



HEADQUARTERS • SIEGE NEW YORK, NY 10017
TEL : 1 (212) 963.1234 • FAX: 1 (212) 963.4879

Distr. RESTRICTED
PRS/2010/DP.6

ORIGINAL: English

SECOND INTERNATIONAL DECADE FOR THE ERADICATION OF COLONIALISM

Pacific regional seminar on the implementation of the Second International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism: assessment of decolonization process in today's world

**Nouméa, New Caledonia
18 to 20 May 2010**

STATEMENT

BY

Dr. Carlyle Corbin

(Expert from the U.S. Virgin Islands)

Dr. Carlyle Corbin is an international advisor on global governance and former Minister of State for External Affairs of the *U.S. Virgin Islands* Government. He has served as a United Nations (U.N.) expert on self-determination for over a decade, and as Independent Expert for the *United Nations Development Programme* on U.N. missions to *Bermuda*, and to the *Turks and Caicos Islands*, respectively.

He has also been constitutional advisor to the *Anguilla Constitutional and Electoral Reform Committee*, political advisor to successive chairmen of the U.N. Special Committee on Decolonisation, *Secretary-General* of the *Inter-Virgin Islands Council* between the governments of the British and US Virgin Islands, and *Secretary-General* of the *Offshore Governors' Forum* comprised of the governments of *American Samoa*, *Guam*, the *Northern Mariana Islands*, *Puerto Rico* and the *US Virgin Islands*.

Dr. Corbin presently serves as international advisor to the *U.S. Virgin Islands Fifth Constitutional Convention*, and was a member of the *U.S. Virgin Islands Political Status Commission* which conducted the only political status referendum in the history of the territory.

He twice served as chairman of the 23-member country *Caribbean Development and Cooperation Committee*, a permanent subsidiary body of the of the United Nations *Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)*. He was also the founding chairman of the Commission's *Working Group of Non-Independent Caribbean Countries*.

Dr. Corbin has presented scholarly papers on governance and political development at *Bermuda College*, the *University of the South Pacific*, the *University of Copenhagen*, the *University of Puerto Rico*, *George Washington University*, the *University of the West Indies* and the *University of the Virgin Islands* where he is on the faculty of the *Institute for Future Global Leaders*.

He is the author of two United Nations studies on the participation of non-independent countries in the United Nations system, four books, two book chapters and numerous scholarly articles on political and constitutional advancement.

Introduction

Non-independent countries of the Caribbean region exist under a wide range of dependency and autonomous models of governance including British and United States-administered non self-governing territories, Dutch autonomous countries (Netherlands Antilles, Aruba, Sint Maarten Saba and St. Eustatius), and French integrated departments (Martinique, Guadeloupe and French Guiana). Of course, there are also the independent states of the region which were all formerly colonies of extra-regional powers.

The political status of the two territories under United States administration in the Caribbean, namely Puerto Rico and the US Virgin Islands, is reflective of fundamental distinctions among the various dependency and autonomous models of governance in the Caribbean.

At the same time, the governance models of these two US-administered territories in the Caribbean have striking similarities to the structure of government in the dependency models under US administration in the Pacific region, namely Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa. Useful comparisons can be made in relation to the challenges to attaining a full measure of self-government faced by the five territories under US administration.

Background

In this light, the dependency model in the US Virgin Islands is almost identical to that of the territory of Guam in the Pacific region, whilst the model of Puerto Rico as a US-administered commonwealth served as an original guide for the development of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands as it emerged out of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Adding American Samoa to the list, all five of the Caribbean and Pacific territories are governed by what is referred to as the "Territorial Clause" of the US Constitution which gives the US Congress the authority *"to make all needful rules for territory or other property of the United States."*¹ Equating the territories to *"other property"* has always served as a point of sensitivity, especially for the Caribbean territories who are the descendants of the survivors of the Trans Atlantic slave trade.

Constitutionally, all five territories are not incorporated as parts of the United States, and their political dependency arrangements are clearly within the purview of the international decolonisation process. Yet, only three are formally listed by the United Nations as non self-governing – American Samoa, Guam and the US Virgin Islands, whilst the annual United Nations review of Puerto Rico is - thus far - limited to the Special Committee which has, in recent years, repeatedly called for the General Assembly to take up the decolonisation of that territory. However, no formal proposal for the General Assembly to consider Puerto Rico has been made to date even as all three political parties in the territory have called for this approach during their statements to the Special Committee.

¹ Article IV, Section III (2) of the Constitution of the United States of America.

All of the US-administered territories have undertaken various actions over the last two decades with the aim of political status development – in the cases of American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico - or at the very least, internal constitutional evolution, in the case of the Virgin Islands. Of these, the Northern Mariana Islands is actually experiencing a reduction of autonomous powers in a reversal of what was originally intended (and which was accepted by the General Assembly without substantial review) as an autonomous political status arrangement. This determination was made at the point of dissolution of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI) with Micronesia, Marshall Islands, and later Palau, achieving sovereign free association through a compact with the United Nations.

The Northern Marianas, meanwhile, chose a covenant of what was to be substantial autonomy under a commonwealth status with the US, and that was projected as sufficiently self-governing to be removed from the purview of the Special Committee on Decolonisation. This will remain the case unless the Committee takes a decision (as it does each year in the case of Puerto Rico) to review the status of the Northern Marianas at the committee level. Of course, such an action would require a critical mass of support among the member states of the Special Committee which is hard pressed to deal with territories formally listed, let alone additional territories which might be considered for re-listing.

Suffice to say that the UN should develop a means to review those territories which were formerly de-listed – short of independence - but which may have experienced a reversal of autonomy through the unilateral applicability of administer power laws. Such is the case in Northern Mariana Islands and other “autonomous” countries where what was considered to be constitutional devolution of authority has been transformed into a reverse delegation of power. It is within this context that developments in the US-administered territories in the Caribbean can be assessed.

U.S. – Administered Territories - Puerto Rico

As in the case of the United Kingdom - administered territories in the Caribbean, *Puerto Rico* and the *US Virgin Islands* has made moves towards advancing their political development, and as the other territories, no substantive changes have been concluded.

Puerto Rico was originally conceived as a self-governing model of free association as a result of constitutional changes in 1952, and was removed from the U.N. roster of NSGTs in 1953. As with the *Netherlands Antilles* and *Greenland*, the ‘graduation’ of Puerto Rico to self-governing status prior to U.N. adoption of the definition of free association in 1960 was achieved in the absence of a mechanism to review the constitutional arrangement after it had been removed from U.N. jurisdiction.

With far less autonomy than the original Dutch or Danish autonomous models, Puerto Rico remains a de-facto non self-governing territory. United States Justice Department opinions written for the White House in 2005 and 2007, respectively, have served to provide legal confirmation of their non self-governing status. Thus, Puerto Rico

remains only under the review of the *Special Committee on Decolonisation* which adopts an annual resolution on Puerto Rico, but which is not transmitted to the General Assembly as is done in the cases of resolutions on the UN-rostered territories.

The public debate on political development in Puerto Rico is shared by the three main political parties which, in turn, support the present commonwealth status in the political center, and independence or integration on either end of the political spectrum. Because of continual erosion of the limited Puerto Rican autonomy under the present dependency status, the centrist position has divided into a faction which argues for expanded powers under the present dependency arrangement, and a second faction which seeks to upgrade the present arrangement into a form of recognised autonomy through sovereign free association, consistent with international principles, in particular Resolution 1541(XV).

Proposals from the elected leadership of the territory to update Puerto Rico's political status were introduced in 1958 and 1959, but were not enacted by the U.S. Congress. The status quo arrangement was selected in a 1967 plebiscite by 60.4 per cent, but lost ground to 48.4 per cent in the subsequent 1993 poll. Increased attention was then paid to whether a more autonomous status quo proposed by the pro-commonwealth party was acceptable under the unilateral applicability of U.S. law to the territory.

Subsequent 1998 legislation introduced in Congress to bind the US to the results of a referendum on political options was adopted by one vote in the U.S. House of Representatives, but not taken up in the U.S. Senate. Thus, Puerto Rico conducted its own local plebiscite in 1998 with separate options of a 'territorial' commonwealth and one of free association - to the chagrin of the pro-commonwealth party which subsequently supported the option of 'none of the above,' which garnered 50.4 per cent.²

A President's Task Force was created by then-US President Bill Clinton, and was carried forth by his successor George W. Bush. Emerging from this mechanism were 2005 and 2007 White House reports referenced above which reaffirmed the non self-governing nature of the political status, and recommended a U.S.-sanctioned plebiscite on the three options of political equality, with the alternative to remain in the existing dependency status.

Accordingly, if the electorate chose to remain in the status quo, the White House Report required that periodic plebiscites would be held until a permanent option was chosen. U.S. Congressional hearings were held on the White House Report, with a number of competing legislative proposals emerging, but none have become law.

Amid the absence of concrete action by the administering power towards the completion of the process of self-determination for Puerto Rico, the U.N. Special Committee on Decolonisation adopted its 2009 resolution which "request(ed) the U.N.

² U.N. Special Committee Decision of June 12, 2006 concerning Puerto Rico: Report prepared by the Rapporteur of the Special Committee. U.N. Document A/AC.109/2007/L.3. April 5, 2007. p. 3-4.

General Assembly to consider the question of Puerto Rico comprehensively in all its aspects.”³ It is expected that the 2010 resolution would make a similar call.

The request for United Nations involvement in solving the political status dilemma in Puerto Rico has been supported by the three main Puerto Rican political parties, but the US has historically opposed U.N. monitoring of US - administered territories – even those which are formally listed. This would make it a difficult – but perhaps not insurmountable – for the General Assembly to take up the issue of Puerto Rico over the opposition of a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council. It remains to be seen whether the Obama Administration maintains the inconsistency of the predecessor Bush Administration which confirmed that Puerto Rico was a non self-governing territory, but yet, somehow, out of political reach of international scrutiny. Perhaps the Obama Administration is more willing to take an internationalist approach to these matters.

Following the 2008 elections which brought the pro-integrationist political party to power, the territory's new Resident Commission to the U.S. House of Representatives submitted legislation for a referendum based on the definitions of the political status options, and the two-step procedure recommended in the two White House Reports where the people would first decide on whether or not to maintain the status quo political arrangement, and if so, would be required to vote again in eight years time. If, on the other hand, the Puerto Rico people choose to change the status, then they would have the option of selecting from the three options of political equality that are consistent with international law, namely integration (U.S. statehood), free association and integration. However, the placement of free association in the category of separate sovereignty along with independence is interpreted as a way of influencing the decision in favour of political integration.

In any case, the process emerging from the legal interpretations of the Bush Justice Departments has resulted in a fundamental narrowing of perception of autonomy that can be exercised under the present status of Puerto Rico. Thus, the commonwealth status, originally projected as sufficiently autonomous, has been effectively been re-defined as an unincorporated territory similar in scope to the other US-administered territories of American Samoa, Guam and the commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in the Pacific, and the neighboring US Virgin Islands. The Obama White House Task Force on Puerto Rico, which had its first meeting in March 2010, has appeared to de-emphasize the Bush Administration emphasis on addressing the political status question in favour of expanding the discussion to economic development issues. The inevitable connections between economic advancement and the level of political development do not appear to be part of the discussions at this stage.

In May 2010, legislation was adopted by the US House of Representatives authorizing a two-phase referendum process for Puerto Rico. In the original legislation, the first phase would provide the choice of retaining the non self-governing

³ Report of the Special Committee on Decolonisation. U.N. Document A/64/23. 2009. p. 7-9.

commonwealth temporarily, or selecting one of the legitimate self-governing options of independence, free association and integration. If self-government was chosen then the second phase of the referendum would be on the choice of one of the three legitimate options. However, the advocates for the continuation of the dependency status in the Congress successfully added a rather confusing amendment to allow for the non self-governing commonwealth to be included in the second phase of the referendum – even if it were rejected in the first phase.

The head of North American Affairs of the Puerto Rico Independence Party described the amendment as “*legislative irrationality*” and commented that the US “*Congress has absolutely no intention of relinquishing its role as a colonizing power.*” He noted that the integrationist advocates had lost out on its plan “*to eliminate commonwealth from the picture,*” while the advocates of the non self-governing commonwealth were left with “*no possibility of arguing that commonwealth is anything less than the status quo*” in reference to their interest in an enhanced status quo with powers which have been almost universally rejected as unconstitutional based on what the US Justice has determined was allowable for a US territory.

The US Senate Committee on Natural Resources will take up the measure on 19th May 2010, but if there is no action taken by that legislative body, the Puerto Rican Government has indicated that it would consider holding a local referendum – as it had done in 1998 after the failure of the same US Senate to act on the referendum legislation adopted by the US. House that year. If the Senate does not act in 2010, the situation reverts to where it was in 1999.

U.S. – Administered Territories **US Virgin Islands**

The *U.S. Virgin Islands* held its local political status process from 1988 culminating in a referendum in 1993 with an excessive number of seven alternatives – the three consistent with international principles of political equality and four offering varying degrees of continued dependency. The proliferation of options ensured a lack of clarity among the electorate. Influenced by organised boycotts of the vote by special interest groups, resulted in the legally-required 50 per cent threshold of the registered voters not being met. It was recalled by the President of the U.N. Association of the Virgin Islands in 2006 that “*in 88 years, the Afro-Caribbean people of the U.S. Virgin Islands have traveled a road from an undefined status in a territory under the sovereignty of the USA to citizenship in a country which maintains that territory in a condition of uncertainty and instability.*”⁴

Some thirteen years following the political status referendum, the US Virgin Islands retreated to a narrower focus on drafting a local constitution based on the present

⁴ Presentation of Attorney Judith L. Bourne, President of the United Nations Association of the Virgin Islands (UNAVI), to a forum on “The Ambiguity of our U.S. Citizenship (in the U.S.- administered territories),” St. John, Virgin Islands, September 24, 2005.

dependency status. This constitutional exercise was authorised by US Congressional legislation, but was not designed to address the colonial status, nor to provide any serious devolution of authority. Instead, it is intended to leave intact the mechanism for the administering power to extend laws to the territory without its consent, and even over its objection. A constitutional convention(the fifth in the territory's history) was comprised of thirty members elected in 2007 to draft a constitution. The Convention adopted a proposed constitution in May, 2009. The document has been submitted to the administering power which can amend the text as it sees fit, consistent with the unilateral authority exercised by the administering power over the territory.

The elected territorial governor, however, declined to transmit the draft constitution to Washington citing what he viewed as 'unconstitutional' provisions contained therein. The provisions in question were designed to safeguard certain political and natural resource interests of the native population in a similar fashion to provisions in other US territorial constitutions. A case was subsequently filed in the territorial court in May, 2009 by the Convention leadership for a *writ of mandamus* to mandate the governor to pass the document to the U.S. Government for review. The court decided in December, 2009 to direct the Governor to forward the document, and the Governor so complied, transmitting the document with his objections attached.

By March 2010, a review of the proposed constitution was being undertaken by the US Administration and Congress where amendments could be made before it being returned to the territory for a referendum. Within the limited context of the mandate to retain the status quo, the *Virgin Islands Fifth Constitutional Convention* had adopted a proposed constitution which would effectively expand the parameters of the present status with respect to more territorial control of areas such as natural resources, and the recognition of a certain primacy of the native population. Opposition to a number of the provisions was articulated by the elected territorial governor in testimony before the US Congress in March, 2010, following a detailed presentation by members of the Convention providing their rationale for retaining the provisions.

The US Justice Department also expressed its reservations on the 'questionable' provisions, and the Convention responded with its own legal analysis. On 19th May, the U.S. Senate Natural Resources Committee will conduct a hearing on the proposed constitution of the US Virgin Islands on 19th May.

Other Legislative Proposals Affecting the US territories

A number of legislative proposals have been submitted to the US Congress for its consideration which could affect the political status of the five US-administered territories collectively. These proposals were discussed in two forums convened by the United Nations Association of the Virgin Islands (UNAVI) in early 2010. An analysis of these proposals was published in an *Overseas Territories Review (OTR)* last March. Portions of the *OTR* assessment follow: ⁵

⁵ "Legislation in US Congress Could Move Political Status of US Territories," In Overseas Territories Review <http://overseasreview.blogspot.com/> , 26th March 2010.

These measures include a bill to fund educational programs on political status options in American Samoa, Guam and the US Virgin Islands. This proposal has already been adopted by the US House of Representatives and has been submitted to the US Senate for consideration.

A companion measure aimed specifically at Puerto Rico is set for a vote in the U.S. House of Representatives. This legislation would authorise a federally-sanctioned self-determination process for the people of Puerto Rico leading to a referendum on temporarily retaining the status quo, or selecting one of the permanent status options of independence, free association or integration.

Another proposal, which has routinely been introduced in various forms over the last three decades would extend the vote for the US president to the territories. The latest proposal would take the form of a constitutional amendment similar to that previously extended to the District of Columbia. Legislation to examine potential modalities for greater territorial representation in the U.S. House of Representatives has also been introduced.

Major principles of the measures are as follows:

The Guam/American Samoa/US Virgin Islands bill, as amended, would provide for public education programmes on political status options in the three territories. The options would *"include but not (be) limited to internationally-recognised options of independence, integration and free association."* It also implies that other options – undefined in the bill – would also be the subject of the educational programme (*which could impact the effectiveness of the political education*).

The bill confirms the statutory responsibility of the US Department of Interior to assist the territories in public education, but does not make reference to any referendum (*this could come later under the 1979 Carter Adm. mandate to deal with political status that is still in effect*).

By contrast, the Puerto Rico legislation creates a two-step referendum process. The first step would have people vote in favour or against retaining the status quo. If the people choose to remain the same, then they would have to be consulted again in about eight years since the status is not considered as permanent. Under the bill, if the people of Puerto Rico choose to change the status in the first round of voting, then they vote again shortly thereafter with the choices being the three internationally-recognised options (*integration, free association and independence*).

Neither proposed measures provide for new budget authority. For the legislation aimed at the three territories of American Samoa, Guam and the US Virgin Islands, the US *Congressional Budget Office* estimated the cost at about \$2 million during the period 2010-2014 (*presumably from the existing Interior Dept. budget*).

On the other hand, the Puerto Rico bill makes it clear that the referendum activities would be funded from Puerto Rico Government resources. The Puerto Rico bill does not address educational costs. In Puerto Rico, political education is usually carried out by the respective political parties. None of the other three territories have such experience of political party advocacy for a political status preference.

The three - territories bill was originally introduced by the Delegate of Guam for Guam-only, and was later amended to include American Samoa and the US Virgin Islands. The House Report on the measure (111-357), in the section on *"Background and Need for Legislation,"* makes specific reference to the relevancy of international law including the United Nations Charter as the basis for the self-determination process. The House Report also makes reference to the *"limited form of self-government in the territories under the Territorial Clause."*

The Guam Delegate to Congress made reference in her formal statement to the House Natural Resources Committee hearings to the international obligation under the United Nations Charter *"to develop self-government"* in the territories, and acknowledged that the three territories are on the UN list of NSGTs.

In a similar way, the Puerto Rico measure also refers to the limits of Puerto Rico authority under the Territorial Clause. In the *"Background and Need"* Section of the House Report on the Puerto Rico legislation the issue of voter eligibility is addressed by explaining that the legislation can permit Puerto Ricans born in Puerto Rico but residing outside of Puerto Rico to participate in the referendum.

The two measures appear to be moving along separately, and appear to be regarded as entirely separate matters, even as they go through the same committees, albeit at different times. It will ultimately be up to the Senate as to whether either or both of the bills will pass.

Several other measures have been introduced in the House which would have the effect of modifying the political status of a number of the US - administered territories. These bills are essentially focused on achieving more political involvement in the US political system under the present status. One would be achieved by amending the US Code so as to enable presidential voting rights for territories, whilst the second bill

would study the possibilities of greater representation in the House for the non-voting delegates to Congress from these territories.

The presidential vote measure has been introduced in various forms dating back to the tenure of Virgin Islands Delegate to Congress Ron de Lugo. More recently, various strategies have been employed to gain a vote for the territorial delegates in the House (*Guam Legislature in 2009 passed a resolution requesting a vote on matters strictly related to the militarisation of the territory*).

The OTR assessment raised a number of fundamental questions as to the impact of the legislative proposals on the political evolution of the territories:

Fundamental Questions

On the bills aimed at a self-determination process, the Puerto Rico measure "cuts to the chase" and provides for a referendum on the clear options recognised by international law, whilst also providing a temporary alternative to remain in the dependency status.

Meanwhile, the measure for American Samoa, Guam and the US Virgin Islands has no referendum component, and is also not as specific on the definitions of the options. The measure could be improved by borrowing from the Puerto Rico measure, and would also be consistent with the draft US Virgin Islands proposed constitution which contains a section on a political status mechanism on the three permanent options.

The measures aimed at more political participation of the territories in the US system also raise some issues:

Could more territorial participation in the US political system affect the financial relationship, specifically the balance of taxation and representation? In other words, could a vote in the U.S. House reduce the ability of the territory to retain excise and income taxes?

Also, would this increased participation in the US political system constitute a fundamental change in the political status of the territory, moving towards a form of 'partial integration.'? If so, should the people be given the opportunity to decide on this in a referendum knowing the implications of such changes?

And finally, what would be the impact of a move toward a 'partial integration' before the people determine their political future. If they chose an autonomous status, would the increased participation be reversed?

As the proposals introduced in 2009 wind their way through the US Congress in 2010, it is hoped that further clarity would be forthcoming.

Conclusion ⁶

In the case of the US-administered territories... continued reluctance by the U.S. Congress to accept Puerto Rico as the 51st integrated state could wear thin with pro-integrationist advocates in the territory. If U.S. statehood is ultimately rejected – and the U.S. Congress has been adept thus far in avoiding the final answer to that question – a grand, anti-colonial coalition could emerge to include the pro-statehood and pro-independence parties which adamantly reject the status quo, along with the substantial free association wing of the ruling pro-commonwealth party, forming a significant majority coalescing around some form of sovereign association. The administering power of the territory may yet see the wisdom of this approach as the economic challenges of the territory continue to deepen.

The US Virgin Islands, meanwhile, is significantly less politically developed on these questions, and would have to develop a modality to define itself as a society, and as a political entity, given that the erosion of the legitimacy of territorial status could cause its further political isolation without a plan to address the fundamental question of the dependency status – even as this erosion of legitimacy is not yet widely recognised in the territory. Organised discussion surrounding the proposed constitution in 2010 would be essential to countering prevailing mis-information about the sustainability of dependency status arrangements.

The continuation of a “political drift” of the US Virgin Islands towards some form of partial integration with the US, deficient of anything approaching full rights in the US political system, is the most likely projection in the short term. U.S. congressional legislation on self-determination spearheaded by the non-voting Delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives from the U.S. administered territory of Guam might open a broader dialogue if the measure is adopted.

Otherwise, the U.S. Virgin Islands could remain in an increasingly isolating dependency status unless new or existing institutions develop programs to accelerate the political education process, bringing together the diverse community of varying interests and national origins, and addressing increasing economic inequalities internally.

⁶ Corbin, Carlyle. *Dependency Governance, Constitutional Reform and Democratic Deficit in the Non-Independent Caribbean*; A paper presented to the Eleventh Annual Conference of the Sir Arthur Lewis Institute of Social and Economic Studies (SALISES), University of the West Indies; 24th March 2010.



HEADQUARTERS • SIEGE NEW YORK, NY 10017
TEL.: 1 (212) 963.1234 • FAX: 1 (212) 963.4879

Distr. **RESTRICTED**
PRS/2010/DP.7

ORIGINAL: English

SECOND INTERNATIONAL DECADE FOR THE ERADICATION OF COLONIALISM

Pacific regional seminar on the implementation of the Second International Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism: assessment of decolonization process in today's world

**Nouméa, New Caledonia
18 to 20 May 2010**

STATEMENT

BY

Dr. Carlyle Corbin

(Expert from the U.S. Virgin Islands)

**Statement presented to the United Nations
Pacific Regional Seminar on Decolonisation**

on the

***Role of the United Nations System in Providing Developmental
Assistance to the Non Self-Governing Territories***

presented by

**Dr. Carlyle Corbin
Independent Expert on Governance**

**New Caledonia
2010**

Dr. Carlyle Corbin is an international advisor on global governance and former Minister of State for External Affairs of the *U.S. Virgin Islands* Government. He has served as a United Nations (U.N.) expert on self-determination for over a decade, and as Independent Expert for the *United Nations Development Programme* on U.N. missions to *Bermuda*, and to the *Turks and Caicos Islands*, respectively.

He has also been constitutional advisor to the *Anguilla Constitutional and Electoral Reform Committee*, political advisor to successive chairmen of the U.N. Special Committee on Decolonisation, *Secretary-General* of the *Inter-Virgin Islands Council* between the governments of the British and US Virgin Islands, and *Secretary-General* of the *Offshore Governors' Forum* comprised of the governments of *American Samoa*, *Guam*, the *Northern Mariana Islands*, *Puerto Rico* and the *US Virgin Islands*.

Dr. Corbin presently serves as international advisor to the *U.S. Virgin Islands Fifth Constitutional Convention*, and was a member of the *U.S. Virgin Islands Political Status Commission* which conducted the only political status referendum in the history of the territory.

He twice served as chairman of the 23-member country *Caribbean Development and Cooperation Committee*, a permanent subsidiary body of the of the United Nations *Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)*. He was also the founding chairman of the Commission's *Working Group of Non-Independent Caribbean Countries*.

Dr. Corbin has presented scholarly papers on governance and political development at *Bermuda College*, the *University of the South Pacific*, the *University of Copenhagen*, the *University of Puerto Rico*, *George Washington University*, the *University of the West Indies* and the *University of the Virgin Islands* where he is on the faculty of the *Institute for Future Global Leaders*.

He is the author of two United Nations studies on the participation of non-independent countries in the United Nations system, four books, two book chapters and numerous scholarly articles on political and constitutional advancement.

Introduction

The importance of the participation of the non self-governing territories in the work of the United Nations system is a longstanding mandate of the United Nations. This assistance is critical to developing the readiness of these territories in assuming the powers of full self-government, especially as many of the economies of these territories require a heightened measure of human resource development in relation to their engagement with the globalised economy.

Background

The General Assembly has included the participation of the territories in the UN system in its resolutions since its very first session in 1946, and a series of resolutions to this effect have been adopted annually since that time with the aim of stimulating participation of the territories in the UN system.

This participation of non self-governing territories in the UN system is generally facilitated in several ways. These include participation through direct membership, associate membership, and/or observer status in the UN regional commissions, as well as in the UN specialised agencies, depending on the rules of procedure of these respective UN bodies.

Many of the territories are associate members in the *Economic and Social Council for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)* and the counterpart *Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)*. Additionally, many of the territories have access to assistance from the UN bodies, usually through the coordination of the *United Nations Development*

Programme (UNDP). In many cases the territories have participated through their own separate country cooperation frameworks facilitated by *UNDP* with targeted assistance provided by relevant UN agencies depending on the scope and nature of the requirements of the territory. In recent years, as GDP per capita income was increasingly used as the determinant for UNDP assistance, these territories were limited to participation in regional programmes unless they used their own funding to access UNDP assistance. This paper explores a number of these methods:

UN Regional Commissions

The two regional commissions which contain non self-governing territories, the *Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)* and the *Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean* provide for virtually all non self-governing territories of the respective regions as associate members. (See Figure 1). The eligibility of associate members is reflected in the terms of reference of the both ECLAC and ESCAP. The ECLAC rules of procedure state:

- 3(a) "Any territory or part or group thereof, within the geographic scope of the Commission's work may, on presentation of its application to the Commission by the member responsible for the international relations of such territory, part or group of territories, be eligible for admission by the Commission as an associate member of the Commission. If it has become responsible for its own international relations, such territory, part or group of territories may be admitted as an associate member of the Commission on itself presenting its application to the Commission.
- 3(b) Representatives of associate members shall be entitled to participate without vote in all meetings of the Commission, whether sitting as commission or as committee of the whole.

- 3(c) Representatives of associate members shall be eligible to be appointed as members of any committee or other subordinate body which may be set up by the Commission, and shall be eligible to hold office in such body." ⁱ

Figure 1. Associate Members of UN Regional Economic Commissions

Associate Member	Date of Admission	Commission
Anguilla	20 April 1996	ECLAC
Aruba	22 April 1998	ECLAC
British Virgin Islands	6 April 1984	ECLAC
Cayman Islands		ECLAC
Montserrat	23 April 1968	ECLAC
Netherlands Antilles	14 May 1981	ECLAC
Puerto Rico	10 May 1990	ECLAC
US Virgin Islands	6 April 1984	ECLAC
Turks and Caicos Islands /a		ECLAC
American Samoa	28 July 1991	ESCAP
Cook Islands	11 July 1972	ESCAP
French Polynesia	31 July 1992	ESCAP
Guam	24 July 1981	ESCAP
Hong Kong, China	25 November 1947	ESCAP
Macao, China	26 July 1991	ESCAP
New Caledonia	31 July 1992	ESCAP
Niue	3 August 1979	ESCAP
Northern Mariana Islands	22 July 1986	ESCAP

Note: Bermuda is eligible for ECLAC associate membership pursuant to the relevant provisions of the ECLAC Terms of Reference, while Tokelau and Pitcairn are eligible for ESCAP associate membership pursuant to similar provisions in the ESCAP terms of reference.

a/ Present status of associate membership in question as constitution was suspended by administering Power in 2009.

Source: Official websites of Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean and Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, 2009.

Associate membership affords the opportunity to participate in relevant areas of the work programme of ECLAC and ESCAP) as any full member country.

Participation in UN World Conferences

Utilising the associate membership in the UN regional economic commissions as a base, the territories are also afforded the opportunity to participate in the main United Nations world conferences and special sessions in the social and economic sphere, in the capacity of observer. This category of participation of “*Associate Members of Regional Economic Commissions*” was first utilised for the *International Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED)* in 1992 and with most world conferences through 2009 with the conference on the financial crisis (*although no AMC attended*).

The strategy for the development of this category of participation emerged from the work of the *Caribbean Development and Cooperation Committee*, a permanent subsidiary body of ECLAC, which had created a *Working Group of Non-Independent Caribbean Countries* in 1990, renamed in 2006 as the *Working Group of Associate Member Countries (AMCs)*. This area of territorial involvement in the world conferences and special sessions was the subject of a study by the Caribbean Subregional Headquarters of ECLAC in 2004¹ which provided significant insight on how the rules of procedure for each of the world conferences were modified to include the

¹ Corbin, Carlyle. “*The Participation of Associate Member Countries in United Nations World Conferences*,” ECLAC Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean, Doc. No. LC/CAR/R.76. 21 June 2004.

AMC category of participation, identified areas of interest of the territories which emerged from the world conferences, as well as the issues of concern in relation to the extent of participation by the non self-governing territories.

In this connection, the report noted that:

“The extent of participation of associate member countries in the U.N. world conferences, summits, International Meetings and Special Sessions varies from country to country dependent on a variety of factors including the level of political and financial commitment to such participation, as well as the extent of awareness of eligibility. In this regard, while a political commitment may exist in many cases, it is often the case that the financial resources are not available for associate member participation in these sessions where it may be available for other developing countries.”²

The 2004 ECLAC report made a number of additional conclusions³:

“...it is evident that the level of participation of the associate members in the U.N. World Conferences has remained inconsistent during the period, ranging from moderate attendance by some associate member countries to little or no participation in several cases. Of the 15 events in which associate member countries were eligible during the period 1992 – 2003..., no associate member country (AMC) participated in all of the sessions.

In the ECLAC region, The AMC which participated in the most sessions during the period was the US Virgin Islands which attended 12 of the 15 eligible events, with the next most frequent participant being the Netherlands Antilles and Puerto Rico. Aruba and the British Virgin Islands participated in three sessions each, with Montserrat attending two conferences and Anguilla participating in one session.

In the ESCAP region, the AMC which participated in the most sessions was Guam which participated in four sessions, followed closely behind by Niue with attendance in three sessions, and American Samoa and the Cook Islands participating in two conferences. The Northern Mariana Islands, Hong Kong, Macau, New Caledonia and French Polynesia all participated in only one session.

² Ibid, p. 26

³ Ibid, pp. 29-30

It is to be noted that the 1994 Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Islands enjoyed the largest number of AMC participants with ten AMCs, preceded by the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development garnering seven AMC participants. The 1994 International Conference on Population and Development, and the 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women amassed six AMC governments, respectively. No other conference drew more than three AMC participant, and two sessions found no AMC participation.

Several recommended actions of the 2004 report were clear ⁴ :

- The General Assembly, and the Economic and Social Council, should intensify implementation of the relevant resolutions of these respective bodies designed to assist the non-independent countries in expanding their participation in the international process. This intensification might take the form of collaboration with those regional commissions which have associate member countries.
- The Economic and Social Council should provide for a formal status for AMCs in the work of the Council, in the capacity of observer or associate member, consistent with relevant resolutions of ECLAC, ECOSOC, and the General Assembly.

The report also concluded that ⁵:

“It is clear that the associate member countries of ECLAC and ESCAP (including the non self-governing territories) have evolved to a strategic point in their development process that should facilitate their logical progression to a more regular and comprehensive participation in the United Nations system, consistent with their level of political maturation and awareness of the importance of their role in international deliberations which impact on their economic and political viability as emerging micro-states.

The international community should show their flexibility by facilitating the participation of AMCs, on a regular basis, in the world conference and special session/summit proceedings.

⁴ Ibid, p. 32

⁵ Ibid, pp. 32-33

United Nations Programmes and Funds

Following on from the 2004 study on participation of the non self-governing territories in UN world conferences was a 2007 study ⁶ which examined the lengthy General Assembly and ECOSOC mandates, and the prevailing access of the territories to the wider UN system including the UN programmes and funds, and in particular, the consistent role played by UNDP. The study also examined the mandate in the respective specialised agencies for the participation of non self-governing territories as members, associate members or observers.

With respect to UNDP, the study drew the following conclusions:

“Examination of UNDP assistance to non-independent countries clearly shows that this United Nations programme has made a major contribution to the development process of this unique set of small island countries, beginning with assistance in the form of individual country programmes as early as the 1970s through to the participation in regional programmes with neighboring independent states within the framework of economic integration. In this vein, it is important to note that the General Assembly in its resolutions from 2003 to 2006 have advocated for a further expansion of UNDP coverage, calling for “the inclusion of the (United States Virgin Islands) in regional programmes of the United Nations Development Programme, consistent with the participation of other Non Self-Governing

⁶ Corbin, Carlyle. *“A Plan of Action for the Further Integration of Associate Member Countries in the United Nations System including its specialised agencies” in the economic and social sphere* ECLAC Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean, Doc. No. LC/CAR/L.152. 14 December 2007.

Territories.”ⁱⁱ The modalities for this inclusion have not yet been identified. Regarding the AMCs affiliated with France, there has not been a UNDP role, although engagement with relevant United Nations specialised agencies can be identified.

It is noteworthy that UNDP has been the most consistent and extensive in providing information requested by the Secretary-General or the President of ECOSOC each year on assistance programmes to those non independent countries which are non self-governing, as compared to other United Nations funds and programmes and specialised agencies.

Overall, the extent of information submitted from the United Nations organisations on assistance to the non self-governing territories varies widely, with the largest number of responses received in 1986-1988, with a slight decline by 1993, and a more steady decline by 2006. In 2005, a number of organisations began to formally advise that they maintained no programmes in favour of the non-independent countries.”

UN Specialised Agencies

In similar fashion to the UN regional commissions, the UN specialised agencies facilitate the direct participation of non self-governing territories in their work. In this connection, the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO), the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO), the International Maritime Organisation (IMO), the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), the Universal Postal Union (UPU), the World Health Organisation (WHO), the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO), the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) and the World Tourism Organisation (WTO) all have varying provisions for

the membership, associate membership or observer status of non self-governing territories.

The *International Labour Organisation (ILO)*, the *International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)*, the *World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO)*, the *United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO)* and the *International Atomic Energy Association (IAEA)* maintain no separate provisions for the participation of non-independent countries as associate members.⁷

Concluding Observations

The findings of the 2007 ECLAC study, which was disseminated in 2008, on the participation of the associate member countries, including the non self-governing territories, revealed important lessons which still maintain in 2010 regarding the role of the United Nations in providing assistance to these territories. A number of points remain especially timely:

- Many United Nations bodies have contributed significantly to fulfilling the mandate of providing developmental assistance to the territories, but some UN bodies have been more consistent than others depending on a number of variables including whether the governance regulations of any organisation has been modernized to include the territories in their work.

⁷ Ibid. p. 62

- The legislative authority is longstanding for the integration of the territories in the United Nations process, including direct assistance as well as direct participation in the organisations concerned.
- The category of associate member of regional economic commission allowing for the territories to participate in the UN world conferences category has not fully become standard United Nations practice, and has been inexplicably omitted from a number of General Assembly summits and high-level sessions on HIV/AIDS, climate change and children, for example. It was included, however, in the 2009 General Assembly Session on the economic and financial crisis.
- ECOSOC should re-visit the resolution which it had earlier declined to approve providing for the territories to participate in the important work of its functional commissions on statistical analysis, science and technology, social development among other areas are directly related to their ongoing development process. The absence of a role for the AMCs in the work of the *Commission on Sustainable Development* is especially glaring, given that the issues of the vulnerabilities of small island states are considered in that body, and the territories already participate in the General Assembly consideration of these issues.
- There are no “constitutional impediments” to the participation of the non self-governing territories to participate in technical programmes and activities as has been argued in ECOSOC by some States which administer territories. Such an argument is inconsistent with General Assembly and ECOSOC resolutions. In this vein, those States which administer territories should be flexible in their decision-making with respect to agreeing the participation of the territories in UN activities.

- UNDP continues to play its critical role in the coordination of specific assistance to AMCs from United Nations programmes and funds, but the net-contributor status of many of the territories impedes their receipt of assistance. A further role for the regional commissions might be considered in terms of developing further access of these countries to the activities of these important United Nations entities.
- While many specialised agencies have modalities for direct participation of the territories, a minimal number of territories have joined these specialised agencies which maintain an associate membership or other category in which they can participate. There is also evidence that those which are in the organisations often do not enjoy the same level of programmatic assistance and participation as experienced in the regional commissions. The requirement of a financial contribution for specialised agency participation is also a deterrent. No such assessment is required for the regional commissions.

In summary, the various bodies of the United Nations system have much more work ahead, firstly, in recognising the existence of the international mandate of the integration of the non self-governing territories in the work of these organisations, and secondly, in devising ways and means of implementing that mandate.

The extent of participation of the territories in these UN bodies is not as extensive as it could be, owing mainly to insufficient awareness on the part of the territories regarding their eligibility to join such UN bodies. It is also the case that many of the agencies do not consider the participation of the territories a priority, despite annual resolutions of the General Assembly

and the Economic and Social Council requesting that the issue be taken up in the governing councils of these agencies.

Thus, when the Secretary-General makes his annual request for information from the specialised agencies on their assistance programmes to the territories, only a few agencies reply. Even a number of agencies which include territories in their programmes do not reply. A better approach needs to be found for the UN system to acquire this important and relevant information.

The direct participation of the territories in the UN system provides the territories with access to the dialogue on some of the major economic and social issues facing the sustainable development of small island countries. Equally as important, it provides them with essential exposure to the international dialogue, and the developmental space to enhance their capacity building.

The continued support for principles of self-determination and decolonisation by the General Assembly are useful, but it is the support for such tangible assistance, such as the participation in the technical work of the UN system, that is equally important to the development process of the territories in a globalised world. Flexibility must be shown by member states if these territories are to be adequately prepared to assume increasing levels of self-government.

Continued and expanded access to the UN system is an important tool for sustainable development in a globalised world, especially for small

island territories whose access to international institutions continues to remain unnecessarily limited, often based on overly restrictive and “control-based” considerations.

The pamphlets on how the UN can assist the non self-governing territories are useful, but do not provide any information on the procedures for the territories to access these UN agencies and the appropriate eligibility criteria. In this light, increased coordination between the Special Committee and the wider UN system is essential. The Special Committee should formally collaborate with the regional commissions, UNDP and other organisations of the wider UN system in order to advance the process.

This collaboration is necessary if the territories will be in the position to access the relevant UN programmes for the benefit of their development process, consistent with the relevant United Nations resolutions where implementation continues to be a major challenge.

ⁱ Biennial Report, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, Economic and Social Council Official Records, (16 April 1992 - 27 April 1994), Supplement No. 18, United Nations; Santiago, Chile.

ⁱⁱ See U.N. General Assembly Resolution 58/108 B of 9 December 2003, Section XI. Operative Para. 3; U.N. General Assembly Resolution 59/134 B of 10 December 2004, Section XI. Operative Paragraph 3; U.N. General Assembly Resolution 60/117 B of 8 December 2005, Section XI. Operative Paragraph 3. U.N. General Assembly Resolution 61/128 B of 14 December 2006, Section XI. Operative Paragraph 3.