

06
1,716

MICRONESIA'S TOMORROW

- Marianas District
 - Agrihan
 - Pagan
 - Alamagan
 - Sarigan
 - Anatahan
- Saipan ●
- Tinaian
- Rota
- Guam
- (U.S. Territory)
- Palau District
 - Kayangel
 - Babelthuap
 - Koror ●
 - Peleliu
 - Angaur
 - Sonsorol
- Yap District
 - Yap ●
 - Ngulu
 - Uliithi
 - Fais
 - Elato
 - Woleai
 - Eauripik
- Yap District
 - Faraulep
 - Lamotrek
 - Satawal
 - Ifalik
- Sorol
 - Sorol
 - Eauripik
 - Pulusuk
- Namonuito
 - Namonuito
 - Puluwat
 - Pulap

- Marshall's District
 - Eniwetok
 - Ujelang
 - Nomwin
 - Murilo
 - Truk ●
 - Losap
 - Namoluk
 - Etal
- Bikini
- Rongelap
- Wotho
- Kwajalein
- Lae Ujae
- Namu
- Ailinglapalap
- Oroluk
- Ponape
- Senyavin Islands
- Lukunor
- Satawan
- Nukuoro
- Kapingamarangi

- Utirik
- Ailuk
- Wotje
- Maloelap
- Aur
- Jabwot
- Majuro ●
- Arno
- Jaluit
- Pingelap
- Kusaie
- Ebon
- Namorik
- Kili
- Mili
- Pongape District
- Kapingamarangi

A PROGRAM OF POLITICAL EDUCATION
Presented by
THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
Headquarters, Saipan, Mariana Islands
1973

PREFACE

This small booklet on Political Education in Micronesia was developed by Mr. Carl Heine at the request of the High Commissioner, with assistance and technical support from the Department of Public Affairs, Headquarters, Saipan, Mariana Islands.

It is our hope that although this program may not meet the expectation of every citizen throughout Micronesia, it will at least provide a basis for political discussion in Micronesia. The task of political education in Micronesia belongs to everyone.

Under the Trusteeship Agreement, the Administering Authority is responsible for political advancement of the people of Micronesia. This booklet along with the program of Political Education of the air are part of that responsibility.

Strik Yoma
Director of Public Affairs

CONTENTS

PROGRAM	PAGE
One BRIEF HISTORY	1
Two FREE ASSOCIATION	5
Three INDEPENDENCE	9
Four COMMONWEALTH	13
Five STATUS QUO	16
Six QUESTIONS & ISSUES	21

This program of Political Education is a public service presentation of the Headquarters Department of Public Affairs. The series is designed to help bring about an awareness of the various political alternatives available to the people of Micronesia.

The Department of Public Affairs takes no sides in the political issues on the future of Micronesia. Its task is simply to present the issues as they are, not to interpret them or draw any conclusions from them.

BRIEF HISTORY

Today, we will take a brief look into history to acquaint ourselves with some of the important events that have happened in the past which have made Micronesia what it is today.

The over 2-thousand tiny islands that make up Micronesia extend from Palau, in the Western Caroline Islands, to the Marshalls in the East. They were first discovered by Spain in the 16th Century.

After this discovery, the Spanish settled in Micronesia until Germany bought the islands for four-and-a-half million dollars. That was in the late 1800's. Germany remained in Micronesia until 1917, when she lost World War One. The Pacific Islands of Micronesia were then mandated to Japan. Japan remained in Micronesia until she was defeated in World War Two. This was in 1945... the beginning of the American period in Micronesia.

With the defeat of Japan in World War Two, the question of the future of these islands again arose. However, in 1947, the United States submitted the present Trusteeship Agreement to the United Nations. It was approved and signed in the same year. Thus, Micronesia, which was discovered by Spain, colonized by Germany and Japan, was now under a Trusteeship Agreement awarded to the United States.

From 1945 until now, 1973, the Micronesians have been under the United States Government. Micronesians have been given opportunities to go to school, an opportunity which was not fully realized under the previous powers.

As the years went by, Micronesians became more and more demanding for greater self-government. Thus, in 1965, the Administering Authority gave its consent, and the Congress of Micronesia was created. This Congress became the highest legislative body in all of Micronesia.

In 1967, two years after the Congress was created, they decided that the time had come to start looking for a political status, other than the United Nations Trusteeship. A resolution of the Congress of Micronesia was adopted which created, for the first time, a new body, composed of Micronesians only. This new body was called the Future Political Status Commission. The Commission was given the task of deciding and recommending the course of Micronesia's political destiny.

The first immediate task of the newly formed Political Status Commission was to make its recommendation to the Congress of Micronesia. However, before it could do that, the Political Status Commission, in 1969, traveled to the South Pacific islands and countries. It visited American Samoa, Western Samoa, Fiji, New Zealand, Australia and the Territory of Papua New Guinea. The Commission was interested in looking into the various forms of political arrangements in these islands and countries of the Pacific area. In April of the same year, the Commission returned to Micronesia, and split up into two groups. One went to the eastern districts, while the other went to the western districts.

It was during these trips to the districts of Micronesia, that the two groups announced simultaneously in Truk and Palau that Micronesia would enter into negotiations with the United States for a country of Micronesia in free association with the United States.

In July of 1969, the Congress of Micronesia convened on Saipan, and the Commission put forward this recommendation of free association to the Congress. This recommendation was adopted by the majority of the members of the Congress of Micronesia.

In September of 1969, the Commission was invited by the Secretary of the Interior to go to Washington, D.C. This was the beginning of the first round of a series of negotiations on the political future of Micronesia. When the Commission went to Washington its name was changed. It became known as the Micronesian Political Status Delegation. For three weeks, the Delegation conducted preliminary talks on eleven points which were presented. The Delegation met with both representatives of the Interior, Defense and State Departments, and observers from the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The eleven topics presented to the United States in Washington, briefly were as follows:

- One. That the people of Micronesia will draft and adopt their own constitution.
- Two. That no land will be taken, or military bases established, without consent, consultation and fair compensation.
- Three. The U.S. will conduct Micronesia's foreign affairs.
- Four. Micronesia will agree not to allow other countries into Micronesia for military purposes.
- Five. The U.S. will agree to an early settlement of Micronesian postwar damage claims.
- Six. The U.S. will remove all barriers to the free movement of Micronesians into the U.S.
- Seven. The U.S. will remove all barriers to free movement of goods from Micronesia to U.S.
- Eight. The U.S. will consult with Micronesians on matters of

FREE ASSOCIATION

shipping, civil aviation and communications. Nine. Micronesia will have access to the U.S. Ninth Circuit Court and the Supreme Court.

Ten. Micronesia will continue to have access to U.S. banking facilities.

Eleven. The U.S. will guarantee financial assistance to Micronesia.

No conclusions were reached during these preliminary discussions in Washington. On the eleven topics presented, the U.S. delegation generally agreed in principle with the Micronesian delegation's basic position except on the question of the control of land.

During round one of the series of negotiations, no agreement was reached on the form and relationship of the association between the U.S. and Micronesia.

In round two, the U.S. came up with a counter proposal. It offered Micronesia a form of commonwealth similar to that of Puerto Rico. The entire delegations of districts to the Congress of Micronesia, except the Marianas, disapproved this form of political status. As a result of this, there was an impasse and there were no more talks until October of 1971, when the form of free association became acceptable to the U.S. Government.

Tomorrow we shall discuss what free association is and what it means.

Tomorrow we will discuss program two of the series.

Today, we will discuss free association and try to learn what it means to Micronesia and to Micronesians. On our first program, if you recall, during the round two of the negotiations, the United States had offered a counter proposal - a form of commonwealth similar to that of Puerto Rico. This offer was rejected by all delegations of each district except the Marianas.

When the negotiations between the United States and Micronesia were resumed in October of 1971, the United States had come to accept the free association as a possible political choice for the islands and people of Micronesia. Let's take a closer look at free association.

Free association is an arrangement which enables people to advance from a colonial status or a trusteeship status to a new and free status which satisfies their basic aspirations to rule or govern themselves and protect their individuality and cultural characteristics. At the same time, it recognizes the practical considerations which must apply to a territory of small population and limited resources.

Since it was of utmost importance that both sides understand what was meant by free association the Congress of Micronesia's Joint Committee on Future Status prepared a statement which presented the important and essential nature of free association in terms of four basic principles and legal rights. These four propositions are as follows:

1. That sovereignty in Micronesia resides in the people of Micronesia and their duly constituted government.
2. That the people of Micronesia possess the right of self-determination and may, therefore, choose independence or self-government with any nation or organization of nations.
3. That the people of Micronesia have the right to adopt their own constitution and to amend, change, or revoke any constitution or governmental plan at any time; and

4. That Free Association should be in the form of a revocable compact, terminable unilaterally by either party.

These, then are the four main guiding principles of free association. According to the Congress of Micronesia's Joint Committee on Future Status, any arrangement which falls short of these four basic guideline is not free association.

In short, these four principles are an attempt to clearly tell everyone how Micronesians think and feel about their rights and the ownership of their lands and territorial waters.

However, during the course of the status negotiations, especially rounds three and four, held in Hana Maui, and Koror, Palau respectively, the United States delegation came to accept in principle, the first three basic principles except the last one on unilateral termination.

In the face of this opposition, the Micronesians proposed that they would be willing to accept a five-year period in which the right of unilateral termination would not be exercised, the United States delegation proposed that it should be fifteen years. To date there has been no agreement or compromise on this point.

Let us now look at free association and what actually it would mean to the people of Micronesia if and when this political arrangement were finally agreed upon.

During the last four rounds of negotiations the two delegations have come to agree in broad principles, that a compact of free association be agreed to between the people of Micronesia and the United States Government. So far only a partial draft compact has resulted from these negotiations.

Under this partial draft compact, the United States Government would be responsible for Micronesia's defense and foreign affairs. The Micronesian people, on the other hand, would be free to run their own internal affairs or government. They would draft their own constitution, a constitution that must be based on democratic principles. They would also be

free to elect and choose their own leaders in the legislative and executive branches as well as the judiciary. In addition to these rights regarding home rule or internal self-government, the United States would pay a rent, annually to the Government of Micronesia, while Micronesia, in return, would agree to a status of forces agreement which would allow certain pieces of land in Micronesia for use by the U.S. military mainly in the Marshalls District and in Palau. (The Marianas are negotiating separately with the United States on this matter). Furthermore, the Government of Micronesia would agree not to allow the entry of a third country in Micronesia.

At this point, it is not yet decided how the Government of Micronesia would be run and organized under free association. There are those who think that rather than have one head of state, Micronesia should have an Executive Council as head of state. This is still under study by the Congress of Micronesia. In respect to finance, this, too, is still undecided. The Joint Committee on Future Status and the U.S. Delegation are still in the process of negotiations to determine how much money the U.S. Government should pay to the Government of Micronesia.

As all of you can see, the arrangement of free association is a give and take proposition. The U.S. Government is given certain responsibilities while Micronesia guarantees certain rights and privileges for the U.S. Government. Micronesians, under this arrangement, would run their own internal government. Certain areas in foreign affairs such as trade and educational and cultural exchange would also be handled by Micronesians, themselves. In choosing the relationship of free association, Micronesia would not exercise its right to full independence, or to remain under the status quo, but, instead, would enter into a formal relationship of free association in which some of the burdens of running a government are freely given to the United States in exchange for certain rights and protection and financial security.

This arrangement of free association was adopted by a majority of the members of the Congress of Micronesia, and is favored by many people throughout Micronesia. There are, however, those within Micronesia who do not like this arrangement. They want complete independence for Micronesia.

In August of 1972, in the Special Session held in Ponape, the Draft Compact of Free Association was submitted to Congress for its review. Since the draft compact was not yet complete, Congress refused to act favorably on it. Furthermore, there were those who felt that there were too many concessions to the military. In the wake of all these problems, the independence Coalition within the Congress of Micronesia introduced a resolution which gave the Joint Committee on Future Status an additional mandate. This was to start to negotiate on the issue of independence along with the arrangement of free association.

Let us now look at the consequences of this arrangement of free association economically, politically and culturally.

Economically, Micronesia would be able to continue with its present programs and some of its capital improvements. It would receive rent money from the U.S. Government which would allow it to improve the standard of living throughout Micronesia. On the other hand, however, Micronesia could become dependent upon this kind of money and level of funding which she would not be able to produce from her small economic resources. She would have a government based on a dependency economy.

Politically, Micronesia would not be too disturbed internally. She would continue with the present setup of government with some small modifications into a government run by Micronesians under the free association arrangement. Micronesia would also be free to move in other directions. She could always choose independence if free association turned out to be unacceptable.

Culturally, there are those who feel that Micronesia has reached the point of no return; therefore the desire to preserve a long-standing culture is a losing battle. On the other hand, there are those who want to combine what is the best from both cultures, and under free association this may be possible.

On our next program we will discuss the movement toward independence and what it would mean for Micronesia.

INDEPENDENCE

Today, we will look into the idea of independence as a political choice for Micronesia. Under the Trusteeship Agreement it is a real possibility, and in the current series of negotiations it is one of the two mandates given the Joint Committee on Future Status. In the final analysis, this alternative, like all others, will be decided upon, in one way or the other by the people of Micronesia.

The language of the Trusteeship Agreement states in part that the Administering Authority shall - quote - promote the development of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory toward self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of the Trust Territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned - unquote.

It is this particular language of the Trusteeship Agreement that causes the Congress of Micronesia and its various select committees on political status to maintain that independence is a real alternative which Micronesians have a right to choose and, therefore, should consider. Furthermore, the Congress of Micronesia maintains that the right to independence is not derived from the Trusteeship Agreement but rather that the Trusteeship Agreement acknowledges its prior existence; that it is a basic and continuing right of Micronesian life. However, during the first five rounds of negotiations, the basic position of the Joint Committee on Future Status, as well as its predecessors, was free association, and all of these rounds of negotiations were directed toward the accomplishment of such a status. This does not exclude the fact that the pro-independence element within the Congress of Micronesia

has been there making its position known in one way or another, both in Congress and in these negotiations.

During the special session in Truk in 1971, the movement for independence took on a new meaning when the Independence Coalition was organized and began to advocate independence for Micronesia. And again, in the special session in Ponape in 1972, the Independence Coalition resurfaced and made Congress adopt its position that the Joint Committee on Future Status should start negotiating with the United States on independence. This new mandate was added to the mandate of free association.

When the Joint Committee on Future Status met in Barbers Point in Honolulu for the sixth round of talks, independence was a point for negotiation. The two sides, however, were unable to reach any agreement regarding the issue of independence.

Let us look at independence and see what are its advantages and its disadvantages. Independence, first of all - all as viewed by the Congress of Micronesia - is the political status most in accord with the intent of the Trusteeship Agreement.

It is also the choice made by all the nine trust territories which have so far changed their status. It is very likely that in the eyes of the United Nations, an independent Micronesia would be an honorable and acceptable climax to the Trusteeship Agreement.

Moreover, as an independent state, Micronesia would possess full legal control of its own affairs. Any relationship with other nations or groups of nations would require Micronesian consent. No foreign presence or interest in Micronesia would be permitted unless it was fully consistent with the best interests of Micronesia. Although the realities of political and economic life would likely oblige the Micronesian Government to give away certain rights in exchange for certain benefits, such decisions would be made by Micronesians and not by others acting on their behalf.

The disadvantages of independence are very substantial. Most

of them come, not from political considerations, but from economic factors. The lack of certain natural resources, the small population, geographical distances, cultural diversity, communication and transportation difficulties would gravely challenge any administration and would undoubtedly create problems for the newly independent government.

Moreover, there is the added difficulty, that the development of a new governmental system more appropriate to an independent Micronesia might prove very difficult to many Micronesians who are now used to the present system which has been in practice for the past twenty some years.

In addition, the most serious disadvantage of independence is that, even to maintain the present standard of living, Micronesia would need considerable assistance. And, to carry out any further program of economic development, even greater aid would be required. It is also questionable whether an independent Micronesia could succeed in obtaining the initial financing necessary to develop a self-sufficient economy.

Whereas a compact of free association would provide specific terms of aid, an independent Micronesia would rely on negotiated treaties for aid.

At this point in time, the Joint Committee on Future Status continues to negotiate with the United States delegation toward the completion of the compact of free association. The independence movement, however, is growing. It is now one of the two options which the Joint Committee on Future Status is negotiating with the United States.

Outside of these considerations within the context of the modern world there are those who see independence as a move toward a taro patch and fish economy... a happy and carefree society in which the people of Micronesia would somewhat ignore the modern world and live on a subsistence economy. For some, it is this aspect of independence for Micronesia that

must be considered as a possibility, even though it may be difficult to attract the younger generation of Micronesia to it.

Thus, during the special session in Ponape, 1972, the 16 members of the Independence Coalition who signed a letter to the presiding officers of the Congress of Micronesia gave the following points, among others, regarding the position of the independence movement in Micronesia.

1. Micronesia must be independent before entering into a treaty with the United States.
2. Micronesia must have a constitution which will be the supreme law of the land, and not be subservient to the compact of free association.
3. Micronesia must have full internal sovereignty over its own internal matters.
4. Micronesia must retain full sovereignty over external matters.
5. Micronesia must not relinquish the ultimate control over the U.S. military activities in Micronesia.

From these points we can readily see that for those who are advocating independence for Micronesia - what they mean and what they want is full independence.

On the other hand, there are many who will take issue with the position of the independence movement in Micronesia.

Still, independence is an available political option in the negotiations on the political future of Micronesia. It is up to the people of Micronesia to decide for themselves what they want and, what they think is best for them now and in the future.

On our next program, we shall take a look into the status of commonwealth, the status which the Congress of Micronesia has rejected, but one which the Marianas have opted for and are now using as a basis for a political settlement in their negotiations with the United States.

COMMONWEALTH

As we learned in earlier programs in this series, the United States offered a commonwealth form of government to Micronesia. However, five of the six districts of Micronesia rejected the proposal. The one exception was the district of the Marianas. For the benefit of those who may still be interested in learning more about this proposal, we will attempt to discuss it today. The Marianas have elected to pursue this form of association and, therefore, this particular program of this series will have a more direct bearing and be of particular interest to them.

The discussion in this program is based on the original U.S. proposal submitted to the Congress of Micronesia in 1970. Whatever changes or modification there may have been with respect to the current round of negotiations between the Marianas and the U.S. delegation, is not covered in this program, which is concerned more with the general nature of the arrangement of commonwealth.

Under the terms of the commonwealth offered by the United States, Micronesia would become a part of the United States and would, as a result, assume certain obligations and at the same time receive certain rights and benefits. The relationship would involve much closer ties than either the free association and independence proposals. However, the relationship would not be as close as that of a state of the United States nor would it be one which implies any further change as is the case of an unincorporated territory. As a Commonwealth, Micronesia would permanently join the political family and political area which make up the union under the United States constitutional system.

Perhaps the easiest way to clearly understand the nature of the proposal for commonwealth Status is to examine the relationship which would exist between the Commonwealth of Micronesia and the United States Government. Under the United States proposal, certain powers would be reserved primarily for the Micronesian Government; others would be shared with the United States Government; and others would be reserved primarily for the United States Government.

A summary of the relationship which would exist in major areas is as follows:

1. By joining the United States system, Micronesians would be offered a choice between two statuses. Current Trust Territory citizens would become United States nationals, but they could, by simple application to the Federal Court, become United States citizens. Since Micronesians would be either U.S. nationals or U.S. citizens, they would have the right to free access to the United States for any reason, including business, study and travel. In addition, Micronesian goods would be allowed free access into the United States.
2. Within certain limitations and restrictions, the people of Micronesia would be free to determine their own internal governmental structure through a constitutional convention. First, the constitution of Micronesia would have to provide a republican form of government, including a bill of rights, and not be contrary to the constitution of the United States or the United States act establishing the commonwealth relationship.
3. The Congress of Micronesia would have full legislative authority in Micronesia, except that no legislation enacted by the Congress of Micronesia could be inconsistent with the constitution of the United States. In addition, no law could be passed imposing any tax upon the property of the United States Government.
4. Both the U.S. Congress and the Congress of Micronesia would have authority to legislate for the Commonwealth of Micronesia.

5. All the property held or controlled by the Trust Territory Government, including the so-called public lands, would be turned over to the Government of Micronesia. All land currently held by the U.S. Trust Territory Government, including all military or government retention areas would be reviewed by the U.S. Government, and would then enter into negotiations or new agreements for those lands considered by it to be necessary for its public purposes or military needs.

6. Micronesia would have its own local courts which would enforce and interpret local laws. In addition, the U.S. Federal Court System would be expanded to include Micronesia, and the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals and the U.S. Supreme Court would be available for appeals.

7. In the area of foreign affairs and defense, Micronesia would be taken care of and handled by the U.S. Government under the direction of the President of the United States.

These are among the major areas in which the Micronesians would have to consider the advantages and disadvantages of the concept of commonwealth.

As pointed out earlier this concept has been accepted by the leaders of the Marianas District. The current negotiations between the U.S. Delegation and the Marianas Future Political Status Commission are based on this political arrangement.

The leaders of the other five districts did not accept or approve this proposal. The negotiations between the Congress of Micronesia's Joint Committee on Future Status and the U.S. Delegation are based more or less on two basic political choices - free association and independence.

Council of the United Nations on April 2, 1947, and by the U.S. Government on July 18, 1947, after the constitutional process;

Whereas the United States of America, under the terms of the agreement, is designated as the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory and has assumed obligations for the government thereof;

Therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, by virtue of the authority vested in me by Article 2 of the Constitution of the United States, do hereby terminate the military government in the former mandated islands and Delegate authority and responsibility for the civil administration of the Trust Territory, on an interim basis, to the Secretary of the Navy.

In signing the Executive Order placing the Trust Territory under the Secretary of the Navy, the President also issued the following public statement:

"I signed today the Joint Resolution authorizing approval by this government of the Trusteeship Agreement for the former Japanese mandated islands and have instructed the Secretary of State to notify the appropriate organs of the United Nations that this agreement, has been duly approved by the Security Council and by this Government, enters into force as of this date. It is the intention of this government to carry out in full the obligations toward the people of the Trust Territory and toward the United Nations, as specified in the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement and Chapter XI, XII, and XIII of the Charter of the United Nations.

"Under the Article 12 of the Trusteeship Agreement, the U.S. is obligated to enact such legislation as may be necessary to place the provisions of this agreement in effect in the Trust Territory. This is the responsibility that falls upon the Congress of the United States. In order to assist the Congress in this task, I have asked the Department of State to prepare, in consultation with other interested departments, suggestions for organic legislation for the Trust Territory. It is expected that these suggestions will be ready for presentation to the Congress at its next session."

STATUS QUO

The status quo of the Trust Territory today is a political arrangement whereby the United States administers the islands as a trust of the United Nations. The United Nations Trusteeship Agreement is the name of the document or charter that provides for the establishment of an international trusteeship system for the administration and supervision of the former Japanese mandated islands of Micronesia. By passage of a joint resolution in the U.S. 80th Congress, approved on July 18, 1947, the Congress authorized the President to approve the U.N. Agreement with respect to the U.S. administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, comprising the islands of the Marshalls, Caroline, and Marianas groups formerly mandated to Japan.

On July 18, 1947, the President issued the following Executive Order:

Whereas the Territory of the Pacific Islands (hereinafter referred to as the "Trust Territory") has been placed in the trusteeship system established in the charter of the United Nations by means of a trusteeship approved by the Security

"With my letter of June 19, 1947, to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, I enclosed a letter addressed to me from the Secretary of State. This letter sets forth the recommendations which have been agreed upon by the Secretary of State, War, Navy, and Interior with respect to the future administration of Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory, and which I have approved.

Accordingly, the President said:

"I have issued an Executive Order today terminating military government in the Trust Territory and delegating responsibility for civic administration on an interim to the Navy Department, which, as a matter of administration expediency, is necessary at this time.

"It is my intention, however, to effect the transfer of this responsibility from the Navy Department to a civilian agency of the government at the earliest practicable date."

On July 18, 1947, the President commissioned the then Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean Area as United States High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

On July 21, 1947, the Secretary of the Navy directed the U.S. Naval Military Government of the Marshall, Caroline, and Mariana Islands disestablished as of July 18, 1947, remarking that this renders the JCS Interim Directive for Military Government no longer applicable to these islands. The High Commissioner was directed by the Secretary of the Navy to institute a civilian administration of the Trust Territory, effective on July 18, 1947 in accordance with the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement. He also authorized the High Commissioner to appoint a Deputy High Commissioner and such sub-area and island governors and administrators as the High Commissioner deemed necessary for the proper conduct of government.

Admiral Louis Denfeld, the first Trust Territory High Commissioner appointed by the President, in his proclamation:

addressing the people of the Territory, gave a brief history of how the Trusteeship Agreement came into being. In describing the Government of the Trust Territory, Denfeld said that the TTPI had been placed under the trusteeship agreement established in the Charter of the United Nations by means of a Trusteeship Agreement, approved by the Security Council of the United Nations on April 2, 1947, and by the United States Government on July 18, 1947, after due constitutional process. He pointed out that the U.S. under the terms of the trusteeship agreement, had been designated as the Administering Authority of the Trust Territory and to assume obligations for the government thereof. He also noted that it had been necessary to establish an interim administration of the TTPI, pending the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress of the U.S. providing for the future government.

High Commissioner Denfeld further noted the President of the U.S. had determined, by Executive Order of July 18, 1947, the military government in former Japanese mandated islands, now the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and had delegated the authority and responsibility for civil administration, thereof, on an interim basis, to the Secretary of the Navy.

High Commissioner Denfeld, in describing his responsibilities as the representative of the Administering Authority, said:

"All powers of government and jurisdiction in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and over the inhabitants, and final administrative responsibility are vested in me as High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and will be exercised through subordinate administrations by his direction.

"Your existing customs, religious beliefs and property rights will be respected and existing local laws and all proclamations, regulations, ordinances and orders of the former military government shall remain in force and effect, except insofar as they are not in consonance with the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement and the Executive Order, and insofar as it may be necessary for me in the exercise of my powers and duties to change them."

High Commissioner Denfeld signed the proclamation at Pearl Harbor on the 18th of July, 1947.

A switch of the civil administration of the territory came about in May of 1951, when the President signed Executive Order 11021, taking the responsibility of administration from the Navy and placing it in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior.

Today, however, we still have a High Commissioner who is appointed by the President of the United States. He is the head of the Executive Branch of the government.

Legislative authority on the other hand, is now vested in the Congress of Micronesia which is the highest law-making body for Micronesia.

The Judiciary is vested in the High Courts of the Trust Territory. The three judges presiding at the High Court are appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. There are also District Courts where Micronesian judges preside.

The budget for the Trust Territory is appropriated by the Congress of the United States annually. Within recent years, the average annual budget for the Trust Territory has been \$60 million. From this grant, the whole operation of the Trust Territory is funded plus smaller amounts appropriated by the Congress of Micronesia from local revenues.

Micronesia has been under the present status quo since the Trusteeship Agreement was signed in 1947. The current series of status negotiations are an attempt to bring about an end to the Trusteeship Agreement, and the present system of government. The language of the Trusteeship Agreement states that the people of Micronesia have a right of self-determination and whether this agreement is terminated or not it is up to both the people of Micronesia and the Administering Authority.

On our sixth and final program we will discuss the general issues and questions related to these programs, and how they may affect the future of these islands.

QUESTIONS & ISSUES

Now that we have listened to the whole series of Political Education broadcasts, perhaps we should pause and ask ourselves, what is the meaning of all these various forms of political options? What do I, as an individual or my island, community, village, or any district, even Micronesia as an emerging country stand to gain or lose? Why may one choice be more advantageous than another one, and how? At this point in history, is it wise to accept the changes that have been handed down to us, or is it better if we stop here and let the world go by us? These are just a few of the many questions that each and every Micronesian must ask himself.

To some people, it may be too late already to even begin to ponder these issues; to some others, it is not too late. The future of Micronesia is in the hands of every Micronesian. The decision as to which forms of political association Micronesia should have, will ultimately be made by the people of Micronesia.

Let's review quickly what we have learned from this series of programs.

We have learned, in addition to what we already knew, about the past history of these islands from the time of the Spanish up to the present.

We have learned a little about what free association is and what it would mean to Micronesia.

We have learned a little about independence, and what it could mean to Micronesia.

We have also learned about the U.S. proposal of commonwealth, and what that arrangement might mean to Micronesia.

We know about our present form of government, or the status quo. We learned about it during the past twenty some years under the American administration.

However, knowing about all of these choices of political status may not be enough. Perhaps we have more questions now than we had before. Let us consider some of the broad questions that may arise in our minds regarding the political future of Micronesia.

Question 1 — Under the arrangement of free association, where would Micronesia receive financial assistance?

Answer — Most of it would come from the U.S. a small part of it from Micronesia local revenues. However, increases in local revenues should be expected as development and growth come to these islands in the future.

Question 2 — Who would be responsible for our foreign affairs and defense under free association?

Answer — The U.S. in consultation with the Micronesian Government.

Question 3 — What kind of government would we have under free association?

Answer — No one has decided yet, but it would be up to the people of Micronesia and their leaders in the Congress of Micronesia. Most likely we would follow the same arrangement we now have.

Question 4 — What about our lands, who would control them?

Answer — Control of land would be in the hands of Micronesian people, and their own government. Each piece of land, whether owned individually or collectively, would not be taken without the consent of the owners. However, under this arrangement, certain lands in Palau, Marianas and the Marshalls would be negotiated with the U.S. Government. The U.S. has some military requirements in these three districts.

Question 5 — Under free association would our customs and cultures be respected?

Answer — Yes, however, it would be up to Micronesian people themselves to determine what part of their cultures they want to retain or disregard.

Question 6 — Under independence, what would be the general situation with respect to government, land, customs, culture, financial assistance?

Answer — Under the arrangement of independence, Micronesia

would be free to choose its own form of government, its leaders, and its customs and cultures would remain as they have always been in the past. No one would tell us how to govern ourselves, and no one would impose any new customs on us if we did not like them.

With respect to financial assistance, Micronesia would have to raise its own money to finance its programs of education, health, public projects, etc. Micronesia, however, might get financial assistance from other countries, including the U.S.; but this foreign aid would not come free; Micronesia would have to pay it back.

The Micronesian people themselves would control their land as they always have in the past prior to the times of Spanish, Germans, and the Japanese.

Question 7 — Under commonwealth, what would be the general situation with respect to these same questions: land, government, finance, customs, leadership, etc.?

Answer — Under this arrangement, Micronesia would be somewhat different. We must remember that under commonwealth Micronesia would be joining the American political family. Because of this, most of the arrangements under commonwealth would have to be shared equally by both Micronesian and American alike.

For example, Americans would have the right to acquire land in Micronesia if they wanted to unless this restriction were negotiated prior to the final arrangement. Micronesia would have to follow the form of the U.S. Government and the U.S. Constitution. The U.S. would provide financial assistance, and would handle Micronesia's foreign affairs. Micronesians could be either U.S. nationals or they could retain their Micronesian citizenship if they wished to.

These are some of the broad issues to be discussed; however, in each district, the Department of Public Affairs will be able to give you assistance if you should have more questions regarding these various political options.

The issues and answers are unlimited. It is not the objective of this program to provide all the questions and answers. Our task has been to lead off with a few general questions, and leave the rest to each and everyone of you to carry on the program of political education in your own home or village on your own island.