree as in the past concerning economic development. As a result, I believe that a few comments are in order. First, we have nearly \$400 million in capital improvement projects begun under the 1978 five-year Capital Improvement Program in various stages of completion. This has resulted in a network of paved roads in major centres, sewer and water systems, improved power, airport and port facilities, schools and hospitals.

As a result, over the past year or so we have seen a tremendous growth in relative terms of private and foreign investment. New hotels, small industries, agriculture and other areas of endeavour are beginning to surface. It has taken a

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

long time, but, keeping in mind that the policy of the Administering Authority has been to stimulate development along lines determined by the Micronesians themselves, the way is now clear for serious development. The five-year plans of each of the Governments, in line with Compact provisions, ensure that this development will take place in the best of circumstances and in line with determinations made by the people for whom the development is being designed.

We are not, of course, attempting to gloss over the real problems that still exist. We had expected to be required to respond to questions relating to the incidence of leprosy in Pohnpei and Truk. Although it was not required of us, because of the several allegations by petitioners, it seems appropriate to put some of the concerns in perspective.

First, the statement has been made that leprosy in the islands represents a major epidemic of outstanding proportions and that the Administering Authority has not taken the situation as seriously as it deserved.

The response is as follows. First, there is a problem with leprosy, no argument exists there. However, a recent report by the World Health Organization (WHO) puts quite a different light on the situation compared to the rather dramatic press release frequently cited by the petitioners. In his report, Dr. Mario Felszer, WHO representative and programme co-ordinator, noted that only 44 per cent of the new cases clinically diagnosed in the field through population surveys and self-referral have conclusive clinical evidence of leprosy. Translated to layman's language, this means that of those who were diagnosed in the field or reported themselves as having symptoms of leprosy only 44 per cent were conclusively proved to have the disease. In other words, there has been an over-dramatization of the situation based on early inconclusive information.

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

In addition the report concludes:

"Through the Federated States of Micronesia, the United States Public Health Service and the World Health Organization joint programme, all necessary measures are being taken to improve many aspects of leprosy control efforts in the Federated States of Micronesia. We are very optimistic about the future of our common effort to control leprosy in the Federated States of Micronesia."

I submit that the report of the World Health Organization should be considered as definitive.

I should like very much to address a very important issue raised by the representative of the United Kingdom in this morning's general debate. He very correctly emphasized the importance of family planning programmes in the long-range development perspective of the islands. It should be noted that the health services of all the Governments have a family-planning component and that many Micronesian health personnel have participated in training and actual programmes involving the United Nations Fund for Population Activities. We note also that, historically, the transition from perceiving large families as beneficial to perceiving the advantages of small families is not a swift progress. However, we are aware that as more women enter the work force more women receive higher education, and, as more organized economic development takes place, families are becoming smaller in some areas. I simply wish to assure the representative of the United Kingdom that this questions is not being overlooked but is a component of programmes throughout the Territory.

The question of foreign investment was raised this morning by the representative of the United Kingdom. He noted that it should be encouraged and co-ordinated. The Administering Authority concurs with this position and would like to assure the Council that many positive steps have already been taken in this field. As a matter of fact, one tour of the Territory sponsored by the Office of Territorial and International Affairs of the Interior Department has already taken place and another is in the works. These missions are designed to familiarize American investors with possible business activities that they may feel are viable investments.

In addition, foreign investment from other sources is encouraged and stimulated through a variety of means, including missions by the Micronesian

(Mrs. McCoy, Special Representative)

leadership to other countries. I do not want to speak for their policies here, but I do know that the Saipan accords encourage mutual co-operation in the field of economic development and that there have already been leadership meetings to work on common developmental problems, such as the exploitation of the exclusive economic zones.

In concluding my closing remarks, again let me say how much I have enjoyed the give and take, the warm remarks, the Council has made and the wise counsel it has given this year. We look forward to the point when no more such meetings will be held; but, believe me, I shall at that time look back with great nostalgia on the many hours spent in the company of such good friends.

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I cannot help remarking - to use that old American vernacular - that the statements we have heard from the representatives of the Micronesian States are very hard acts to follow. If anyone thought the Micronesian leadership lacked the capacity in fact to exercise leadership over the peoples of Micronesia, the analysis and eloquence of the statements we heard this afternoon ought to be completely convincing.

My closing remarks will be brief, for over the course of these past two weeks we have covered a great many subjects and in considerable detail. We, the Administering Authority, provided quite an extensive annual report and we have provided additional information in response to comments of petitioners and questions from representatives on this Council. Given the broad scope and complexity of the many subjects which have been covered, no doubt there is more that could be said.

During the course of our discussions I have attempted to clarify and correct many significant, and even a few relatively insignificant, statements which, in our view, were not altogether accurate. But there are limits to the usefulness of such an exercise. For example, it would not have been productive for me to respond each time that our colleagues from the Soviet Union chose to mischaracterize what I or others of this delegation said, or to pursue the more abstruse points in the allegations of some of the petitioners. I think we have covered in these discussions the basic facts and the points of which the Council should be aware. And now the time has come to summarize those things which, in our view, are the salient points and basic conclusions.

(Mr. Feldman, United States)

First, there has been criticism - quite a bit of it - of our administration of the Trust Territory. It has been said that there could have been further improvement with respect to health, education, economic and social development in the Trust Territories. Certain of our actions, as well as inactions, have been criticized. The priorities which have guided our efforts also have been questioned.

We must agree, and we have agreed, that we have made mistakes. We have not accomplished all that we could have hoped for. We have not done everything we should have done. We do not claim that our administration has been perfect or that we have always pursued what, in retrospect, might now be seen, with the benefit of hindsight, as the perfect path. But we do not agree that the defects or the imperfections of our administration reflect any evil intent on our part. We do not agree that we have violated in this respect either good faith or the fulfilment of our trusteeship obligations.

The record of our actions which has been presented to the Council each year for almost 40 years, I think demonstrates that we have pursued in good faith the promotion of the economic, social and educational advancement of the Trust Territories, as we undertook to do in the Trusteeship Agreement. The record demonstrates our belief that we have made and continue to make a very considerable investment of money, technical expertise and other forms of assistance towards the development and maintenance of economic, social and educational conditions. Where we found problems, we sought to address them; and where we made mistakes, we sought to rectify those mistakes.

In the consideration of economic, social and educational conditions, however, we should not lose sight of the fundamental objective of the Trusteeship System. The fundamental objective of trusteeship is the promotion of political development towards self-government or independence. This is the raison d'être; this is the ultimate object and the purpose of the trust.

(Mr. Feldman, United States)

The task of political advancement of a Trust Territory must have an end. There must be some point at which one can say: it is done; it is over; it is accomplished. The tasks of economic, social and educational advancement, on the other hand, have no end; they never are completed. These are the ongoing challenges which face the entire world community, not merely the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. They face all of us, the developed and the underdeveloped alike.

It follows that the most important development with which we as Administering Authority, as well as this Council, must be concerned is the development of political self-government and autonomy.

In the promotion of political self-government and autonomy one must look to the views of the Micronesian peoples themselves. We have heard the Micronesian leaders speak in this Council. Just this afternoon we heard them speak with eloquence and with the knowledge we have come to expect of them about their own social and economic hopes and achievements, about their constitutional Governments and about their route to self-determination and the culmination of that process.

What I think was most significant in their statements was their message on the subject of the trusteeship; that message was loud, clear, unmistakable. Those representatives have told us that the Micronesian people have welcomed the contributions and the protection of the Trusteeship System, but that they are ready to move on. They want to shed the Trusteeship System. They want to assume their rightful place in the international community, with all its corresponding problems and all its opportunities.

I should like to cite their statements directly. President Nakayama of the Federated States of Micronesia said:

"I shall reiterate what we said last year, because it cannot be said too often: our people want to end the trusteeship and enter into full self-government under our Constitution in free association with the United States." (T/PV.1581, p.17)

Vice-President Oiterong of the Republic of Palau said:

"my Government whole-heartedly supports and endorses the request of the Marshall Islands Government and the Federated States of Micronesia for termination of the Trusteeship Agreement as it applies to them this year" (page 33),

and that Palau, too, will, as soon as possible, come before this Council with a similar request.

(Mr. Feldman, United States)

Chief Secretary DeBrum of the Marshall Islands said:

"we have achieved the political maturity, economic development, educational standards and social advances necessary for self-government.

"...

"The time has come for the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement."

(T/PV.1582, p. 3)

Lieutenant Governor Tenorio of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands said:

"This important step will ultimately result in granting true self-government to the peoples of Micronesia"

and that his Government

"supports expeditious termination of the trusteeship as being in the paramount interests of Micronesia". (T/PV.1581, pp. 26, 27)

These are the words of the elected representatives of the Micronesian people, reflecting their wishes. This has been confirmed by the democratic constitutional processes by which those representatives were freely chosen as well as by plebiscites in which the people have directly spoken.

It is incumbent upon the United States, as the Administering Authority, to heed that message. The United States Administration is pursuing the final approvals necessary to completely this process so that the trusteeship can be terminated. The Trusteeship Council too, we believe, must be guided by this goal, which the peoples of Micronesia clearly desire.

We have also listened with attention to the views which have been presented here by petitioners and by other delegations to this Council. We appreciate the concern which has been demonstrated for the welfare of the Micronesian people, as well as the helpful criticism and suggestions for improvement in relation to the trusteeship administration.

Certain of the petitioners have expressed their view that the plans made for termination of the trusteeship are defective. Their views are of interest and, in some cases, thoughtful, but in our view they fail ultimately to accord due respect to the wishes and choices of the Micronesian people themselves. Ultimately, the argument of these petitioners is that the Micronesian people must continue to be protected by the Trusteeship Council for their own good, against their own free choice and their own freely expressed desire.

(Mr. Feldman, United States)

We trust and hope that the Trusteeship Council will continue to judge the situation truly. The Trusteeship Council has watched the growth of political autonomy of the Micronesian peoples, has watched the adoption of constitutions, the development of sophisticated and effective systems of self-government and the free choice of future status in plebiscites. The Trusteeship Council has heard from the duly elected representatives of the Micronesian people, who are uniquely qualified and uniquely entitled to speak on their behalf.

It is therefore with particular gratitude that we have noted the fundamental recognition of and respect for the self-determination process in Micronesia which has been shown by the delegations of France and the United Kingdom. Both the United States and, I am sure, the Micronesians, welcome the contribution made by the United Kingdom and France to that process.

It is with corresponding disappointment that we have listened to the statement by Ambassador Oleandrov of the Soviet delegation. We must question whether the Soviet Union also is guided by respect for the wishes and views of the Micronesian peoples, whether its objective is to foster the self-determination and the self-government of the peoples of the Trust Territory, or whether it is pursuing wholly different political objectives which it perceives to be in its own interest but which are not related to Micronesia. We urge that the Soviet Union reconsider its approach and that, for the benefit of the Micronesian people and the international community, it be guided to endorse the process of self-determination.

Almost one half of his statement was devoted by Ambassador Oleandrov to attempting to prove that the United States set out from the very beginning to annex the Trust Territory, to incorporate it into the United States. Surely, had we wished to do that, we would have contested turning over the Territory of Micronesia to the United Nations as a Trust Territory, for that event took place years after the Territory was military occupied by the United States. In fact, had we wished to annex the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands we had, of course, a precedent. There was another country, which seized islands from Japan, islands with the names Kunashiri, Etorofu, Shikotan and Habomai, and annexed them; there was, indeed, that precedent. But we chose not to follow it; we chose to create a Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. And now we hope that the day will soon come when we may be able to repair to this Council and say: everything is completed; it is now time for the trusteeship to be dissolved.

The PRESIDENT: That brings us to the end of the concluding statements.

Mr. BEREZOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation will study the statements that have been made today, the so-called concluding statements. We should like to reserve our right to make our own concluding statement at a somewhat later stage.

THE PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): Sir, I wish to query whether it is proper for a member of the Council other than the Administering Authority to make a concluding statement.

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure of the position on that point. I think it is probably not normal for the spokesman of any delegation but the Administering Authority to make a concluding statement as such. On the other hand, it is clear that the representative of the Soviet Union will have further opportunities to express his views later during our session.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I have no wish to make a concluding statement. I merely wish to offer my thanks to the Administering Authority, and indeed, to the representatives of the territorial Governments for their concluding statements made this afternoon. We have listened with great attention to what they have said. I think it would be a brave man who disagreed with them, who sought to improve on them or who took issue with them. They underlined what I said in my statement this morning about the confidence of the Micronesians in their own future, bore eloquent testimony to their ability to manage their own affairs and illustrated their extraordinary grasp of detail concerning their own affairs. As I said, we are grateful to them for responding in such detail to our questions and for the comprehensive, informative and instructive information that they have supplied to us. I am grateful, too, to Mrs. McCoy for responding directly to two major points I made in my statement this morning. She may rest assured that we shall attempt to hone up our interrogation methods for future years. We have learned much from what we believe has been a constructive and fruitful debate. I am sure we shall be able to complete our agenda in the same spirit of co-operation and flexibility that, I think, we have all shown to each other, though I would hope that the curious phenomenon of the disappearing Soviet Ambassador might be borne in mind for the future, so that it does not further reduce the limited time available to us.

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

Someone once told me that if all United Nations documentation for one year were laid end to end it would reach from here to the moon. Just occasionally in this chamber I have had the impression that perhaps that was a slight underestimation or, alternatively, that the verbatim records of the Trusteeship Council may indeed account for a large proportion of that distance. I do not wish to lend further credence to that statistic and therefore I shall conclude by offering my thanks to my colleagues and once again to the Micronesian representatives who have given so much of their time to our deliberations.

Mr. RAPIN (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to associate myself very briefly and at the same time very warmly with the words just spoken by the representative of the United Kingdom, and to thank the representatives of the constitutional Governments of the Trust Territories for the statements that they made this afternoon; the contents of those statements, which very often referred to questions we had raised, were extremely interesting. I listened to the representatives of Micronesia with great care and personally I was very impressed by their performance. I should also like to thank Mrs. McCoy, the High Commissioner, who is aware of the great esteem and affection that I have for her. Finally, I wish to thank the representative of the Administering Authority.

The PRESIDENT: I should also like to add my small measure of thanks to the representatives of Micronesia and of the Administering Authority for coming to New York and for providing the Council with some much valuable information on conditions in the Trust Territory, which will be of great help to the Council in preparing its annual report to the Security Council. May I also wish all of you who made the long journey from Micronesia a safe return home.

I call on the representative of the United States who wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): In his statement this afternoon, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that there were many nuclear weapons stored in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and that their presence endangers the people of Micronesia. Sir, I wish unequivocally to state to this Council that there are no nuclear weapons stored anywhere in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and that the Administering Authority has no intention whatsoever of storing nuclear weapons, chemical weapons or biological weapons anywhere in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.