

May 7, 1970

12  
5

STATEMENT BY THE U. S. DELEGATION

The United States would certainly agree that the Trusteeship Agreement envisages a possible ultimate political status of either self-government or independence. As you have correctly observed, the choice of either of these possibilities is qualified by the requirement that the status be appropriate, first, "to the particular circumstances of the trust territory and its peoples" and, second, "the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned." Also in Article 6 of the Trusteeship Agreement, there are a number of practical objectives relevant to the ultimate political status.

Yesterday I dealt with some of the practical considerations in favor of self-government in association with the United States. Today, let me point out some of the considerations that do not favor independence. Essentially they center around the responsibility the United States has -- both morally, and under the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement and the United Nations Charter -- to ensure that Micronesia is prepared for whatever status its people might select. Furthermore, paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 of the same Article 6 of the Trusteeship Agreement discuss the United States responsibility to "promote the economic advancement and self-sufficiency;" to "promote social advancement" including health; and to "promote educational advancement." The United States has tried, admittedly not always with uniform success, to carry out all of these obligations. But with the best of

will and foreseeable expenditures, it is hard to forecast when Micronesia might achieve the situation in which its particular circumstances would be appropriate for independence. Micronesia has limited natural resources, tremendous logistical problems, and even a wide diversity of cultures and languages presenting unique problems of government.

In summary, disregarding security considerations, the United States does not believe that independence will be a realistically appropriate status, considering the particular circumstances of the Trust Territory, for some time to come; and the United States would be remiss in its responsibilities to say otherwise.

Your second question is really threefold -- first whether the United States would be willing to redirect its programs and assistance towards the goal of independence; second, whether the United States would be willing to establish a timetable towards independence; and third, whether the United States is willing to begin discussions with Micronesian leaders on the future relationship which would exist between the two countries after independence.

To answer the first question, the United States effort is, of course, already directed toward developing Micronesia -- in all its facets -- toward self-determination. However, the United States does not see how it could agree to redirect its programs so that they were specifically aimed at one particular future status. The United States would, in fact, be derelict in its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement if it were to prejudge the outcome of that act of self-determination by the people of Micronesia as a

a whole. The United States will, of course, continue its policy of consulting fully with the Congress of Micronesia and district leaders on the various programs contemplated and, indeed, plans to continue shifting responsibility for these programs to the Micronesians themselves.

As for a timetable for transition to independence, obviously in view of the practical problems which I have cited in terms of the circumstances of the Trust Territory, as well as the inappropriateness of our aiming for only one particular goal, this becomes a moot question. Rather, we must concentrate our efforts on the development of the Trust Territory, particularly in the fields cited in the Trusteeship Agreement. Clearly these efforts have been accelerating in recent years, and we would hope that the resulting progress will continue. But the specific date for self-determination will depend on the wishes of the Micronesian people and the ability of the United States, in good conscience and in accordance with its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement, to agree that Micronesia is prepared for the choice in question.

On the third question, not only are the problems which I have already cited germane to possible discussions on the future relationship between an independent Micronesia and the United States, but it is impossible for this delegation or even this administration to discuss such issues in anything more than the most speculative terms. These would be matters of treaty and other types of international agreements between two independent countries to be entered into by the Executive Branch, probably in most cases with the approval of the United States Congress. Clearly we do not know what United

States Administration might be in office or what its policies might be. Nor do we know how either the United States Congress, or more broadly the American people, might view such relationships in the context of conditions at the time in question.