



UNITED NATIONS  
TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL

UN LIBRARY  
JUN 7 1985



Distr.  
GENERAL  
  
T/PV.1595  
31 May 1985  
  
ENGLISH

Fiftieth Session

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE FIFTEEN HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Tuesday, 28 May 1985, at 3 p.m.

President: 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

Examination of petitions listed in the annex to the agenda

Co-operation with the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination

Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination

Attainment of self-government or independence by the Trust Territories and the situation in the Trust Territories with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

Co-operation with the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples

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

This record is subject to correction.

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

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 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)  
EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS LISTED IN THE ANNEX TO THE AGENDA (see T/1872/Add.1) (continued)

The PRESIDENT: As members will recall, on 21 May the Council decided to grant a request for a hearing by representatives of the Old People's Square Level and Justice Organization of Ponape and Kosrae provided that the petitioners could be here by today at the latest. The petitioners have in fact arrived and are prepared to speak this afternoon.

It seems to me best that we hear them now and hope to complete our agenda afterwards, rather than postpone hearing them until tomorrow. As I hear no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Pedrus Silbanus, Mr. Jose R. Cruz and Mr. Fritz S. Cruz took places at the petitioners' table.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Jose Cruz.

Mr. J. CRUZ (interpretation from Ponapean\*): I should like to thank the Trusteeship Council for allowing us to appear before the Council today. We have asked to appear because we should like to inform the Council of what is happening in our islands of Pohnpei and Kosrae and what the Administering Authority is doing to us in the Trust Territory.

I should like our statement to be read out to the Council.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Mr. Fritz Cruz, who will read out an English translation of a statement by his father, Mr. Jose Cruz.

---

\* Interpretation furnished by the petitioner.

Mr. J. CRUZ: Our organization, the Old People's Square Level and Justice Organization of Ponape and Kosrae, composed of people of the islands of Pohnpei and Kosrae, requests the Trusteeship Council to listen to what we are about to say. We cannot stand the treatment meted out to us or the operations which have taken place from the time of the Spanish administration to the present moment.

We island people cannot be very highly educated, because no administering authority has really taught us or educated us to match the standard level; all they teach us is how to understand what they would like us to do for them. If Reagan and I had been brought up in the same area and had had the same education I think I would be the President of the United States, not he. I ask the Council to excuse us if we make mistakes in our presentation, because this is as all they have taught us.

We would like to start our presentation with the Spanish period. First, it was reported that during the Spanish administration the people of the island of Saipan had died of widespread disease. That is a lie. Out of the whole population of the island of Saipan, only 364 were left, and the truth is that between the years 1521 and 1895 the Spanish administration killed most of the population of Saipan. There is evidence of this on Guam.

I come next to the German administration of what is now the Trust Territory. The German Government enforced strict laws on the islands. It did not cover anything up to protect its people, which is not to say that the Germans were 100 per cent good. The German administrators at the time even sentenced one of their number to death on Saipan. It is usual that in any society there should be good people and bad people.

I turn now to the time when the Germans left the Territory and the beginning of the Japanese administration. During the early part of their administration, the Japanese carried out their obligations and responsibilities, but when they began to withdraw from the League of Nations, in 1930 if I am not mistaken, they also began to take advantage of the Trust Territory. For example, on Saipan, the Japanese district administrator and the President of the Kohachu sugar manufacturing company, Mr. Machue Sachio, agreed to have all properties on Saipan planted with sugar cane. That involved annual land and property surveying, and the property of the Kohachu manufacturing company was to increase every year. The property of all the people would decrease each year.

(Mr. J. Cruz)

In addition, the Japanese even spread bugs that, it was said, would kill the insects that were found on the sugar cane; but instead the bugs attacked our coconut trees. The bugs were released in 1931 and 1932 and from that time our coconut trees have been unable to bear any fruit. Evidence of this still exists on Saipan.

Sometime in 1933 the Japanese started to prepare for the Second World War. In that same year, the Japanese Government on Saipan started to force people to move off their property, alleging that it was required for the Kohachu company, but instead this property was for military use. Also in 1933, the Japanese Government took away my father's land for military use. It did not even give us any particular place on which to reside or make our living; all they gave my father was an offer of 2,400 yen, take it or leave it. He was also told to leave his property. When my father refused the offer, he was punished, so we had no choice but to leave our property, planted with newly-bearing fruit trees, and go somewhere else. The Japanese used materials from our properties to build the Saipan dock, which the Japanese called Chicko Sambasi. Its present name is Charley Dock.

When taking the materials from our property, the Japanese used dynamite to blast the rocks. That blasting work was done for three years. I often saw tears running down my father's cheeks as he watched his plants, farm animals and cattle being destroyed by the blasting work. The Japanese Government, or military, even destroyed a large ancient cave in Saipan, which was located on our property. When the Japanese took our property we did not have enough capital to start a new life at that very moment, so we sold our house and moved to Pohnpei.

In 1942 the last ship to travel to Pohnpei was the Omi Maru, and I, Jose R. Cruz, boarded it at Palau. The first product to run short at this time on Pohnpei was tobacco and cigarettes. To illustrate how rare this product was and how much it was in demand, let me say that a package of tobacco was sold for as much as 300 yen. At that time, my father used to grow tobacco plants, and people used to offer him 25 yen for each large tobacco leaf. In 1942, my brothers, my sisters, my parents and I went from the capital town to our farmland in a distant place because of the war problems, which were increasing at that time. In late 1942, in September, three Japanese officials came to me on our farmland and made an oral agreement with me that I, Jose R. Cruz, would plant tobacco which the military would get from me for 7 yen per leaf, whether large or small. The Japanese officials were Hojono Taii, Sinji Hayashi and Nagayama.

(Mr. J. Cruz)

Then the Japanese started getting tobacco leaves from us. Three months later, Hojono Taii and Sinji Hayashi came back and told us to continue our work and have patience, for the military did not have any money at that time, but that when a ship or plane arrived we would be the first to get paid. Since then, a lot of ships and planes have come in and out, and I, Jose R. Cruz, have not yet received so much as one red penny.

I shall now focus on some of what the Japanese did on Pohnpei. In the area they called Nan Pohnmal the Japanese forced people to work on an airfield for 21 days, day and night, doing manual labour. If you happened to be working there at that time and if you happened to stand up for a short stretch the Japanese guard would hit you and force you to bend down again and continue your work. If you were too weak and could not stand it any more, and if you fell down, they would take you and punish you. Most of the people working on that airfield project died immediately after they finished their work.

(Mr. J. Cruz)

Another incident occurred in another village on the same island of Pohnpei. The name of the village is Kitti. In this incident males numbering 179 were relocated to another island called Kosrae. These 179 men were taken to work on this island of Kosrae, to build dwelling shelters and cave shelters for military use. What is interesting is that the wives of the 179 were left behind. They were taken and distributed to the soldier battalions on Pohnpei.

Briefly, I turn now to the Administration of the United States of America. First, directly after the war, they tell the people to submit their claims. Then they pick up all the claims from the districts and deduct 360 from the totals. Then, when some of the people receive their monies on their claims, they receive their payments in cash, which we do not believe it is correct for a Government to do. Please see the reports we have attached to our written petition. We do not desire any more payments on war claims to go through the Government of Pohnpei or the Trust Territory, if it is for Pohnpei or Kosrae. Please let our organization - O.P.S.L. and J.O.O.P. - handle this. The total of our reported claims right now is \$105,067,311; and we have 3,931 claimants.

Please consider us with regard to the situations that are being applied to us island people. We would like to request that all agreements be held back until certain types of education from various countries are spread over the islands, so that we can really understand what kind of status would be proper for us or good for us.

On behalf of the people of Pohnpei and Kosrae, we would like to request the following categories. First, please stop the Compact of Free Association with us, because the people of Pohnpei and Kosrae do not want this agreement any more. Secondly, please help us in controlling and stopping any testing or experiments within our society. Thirdly, we would like to ask the whole Organization of the United Nations to help us and protect us from international conflicts or wars that would have us involved in them. For example, during the Second World War, we, the island people, had two enemies at that time - there were the air raids by the Americans, and the Japanese on the island beat us up whenever they desired. Lastly, we expect the United States of America at all times now to give us, the people of Pohnpei, free medication and also to be responsible for giving us free food, because the United States of America has destroyed one of the most important structures of our life, the ocean.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Silbanus, who will make his presentation in Ponapean.

Mr. SILBANUS (spoke in Ponapean; English text furnished by the petitioner): First, I would like to introduce myself and my two partners who are with me. My name is Pedrus T. Silbanus. I am the President of the Old People's Square Level and Justice Organization of Ponape and Kosrae. My older partner here with me is Mr. Jose R. Cruz. He is the adviser of our organization. He established this organization on 24 February 1984. This next man is our Secretary.

Speaking on behalf of the people of Pohnpei and Kosrae, I would like to request the Council to hold back this Compact of Free Association for Pohnpei and Kosrae, because we believe that we should not be involved in any conflict or war problems, for national problems might lead us into becoming ashes one day. During the past 40 years of the United States of America's administration over us - the people of Pohnpei and Kosrae - the United States has not given us good education and has not even given us a good life. Only the glory of God is what has been keeping us alive up to now.

The PRESIDENT: Does any member of the Council wish to ask a question?

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like first of all to express our appreciation to the petitioners for coming here to express their feelings and views and to tell us about the sufferings of the people of Micronesia, not only during the colonial period but also during the subsequent period of trusteeship. From the statement made by the Micronesian petitioners we can see that the people are in a difficult situation and, above all, that they were deprived of the economic development that would have enabled them fully to understand the situation and freely to exercise their right to self-determination.

I should like to ask the petitioners whether, if the administering Power had fulfilled its responsibilities with regard to education, so that the people attained a proper level of education and the economic development that would have enabled Micronesia to be economically self-sufficient, it would not have been preferable for the people of Micronesia to have chosen independence.

The PRESIDENT: Would Mr. Cruz like to say anything in reply to the Soviet representative?

Mr. J. CRUZ (interpretation from Ponapean): I should like to mention the matter of a plan that was given to me in 1965 and then, when it was found out that the plan was good, taken away and given to JNG, which is now on Guam. In 1965 High Commissioner Godding and Governor Galimore gave me my plan because they approved it. They told me that my plan was approved and that I should purchase some cattle to start a cattle ranch on Tinian. I have my title of approval here. In January 1965 I bought 39 cows, and in February of the same year they took away all those cows and my plan and said that the plan should be tendered for.

At that time a Texan resident came along and was going to join in the bidding on my plan with Ken Jones. The bidding took place on Good Friday, which is a Holy Day for us Chamorro people, the people of Saipan.

First, I do not believe that Ken Jones should have priority in this bidding, because the property is on Saipan, which is our island. I should have priority in bidding on this plan because I was the first to plan this cattle ranch. Secondly, I should have priority because this property is on Saipan, where I was born and of which I am a resident. Thirdly, I was told to purchase 39 cattle to start my work, and then these were taken away and up to the present I do not know where they are. Fourthly, Ken Jones has no right to get property or plot of land because he is not a citizen either of Saipan or of the Trust Territory. And another reason is that we can do the work, but we were not given a chance to try.



(Mr. J. Cruz)

During the Japanese Administration, Santiago Camacho of Saipan requested a parcel of land in Palau and was given it right away because he was a Trust Territory citizen. Mr. Camacho worked it as a cattle ranch until the end of the Second World War.

I should like to ask all the members of the United Nations Trusteeship Council to be so kind as to help us in our efforts to regain our property, which was taken from my family during the war. The properties taken from us have been rented up to this day. I request that action be taken as soon as possible because most of the claimants - that is, more than 70 per cent - have already passed away.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I, too, thank the petitioners for coming here this afternoon. I should like to ask them one question. How many members are there in the organization that they represent?

Mr. J. CRUZ (interpretation from Ponapean): The members of our organization include children and persons 18 years and over. We are 85 per cent of Pohnpei and Kosrae.

I should like to speak on another matter that took place on the Island of Kosrae. This is about a person who was told to go and fish for the Japanese military and who, on return, took one fish for his family. For that they cut off one of his fingers. We have a photograph of that person with us. There was another person on Kosrae whose father was very ill and told him to climb a coconut tree and get him a coconut; the son got him a coconut. The Japanese military found out about it and cut off one of his fingers.

Mr. FELDMAN (United States of America): I wish to correct a misstatement. We have heard, in typical fashion, in the lengthy statement with which the Soviet delegation always seems to precede a question, the assertion that the United States as the Administering Authority would not allow the people of Pohnpei, or indeed of the Federated States of Micronesia or the Trust Territory, to vote on the question of independence. I want to point out, so as to correct the record, that independence was indeed on the ballot - as we have said so many times - the balloting was observed by the United Nations in the Trust Territory. The people of the Federated States and of Pohnpei had the opportunity to vote for independence. In the event, 79 per cent of the ballots were cast for free association. In fact the vote total for free association was the highest in the Federated States of any of the entities in Micronesia - 79 per cent, almost four fifths, of the ballots cast.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I should like to follow up the last comment made by the representative of the United States, because at the beginning of his petition the petitioner said that he did not wish the Compact to come into effect and wished the Trusteeship Council to stop that. Later, in answer to my question, he also said that 85 per cent of Pohnpei and Kosrae were members of his organization. Yet, as far as I recall from my participation in the Mission to observe the plebiscite in the Federated States of Micronesia, both Kosrae and Pohnpei actually voted quite substantially in favour of the Compact.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With regard to what the representative of the United States just said, I should like to make it clear that my question did not contain anything to the effect that the choice of independence was not granted to the population of those islands. What I asked was: If the Administering Authority were to raise the level of education sufficiently among the population of the islands and to develop the islands economically - in Micronesia as a whole - to a level of self-sufficiency, would it not be preferable for the people of Micronesia to choose independence? For without the necessary level of education and without economic development, of course the people of Micronesia would find themselves in a very difficult situation - a situation in which they could not make a free choice.

The PRESIDENT: It is not my impression that the petitioners feel able to comment on these larger issues.

If there are no further questions, I thank the petitioners, on behalf of the Council, for their statements and invite them to withdraw from the petitioners table.

The petitioners withdrew.

CO-OPERATION WITH THE COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION  
(GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS 2106 B (XX) AND 39/21)

DECADE FOR ACTION TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
RESOLUTIONS 3057 (XXVIII) AND 39/16)

The PRESIDENT: I suggest that in accordance with custom the Council examine these two items together.

It was so decided.

Mr. GRIGUTIS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The United Nations in its activities gives pride of place to the struggle against racism and racial discrimination. The adoption of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid was of great international significance.

The attitude of States towards the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination (General Assembly resolution 3054 (XXVIII)) shows the extent to which they are ready to take serious action to eliminate all manifestations of racism and racial discrimination. Direct responsibility for preventing manifestations of racial discrimination and for ensuring the observance of the basic fundamental human rights and freedoms in the Trust Territory of Micronesia lies with the Administering Authority.

The position taken by the Western members of the Trusteeship Council makes it impossible for activities to be undertaken within the framework of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination because these members are unwilling to co-operate with the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

In the report of that Committee submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session (A/39/18) it is pointed out that the Committee was informed by the Secretary-General about measures taken by the Trusteeship Council at its fifty-first session, in connection with article 15 of the Convention. That is to say, the Trusteeship Council simply took note of the statement made on this question to its members and no measures or recommendations were adopted.

(Mr. Grigutis, USSR)

In other words, the Trusteeship Council did not respond to the appeal to provide information and co-operate with the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. The Soviet delegation views the opinion and recommendations of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination as entirely justified and insists that the Trusteeship Council, in accordance with an earlier decision, should whole-heartedly co-operate with that Committee, which means giving the Committee all relevant material, including petitions, reports relating to the situation in the Territory, and ensuring that the Administering Authority respects fundamental human rights and freedoms in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The Soviet delegation cannot fail to express its concern at the continuing refusal of the United States to give the Trusteeship Council information about the implementation by that Power in the Trust Territory of the provisions of international documents forbidding racial discrimination and preserving human rights.

In the course of the discussion of the report of the Administering Authority, and hearing the statements of petitioners, it has become clear that discriminatory measures have been taken against the people of the Trust Territory and the Soviet delegation has already drawn attention to the consequences of the many years of testing of atomic and nuclear weapons in the Trust Territory. These tests have led not only to the pollution of the environment but also have done irreparable harm to the well-being and health of the indigenous population.

The rights of the Micronesians have been violated and continue to be violated. The very fact that the inhabitants are expelled from lands used as nuclear testing ground shows that the Administering Authority has been guided solely by its own interests and in disregard of the legitimate rights and interests of the indigenous inhabitants of Micronesia. The United States authorities have not taken such action with regard to the population of the United States itself, have they? Yet, with regard to the people of Micronesia they are taking such action, and furthermore not even in war time, but in peace time. Surely this is discrimination against the people of Micronesia. At this session of the Council many petitioners have testified that they have been stripped of their rights. A young woman came here and asked for the return of land which had been unlawfully seized. It has been alleged that the continuing nuclear tests are not harmful, that radiation in California is higher than it is in the Pacific Islands. If that is so why does the Administering Authority not carry out these tests on its own territory, rather than on other peoples' territory.

(Mr. Grigutis, USSR)

At this session of the Trusteeship Council it has been pointed out that in Micronesia there is a high level of unemployment. At the same time, there are not enough skilled workers and labour has been exported. There is a desperate situation with regard to plumbing and sewage. The medical services situation is very bad. The indigenous population is suffering from such diseases as cholera, tuberculosis and leprosy.

The living conditions of the Micronesians, for example in Kwajalein Island and Ebeye, are very different from those of the Americans who actually live in the same Territory but who enjoy all comforts. If the Administering Authority did not consider the Micronesians second-class citizens, it might have been able, in the course of the 40 years of its administration, to provide the Micronesians with the same standard of living as that of the Americans themselves, or at least some approximation to it. The present situation can only be viewed as discriminatory.

Therefore, it is regrettable that in the discussion of questions related to the implementation of the resolutions on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination and the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, items 9 and 10 of the agenda, the Trusteeship Council has so far confined itself just to taking note of the statements made by its members and that no other measures, views or recommendations have been adopted.

Our delegation would like to hope that at this session the Council will change this approach and will display considerable concern and pay attention to the problem of preventing racial and national discrimination in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I do not think that any sane, reasonable representative in this Chamber could seriously disagree with the representative of the Soviet Union that racism is ugly, that it is a disease and that it deserves to be stamped out brutally wheresoever it rears its ugly head. I think it would be a brave man who would come to this Council and say that there had never ever been any incidence of racial discrimination throughout the history of the Trust Territory. Similarly, I could not come to this Council and say that in the United Kingdom there had never ever been a case of racial discrimination.

But what we are talking about here is discrimination on the grounds of race as a matter of public policy. That is what the representative of the Soviet Union has been talking about. Now, it seems to my delegation that nothing that has been presented to this Council in the course of this session can remotely be equated with discrimination on the grounds of race as a matter of public policy. Indeed, the examples quoted by the representative of the Soviet Union could not be classified even as isolated examples, ad hoc examples, of racial discrimination. We have heard of problems related to radiation, to pollution, to the illegal seizure of land. Yet none of this in any way - even if one accepted that all these allegations were entirely true - could possibly be explained on the grounds that they were based on racial discrimination; in short, that it was the colour of a man's skin that had resulted in these political and economic failings.

My second point concerns the actual item before us, which is co-operation with the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. Now, my own country, as a State party to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, co-operates closely with the Committee. We submit reports to it, including reports on our dependent Territories. I believe that we have a good record of co-operation with the Committee and that we are respected for it. But the situation in the Trusteeship Council is rather different. Surely it is the United Nations Charter that lays down the responsibilities of the Trusteeship Council. Article 83 of the Charter makes it very clear where that responsibility lies: it is with the Security Council, which avails itself of the Trusteeship Council to perform its functions. There is no suggestion here that we are obliged as a major organ of the United Nations to go outside the Council and to co-operate with the Committee in the way suggested.

My third point - perhaps the most crucial of all - is that it is a pity that we do not have here this afternoon representatives of the territorial Governments in Micronesia to answer the question that I would happily put to them: is there

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

evidence of racial discrimination in Micronesia? If the answer is "no", then it seems to me that the problem we face is entirely academic, entirely redundant. I recall that last year when we discussed this issue we did indeed have the opportunity to put that question to one of the Micronesian representatives, and we received an unequivocal answer. He said that he had not encountered any pervasive examples of racial discrimination.

In conclusion, I think it would make sense if next year we took this item up while representatives of Micronesia were still with us. I think that this would be extremely instructive to all concerned.

But my main point, concerning co-operation with the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, is that while we in no way wish to devalue or dilute the importance of the work of that Committee, we in the Trusteeship Council are empowered to take these decisions ourselves, under Article 83 of the Charter. We are not obligated to co-operate with other bodies of the United Nations. Our sole responsibility relates to the Security Council.

Mr. RAPIN (France) (interpretation from French): As the Council knows, agenda items 9 and 10 - as well as agenda items 11 and 12, which we shall take up in a few minutes - are considered every year in the Trusteeship Council. It should therefore not be surprising that I now very briefly recall my delegation's position on the point that has been raised. It is very close to the position just stated by the representative of the United Kingdom.

As far as my delegation is concerned, the Trusteeship Council, which exercises on behalf of the Security Council all the Organization's powers in regard to the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, has every opportunity to monitor the situation in the Territory. It can do that at its regular sessions, by hearing statements from representatives of the Constitutional Governments and, above all, by hearing statements from the many petitioners who address the Council. It can do that also during its Visiting Missions to the Territory, which provide an opportunity for petitioners who are not able to come to New York to speak to representative of the United Nations.

As has already been pointed out by the representative of the United Kingdom, an examination of the contents of the petitions and the statements made in New York at the regular sessions of the Council as well as the statements made to members of Visiting Missions of the Council shows that there is no trace of any complaint about discrimination based on race. I therefore think that there are no grounds

(Mr. Rapin, France)

for concern in this regard. In any event, the Trusteeship Council has every opportunity to exercise vigilance in this matter.

Mr. BADER (United States of America): I have very little to add to the statements just made by the representatives of France and the United Kingdom - statements with which I agree whole-heartedly. I wish simply to make a few comments on the question of racial discrimination in Micronesia and on the legal question of jurisdiction.

If there is a society on earth where the phenomenon of racism and racial hatred is all but unknown, I think that it might be the Micronesian society. The representative of the United Kingdom referred to a statement made last year in this body by one of the Micronesian representatives, who was commenting on precisely this subject. The representative of the United Kingdom has, as is so often the case, anticipated my own thinking. I happen to have before me the statement in question. It was made by the Secretary of External Affairs of the Federated States of Micronesia, Mr. Andon Amaraich, in response to what he considered to be inaccurate statements regarding the existence of racial discrimination in Micronesia.



(Mr. Bader, United States)

He said:

"I hesitated to speak ... because, frankly, I do not know what we are talking about.

"Usually, when my Government addresses this Council on specific points it does so because of what we have experienced in individual cases in our country. As you will have noted from my statements, both opening and closing, my Government has made no complaint about racial discrimination. And that is because my Government, and I myself as an individual, have never found reason to speak on that subject because we have never experienced it. I can assure you that if we experience racial discrimination, you will hear from us."

(T/PV.1576, p. 25)

I would note also that Mr. Epel Ilon, in his closing statement on behalf of the Federated States of Micronesia, reiterated those sentiments.

As for the accusation that the conduct of nuclear tests in the Marshall Islands is a sign of a kind of racial discrimination because such tests could never have been conducted in the United States in the proximity of United States citizens, that simply does not hold water. If anything, in the question of the settlement of nuclear claims, if there has been any discrimination it has been in favour of, rather than against, the Micronesians. The nuclear claims settlement of the Compact of Free Association, section 177, provides for espousal of claims and provides espousal of claims by the Marshall Islands Government and the provision of funds to that Government to settle those claims. No such arrangement exists for claimants in the United States in instances where individuals feel there was damage because of nuclear testing.

As for the living arrangements in Kwajalein, which have been referred to, the distinction in living arrangements there is based upon normal security arrangements that would prevail in any military facility.

Since we are considering these two items, I should like to mention my Government's position on the Second Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. In the view of my delegation this item does not belong before us in this body, but since we have the misfortune of having to consider it here, let me simply state what anyone familiar with the United States and its history knows.

Racism and racial discrimination are plagues which have affected much of our planet, with terrible consequences. My country has not escaped the damaging effects of these plagues, nor have most Members of this Organization. The fight

(Mr. Bader, United States)

against racism is a long-term project in which all of mankind has a stake and to which the American people and the United States Government are committed.

As to the Second Decade for Action to Combat Racism, this particular subject at the United Nations has a peculiar and unfortunate history. Because of flaws - fatal flaws, in the view of my delegation - in the language used in the 1975 resolution on this subject, notably the preposterous linkage of zionism and racism, the entire concept of the Decade has been terribly damaged. My delegation has discussed this subject adequately in other forums, and sees no merit in devoting any more time or attention to it here. I would simply note that my delegation does not participate in the activities of the Second Decade.

As for co-operation with the Committee to Eliminate Racial Discrimination, I would simply reiterate what the representative of France said on this subject: that the Trusteeship Council receives its mandate from the Charter, in particular from Article 83, which provides that "all functions ... relating to strategic areas ... shall be exercised by the Security Council", and that the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination cannot instruct the Trusteeship Council as to whom and on what to report. We must take our instructions from the Charter.

Mr. GRIGUTIS (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation understands perfectly well what racial discrimination is. But how can one view the fact, that one state which has been given the opportunity to administer other peoples has deliberately created for that people conditions of economic, political and cultural development at a lower level, if not as discrimination of the whole nation?

The people of Micronesia are in a much worse position, in terms of medical services, economic level, employment and so on in comparison with the inhabitants of the United States. That is discrimination against a whole nation.

The PRESIDENT: If there are no further comments, I suggest that the Council decide to take note of the statements made at this meeting.

It was so decided

The PRESIDENT: Before we leave this item, it is appropriate that I should draw attention to the four communications that were sent to the Council on behalf of various United Nations bodies concerned with human rights. Those communications were circulated to members of the Council last week. All seek information from the Council on activities in the human rights field.

(The President)

I propose in the light of the positions adopted at this afternoon's meeting that the Secretary should reply on behalf of the Council, drawing attention to the verbatim record of this afternoon's meeting. If there is no comment, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

ATTAINMENT OF SELF-GOVERNMENT OR INDEPENDENCE BY THE TRUST TERRITORIES (TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL RESOLUTION 1369 (XVII) AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1413 (XIV)) AND THE SITUATION IN TRUST TERRITORIES WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS 1514 (XV) AND 39/91)

CO-OPERATION WITH THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES (GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 1654 (XVI))

The PRESIDENT: May I suggest that the Council consider these two items together, as I understand it has done in previous years? If I hear no comment, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Trusteeship Council has now taken up agenda items 11 and 12, in respect of the situation in Micronesia in connection with the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and the attainment of self-government or independence and co-operation with the Special Committee.

The Soviet delegation attaches great importance to these questions and their consideration in the Trusteeship Council from the viewpoint of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The situation in the Trust Territory of Micronesia is completely unsatisfactory and is contrary to the Declaration itself, to subsequent decisions on decolonization by the United Nations, and also to the Charter of this Organization. The situation is further worsened by the fact that the Administering Authority, the United States of America, is making efforts to present the United Nations with a fait accompli in the very near future: annexation of the Trust Territory. Here, the Administering Authority is making efforts to cover up its illegal activities by talking about a supposed statement of the will of the people of Micronesia. The Declaration adopted on the initiative of the Soviet Union has played a great historic and practical role in ensuring that millions and millions of dependent people have been granted freedom and independence.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

In this year of its twenty-fifth anniversary, the Declaration is still playing an important role in respect of the specific and ongoing programme for peoples struggling for their inalienable right to freedom and independence. The programme is directed towards the swift elimination of colonialism from this planet earth.

The United States, the Administering Authority, stubbornly ignores the Declaration as it makes its annual reports to the Trusteeship Council and as the Council discusses the situation of Micronesia. It avoids stating what is being done to implement the Declaration in that country.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

Moreover, the representatives of the United States try to affirm that under Article 83 of the Charter the Administering Authority is responsible for Micronesia only to the Security Council, and that the General Assembly in its decisions has nothing to do with what is happening in Micronesia. The Soviet delegation has on many occasions shown this concept to be groundless because it is contrary to the Charter, although it is maintained by the United States. It is a concept used to defend the political and strategic interests of the United States and to keep the people of Micronesia in a situation of dependency, at the present time and in the future, subject to American militarism.

This concept is absolutely unjustified and incorrect. Constant reference to Article 83 of the Charter by the United States provides no grounds for depriving the people of Micronesia of their inalienable rights to true self-determination and independence. What the United States refers to as the strategic Trust Territory of Micronesia, as a unique situation, does not justify its depriving the people of freedom and independence.

On the contrary, implementation of the Declaration on decolonization in Micronesia would be fully in accordance with Article 83 of the Charter and there is nothing in that Article that prevents other organs of the United Nations, including the General Assembly, from following the situation as it evolves in that Territory. Micronesia comes within the scope and context of the Declaration, because the people have not attained full freedom and independence.

It is the General Assembly itself that therefore entrusted the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples - that is, the Committee of 24 - to consider the question of Micronesia. The Territory is one on the list of territories falling under the Declaration on decolonization and is the subject of annual consideration in that body of the United Nations.

In its report to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, the Special Committee on Decolonization made a number of conclusions and recommendations. These conclusions and recommendations, although in our view they are weaker than the text of the Declaration on decolonization itself, nevertheless are directed towards achievement of the goal of the Declaration in respect to the people of Micronesia. But even in that way, they are not recognized, and they are disregarded by the United States.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

The Special Committee inter alia reconfirmed the inalienable right of the people of Micronesia to self-determination and independence. That right is at the basis of the Declaration. The Administering Authority, despite the Declaration and in violation of the Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement, maintains that it is not mandatory for the people of Micronesia to exercise that right and that the people of Micronesia would prefer to be dependant. This would justify the military and strategic plans of Washington in that area. And that was the goal of the activities of the United States during its years as the Administering Authority of Micronesia.

The Special Committee, taking account of the principles of the Declaration and the Charter, confirmed that the Administering Authority is obliged in the Trust Territory to create such conditions as would enable its people freely to declare themselves on the various options available to them and to exercise their right to self-determination and independence without any intervention or interference.

In the Declaration on decolonization, it states:

"Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom." (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), para.5)

In this connection, I should like to emphasize that the Declaration refers to the transfer of all powers to the people of the Territory. Under the Compact and agreements under the Compact, what is provided for is not the transfer of all power to the people of Micronesia, but rather the maintenance by the Administering Authority - the United States of America - of power and competence in the areas of defence, foreign policy and many other, even internal, matters.

Were such conditions established by the Administering Authority as would enable the people of Micronesia freely to express their will? Certainly not. On the contrary, all the conditions were established for economically keeping the people of Micronesia subject to and dependent on the United States. And after this, the people of Micronesia were told that of the various options available to them, it was hoped they would have only one option left to them really - the so-called free choice of being fully subject to Washington.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

In respect of reservations and conditions attached thereto, Washington clearly explained that if they did not come out in favour of the Compact, which would keep them subject to Washington, there would be no other option that it could think of and the economic situation would remain very pathetic. In this way, the people of Micronesia would in fact do what they were told and become more compliant. In the case of Palau, they were told that unless they agreed to Washington's nuclear provisions, even the provisions under the Compact would not be available to Palau.

The Special Committee on Decolonization in its decisions called on the Administering Authority not to take any measures that would hinder or interfere with the unity or the rights of the people of Micronesia until those rights were exercised. And the Declaration on decolonization states quite clearly that any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of national unity and territorial integrity is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

But what did the Administering Power in fact do? It declared that its administration of Micronesia under the Security Council meant that it did not have to remain united, that the fault of this lay with the geographical situation. And at this session of the Trusteeship Council, another argument was put forward - namely, that Micronesia supposedly had never in fact been administered as one whole unit.

The Soviet delegation would like to emphasize here that the Security Council assured the United States that Micronesia was a single, united territory and the Micronesians did indeed have aspirations to maintain their unity. However, that aspiration was not in accordance with the plans of the United States and, as a result of Washington's policy, the territory was fragmented.

The Declaration and the Special Committee also indicated that military bases and equipment and military activities by the Administering Authority in a colonial and dependent territory were a hindrance to the implementation by the people of their right to self-determination and independence. They called for protection of the people from such bases and installations and military activities.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

What in fact, however, is the situation in Micronesia in this respect? Basing itself on provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement permitting it to maintain military bases and installations in the Trust Territory, the Administering Authority has been trying in recent years to retain those rights in Micronesia for the foreseeable future. In other words, the military and strategic interests of the United States are hindering the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization not only for the present but also for the future, so that then too the people will be subjected to the Pentagon's plans.

The Special Committee on decolonization has expressed its regret at the refusal of the United States to co-operate with it on the question of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. It has called on the Administering Authority to ensure the presence of its representatives at meetings dealing with this matter, which would help the Special Committee to obtain necessary and useful information for drafting its conclusions and its recommendations to the General Assembly in respect of the future of the Territory, in accordance with the obligations of the Administering Authority under the Charter.

The Special Committee on decolonization is undertaking a very thorough consideration of the situation in Micronesia. It has also heard petitioners state that one shortcoming of the Trusteeship Council is that it has been unwilling to co-operate with the Special Committee on decolonization. The Soviet delegation feels that the Trusteeship Council could not only be useful to the Special Committee, but could itself benefit from such co-operation. If we consider the tasks that should be carried out by the two bodies, we see that they should work together, for those tasks are one and the same: to protect the interests of the people of Micronesia.

From the outset Micronesia was declared to be a strategic Trust Territory. Yet for a while, some time ago, the United States and the Trusteeship Council co-operated with the Special Committee. But the stronger the annexationist ambitions of the United States grew, the more the United States, taking into consideration the Trusteeship Council's composition, used the Council for other purposes.

It is in this light that we can understand the situation in Micronesia as far as the General Assembly is concerned. The Programme of action for the full implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session,



(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

states that where the Declaration 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 all power is transferred to the the people of the Territory, unconditionally and unreservedly, and until such time as the people has had an opportunity to exercise freely its right to self-determination and independence.

Therefore, the Soviet delegation is convinced that if the Trusteeship Council truly wishes to shoulder its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations and does not wish to be an accomplice in depriving the people of Micronesia of its freedom and independence, it must speak out in defence of the people of Micronesia and promote the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization in respect of Micronesia.

Mr. RAPIN (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation too wishes to recall its position on agenda items 11 and 12, which is, of course, different from the position just set forth once again at great length by the Soviet delegation. For this purpose, I shall return to the argument which I put forward briefly during the consideration of items 9 and 10 and developed at greater length during our questioning of one of the petitioners, Mr. Clark, who himself referred to General Assembly resolution 1541 (XV).

Article 83 (1) of the Charter states very clearly that, as regards strategic Trust Territories such as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, all functions of the Organization shall be exercised by the Security Council. In paragraph 3 of the same Article, the Charter states that the Security Council shall avail itself of the assistance of the Trusteeship Council to perform those functions.

The Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is, of course, a subsidiary body of the General Assembly, not of the Security Council. Since the sole remaining Trust Territory is a strategic area, my delegation considers that there is no longer any need for the co-operation between the Council and the Special Committee which existed when Territories other than Micronesia were under the jurisdiction of the Trusteeship Council, and that it would even be contrary to the Charter.

Moreover, the process of self-determination in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands began in 1969, under strict Trusteeship Council supervision, and that process will continue in the future under the ultimate supervision of the Security Council - which, surprisingly, certain people seem to forget.

(Mr. Rapin, France)

Surely, therefore, further comment is unnecessary. I will simply say that my delegation considers that the inclusion of these items on our agenda is no longer justified.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): Listening to the statement made this afternoon by the representative of the Soviet Union, I wondered whether the United Kingdom response might not be simply to read out the statement made in the general debate last week, since that is essentially what the Soviet Union has done this afternoon.

I have a certain amount of sympathy with the Soviet delegation, since the title of the agenda item, "Attainment of self-government or independence" and so on, is surely - unless I have been dozing too much these past two weeks - precisely what we have been talking about at great length and in great detail in this Chamber. It seems to me somewhat extraordinary that we should have here a large number of representatives of Micronesian Governments, plus the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory, that we should subject them to lengthy questioning, that they should then leave, we having made our national statements, and that we should then start the process all over again under this item on attainment of self-government. Surely that is precisely what the general debate has been about.

Secondly, I associate myself with the remarks just made by the representative of France concerning the responsibility of the Trusteeship Council to the General Assembly and, in particular, to the Special Committee on decolonization as far as the strategic Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is concerned.

Let me make a distinction here. In Article 85 (1) of the United Nations Charter it is made quite clear that functions of the United Nations with regard to such Territories,

"including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the General Assembly". Paragraph 2 of Article 85 is equally explicit.

(Mr. Mortimer, United Kingdom)

However, as we all know, we are not talking here about Trust Territories that have since become independent; we are talking about a strategic Trust Territory, and it is Article 83, not Article 85, of the Charter that is applicable to strategic Trust Territories. That Article, as has already been stated by the representative of France, makes it perfectly clear that all functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas shall be exercised by the Security Council.

As far as co-operation with the Special Committee on decolonization is concerned, the same distinction of course applies. It is true that under resolution 1654 (XVI), which is referred to in the title of the agenda item, the Trusteeship Council was requested to give the Special Committee assistance, but we did so, again, in relation to the non-strategic Trust Territories. As I have said, all those non-strategic Trust Territories have now achieved independence. As again we all know, there is only one Trust Territory left, and that is a strategic one, to which Article 83 alone applies.

In short, the view of my delegation is that we are no longer required to render assistance to the Special Committee or to the General Assembly in their work.

Mr. BADER (United States of America): I listened with interest to the statements made by the Soviet, French and United Kingdom delegations, and I found much to agree with in the statements by the French and United Kingdom delegations. I noted that in his statement the representative of the Soviet Union referred to resolution 1514 (XV), as Soviet delegations frequently do in discussions of decolonization. I see no particular purpose to be gained and no particular goal to be served by an extensive discussion of General Assembly resolutions on decolonization in this forum, since such resolutions are, as are all General Assembly resolutions, recommendations. They are not binding, certainly not binding upon strategic Trust Territories. In any case, it perhaps bears mentioning that the representative of the Soviet Union did not refer to two other resolutions on the subject of decolonization. One is resolution 1541 (XV), which was adopted on the same day as resolution 1514 (XV), in 1960, and which contains the following as principle VI in its annex:

"A Non-Self-Governing Territory can be said to have reached a full measure of self-government by:

- "(a) Emergence as a sovereign independent State;
- "(b) Free association with an independent State; or
- "(c) Integration with an independent State."

(Mr. Bader, United States)

Furthermore, the representative of the Soviet Union did not refer in his statement to another, more recent resolution on the subject of decolonization, resolution 2625 (XXV), adopted in 1970, with its Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, which contains the following language:

"The establishment of a sovereign and independent State, the free association or integration with an independent State or the emergence into any other political status freely determined by a people constitute modes of implementing the right of self-determination by that people."

What has happened in the case of the Micronesian entities conforms with the last two resolutions, although, as I said at the outset, these are merely non-binding recommendations. The reason they are not binding has been amply spelled out by the representatives of France and the United Kingdom. I will spare this body yet another reading of Article 83 of the Charter, but I think that that makes it quite clear that the functions relating to strategic Trust Territories are the responsibility of the Security Council and not the General Assembly.

As for the General Assembly's attitude to what we do here and to the Trusteeship Council's recognition of the Security Council's role, the draft resolution from the Special Committee of 24 which the representative of the Soviet Union cited at some length was never taken up by a plenary body of the General Assembly. In fact, for the past three years the Chairmen of the Fourth Committee, the Ambassadors of Libya, Cuba and Papua New Guinea, have announced deferral of consideration of that draft resolution. Those three Chairmen, one must presume, were reflecting the will of the membership of the Fourth Committee. In 1981 there was a vote in the Fourth Committee on the question of deferral, and the result was 71 to 30 in favour of deferral.

I should comment briefly on one other point raised by the Soviet representative. He noted - I am paraphrasing, I hope accurately - that the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands was turned over to the United States as an integral whole. I presume that his interpretation was that therefore it was the responsibility of the United States to see to it that the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands emerged from the period of trusteeship as an integral whole. My delegation does not see why that is the case. There is a precedent of a Trust Territory having been divided; Cameroon was divided in accordance with the

(Mr. Bader, United States)

plebiscites conducted under United Nations observation. The peoples of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands have chosen to divide themselves into four entities in precisely the same manner - through plebiscites conducted under United Nations observation.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I was not at all surprised, of course, that the other members of the Trusteeship Council responded negatively to consideration of the question of Micronesia from the standpoint of the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. I was not even surprised at the fact that the representative of France, as I understood it, wanted to remove this item from the agenda of the Trusteeship Council. This is a continuation of the line that the Western Powers have long been pursuing in decolonization bodies and in the General Assembly. Their purpose in recent years has been to halt all activities on the part of United Nations organs dealing with questions of decolonization. If the colonial Powers could have done so 25 years ago they would have even prevented the adoption of the Declaration on decolonization. But they were not able to do that then, and they are not able today to stop the activities of United Nations organs dealing with decolonization - just as they were not able to prevent their colonial empires from collapsing.

The majority of Member States are now in favour of the total elimination of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations, in favour of active work on decolonization by the Special Committee of 24 and in favour of the full implementation of the Declaration on decolonization. They believe - and the Soviet delegation agrees with them - that colonialism is not yet dead.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

It is not only alive, but is counter-attacking. At the present time, neo-colonialism is stepping up its activities, and the case of Micronesia is precisely one of the clear-cut examples of the stepping up of those neo-colonialist activities, which are fundamentally contrary to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations believe that Micronesia is on the list of those Territories covered by Declaration on decolonization and that the problem of Micronesia remains one of decolonization.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I have only one brief comment to make on Ambassador Oleandrov's last statement, and that is that I found it somewhat amazing that he should say in this Council that the colonial Powers - among which, I assume, he includes the United Kingdom - should be trying - if I am paraphrasing him correctly - to wind down, destroy, subvert the work of decolonization committees in the United Nations. My delegation of course submits lengthy statements to the Sub-Committee on Small Territories each year in addition to the information we are obligated to provide to the Secretary-General under Article 73 e of the Charter. We also periodically invite Visiting Missions from the Committee of 24 to visit our dependent Territories, thereby demonstrating our good faith and, I think, providing the best testimony we can of co-operation with the Special Committee on decolonization.

If certain delegations regard such obvious co-operation as simply a means of trying to stultify decolonization work, one might well wonder whether it is worth continuing such co-operation in future.

Mr. BADER (United States of America): The representative of the Soviet Union said in his statement that the majority of Members of the United Nations are in favour of the elimination of colonialism in all its manifestations. I suspect that he was understating the sentiments of the United Nations community and that there was really more than a majority. Speaking for my delegation, we absolutely favour the elimination of colonialism in all its manifestations, not only in Micronesia, which is the business of the Trusteeship Council after all, but everywhere else in the world where colonialism continues to exist, including South-East Asia and South Asia.

Mr. RAPIN (France) (interpretation from French): Just a brief historical reminder. In connection with the second statement of the representative of the Soviet Union I would recall that it was in 1959 that General de Gaulle, who at that time headed the French Government, defined the principles and mechanisms which the following year led to the peaceful independence of most of the French possessions in Africa. The last thing I would add is that those principles and mechanisms were then taken up by all French Governments, including the present one.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to point out that co-operation with the Special Committee on decolonization by countries which have colonies is by no means a gift from those countries to the Special Committee on decolonization but an obligation according to decisions of the United Nations. That is my first point.

Secondly, as is well known, there are no cases in history where colonial Powers have ever voluntarily given independence to colonial countries. They have relinquished control only when forced to do so as a result of a struggle on the part of the peoples of those Territories against the colonial yoke.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): The second part of that last statement was undiluted nonsense. In fact, our decolonization record is second to none. Approximately one third of the Member States of the United Nations today have experienced British colonial rule and most of them were granted independence peacefully.

The PRESIDENT: The Council has heard statements regarding items 11 and 12 on its agenda. However, it has, I believe, been the procedure in the last few years for the Council to await the adoption of its conclusions and recommendations before deciding on the action to be taken on these two items.

If I hear no comments, and if there is no objection, we shall defer decision on the subject.

It was so decided.

DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE INTERNATIONAL TRUSTEESHIP SYSTEM IN TRUST TERRITORIES; REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL [TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL 36 (III) AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 754 (VIII)]  
(continued)

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I apologize, Mr. President, but at earlier meetings when the question of the dissemination of information was considered, some comments were made and the Soviet delegation at the time expressed the wish to make a short statement on this matter. I would like to make this statement now.

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

In connection with agenda item 8, the Soviet delegation has more than once noted in earlier sessions of the Trusteeship Council that the dissemination of information in the Trust Territories about the United Nations in general and, in particular, about the International Trusteeship System in trust territories and about the question of decolonization and the implementation of the Declaration on decolonization, is the direct responsibility of the Administering Authority - in this case, the United States of America.

On this question, appropriate assistance is provided by the United Nations Secretariat and, in particular, by its Department of Public Information (DPI). Unfortunately, our delegation is once again obliged to note that at this session also the activities in this respect of the Administering Authority in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and the assistance provided by the Secretariat leave something to be desired.

Let us look, first of all, at how the Administering Authority is implementing the Trusteeship Council resolution 36 (III) of 8 July 1948 and General Assembly resolution 754 (VIII) of 9 December 1953 regarding the obligation to disseminate information in the Trust Territory. For a number of years now, the Administering Authority has not endeavoured to provide detailed information in its annual reports, or through separate reports, or even orally. Now what was specifically done last year by the Administering Authority in this area? In the Administering Authority's previous report to the Council and in the report which is now before the Trusteeship Council at this session, our delegation was not able to find any trace or indication of information disseminated by the Administering Authority on the United Nations or on the International Trusteeship System. Moreover, during consideration of this item last Friday the representative of the Administering Authority made no attempt to inform the Council, even briefly, of the situation in this respect at the present time. What specific materials - press, radio, video cassettes - on what specific matters were provided and in what specific parts of the Trust Territory was information made available and disseminated by the Administering Authority?



(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

How can we judge these omissions by the Administering Authority?

On the other hand, in some of its earlier reports, the Administering Authority reported - albeit briefly - on how information on the United Nations was disseminated in the Territory in documents of the Trusteeship Council and so on. How has this situation changed?

It is particularly strange that during the last two Council sessions the representative of the United States himself said - and this was duly reflected in the report and records of the Trusteeship Council - that inadequate numbers of Trusteeship Council documents had been sent to the Trust Territory. He said that the Administering Authority would make sure that larger quantities of those documents were made available and promised to ensure wider dissemination. The Micronesians themselves and the representative of France also referred to this matter. The Micronesians said they were not fully informed about the content of the Trusteeship Council's report. In some cases, members of the Visiting Missions to Micronesia tried to read out in public the paragraphs of the Council's report which were of direct interest to the part of the population of Micronesia to whom they were speaking.

It is clear that United Nations materials do not reach the Micronesian people. The Micronesians cannot be blamed for this; it is somebody else's fault. It is the obligation of the United Nations Department of Public Information to provide information on the United Nations, the International Trusteeship System and major decolonization issues.

From the report of the Secretary-General (T/1873) and the answers given by representatives of the Department of Public Information in response to questions from members of the Council it appears that the Department of Public Information does not send sufficient copies of material about the United Nations, the International Trusteeship System and decolonization to the Trust Territory. There was no reference in the Secretary-General's report to measures for the dissemination of information on, in particular, such a major issue as the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

The Soviet delegation believes that the Trusteeship Council should urge the Administering Authority and the Department of Public Information to improve the state of affairs relating to the provision of information to the inhabitants of the Trust Territory. The Micronesians are fully entitled to know everything relating to their own Territory and the activities of the United Nations. This is

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

particularly important in the present critical period in the history of the Micronesian people, when the Administering Authority is continuing to take illegal action in respect of that Territory, in violation of the United Nations Charter, taking advantage of the economic dependence of the inhabitants of those islands and keeping them dependent on the United States.

Mr. BADER (United States of America): Perhaps I did not understand clearly the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union, but I thought he said that there was no reference in the Administering Authority's report to the dissemination of information on the United Nations. There is a description in the report of dissemination of such information. The relevant paragraph reads:

"The Administering Authority, as part of its transfer of functions to the constitutional Governments, has relinquished any control over broadcast policy or programming on the radio stations of the Territory. United Nations materials are distributed both directly from UN agencies and the Tokyo Information Office and through the Trust Territory Headquarters on Saipan. There has been close collaboration with the Tokyo Information Office in developing address lists to assure that the materials reach appropriate addressees, including radio stations directly, schools, public libraries, newspapers, governmental agencies and private individuals and organizations."  
(T/1878, annex, para. 97)

With regard to the question raised by the representative of the Soviet Union on the numbers of copies of relevant documents supplied, he is indeed correct that that is on occasion a problem. We did have requests, particularly last year, for additional copies of the Trusteeship Council's report and the provisional verbatim records. The Secretariat very kindly and efficiently responded to those requests and sent additional copies of those documents, but there may still be some shortcomings in that regard.

I would simply note that we do not need many copies for use on radio broadcasts - one reading has an audience of 10,000 - and the same is true of items in libraries, which have a large readership.

Mr. OLEANDROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): With reference to the statement of the United States representative, it was pointed out that what we need is an improvement in the work on providing information on the United Nations, the International Trusteeship System and decolonization to the inhabitants of Micronesia. At the same time, there was an indication that the Administering Authority is making the local authorities do this

(Mr. Oleandrov, USSR)

work, and we cannot possibly agree with that, because it is primarily the responsibility of the Administering Authority to keep the population of the Trust Territory informed. And obviously the Administering Authority is responsible to the Trusteeship Council and the Security Council for the shortcomings that exist in this area.

Mr. MORTIMER (United Kingdom): I wish merely to express my delegation's hope that the practice of reopening agenda items - which I put in the same category as suspending meetings of the Council owing to the non-availability of Ambassadors to make statements - will not be regarded as a precedent for the Council's future work.

The PRESIDENT: I am bound to point out to the representative of the United Kingdom that the Soviet Union had earlier registered a wish to make a further statement on this item.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.