

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Section I:	What this case is about: the essence of the Nauruan claim	3
Section II:	Definition of rehabilitation	5
Section III:	Outline of this Counter-Memorial	7

PART I

HISTORICAL AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Chapter 1: An historical overview of the pre-Trusteeship period.....		11
Section I:	The period of German administration.....	11
Section II:	The Mandate period	13
A.	1914 Capitulation.....	13
B.	Grant of Mandate over Nauru	13
C.	Administration under the Mandate	16
Section III:	The 1919 Agreement and the BPC concession.....	20
A.	History of the concession	20
B.	The 1919 Agreement	23
C.	The resultant position	25
Chapter 2: Nauru under Trusteeship.....		27
Section I:	Political and administrative advancement	27
Section II:	Social advancement	32
Chapter 3: Public finance and royalties under the Trusteeship		36
Section I:	Public finance	36
Section II:	Royalties and trust funds	37
Section III:	Reporting to the United Nations on BPC	46
Chapter 4: The proposals for resettlement and rehabilitation		51
Section I:	Consideration of resettlement by the Partner Governments and the United Nations	51
Section II:	Rehabilitation.....	59
A.	The rehabilitation investigations	59
1.	The CSIRO inquiry	59
2.	BPC estimates	61
3.	The Davey committee	65
4.	Reception of the Davey report	69
B.	United Nations attitude to rehabilitation	71
1.	1964	71
2.	1965	72
3.	1966	73
4.	Trusteeship Council, 1967	77
5.	Special Session, Trusteeship Council, November 1967	83
6.	United Nations General Assembly, December 1967	85
Chapter 5: The negotiation and outcome of the 1967 phosphate settlement.....		88
Section I:	1965	88
Section II:	Nauruan/Partner Governments' discussions, June/July 1966.....	90
Section III:	The Phosphate settlement 1967	92
A.	Policy re-consideration by the Partner Governments	92
B.	Resumed negotiations with the Nauruans.....	92
1.	Phase 1: 12-20 April 1967	92
2.	Phase 2: 9-20 May 1967	94
3.	Phase 3: 13-14 June 1967	96
4.	The purchase of BPC assets on Nauru.....	97
C.	The Phosphate Agreement.....	100
D.	The value of the 1967 settlement to the Nauruans	101

PART II

THE ABSENCE OF A TENABLE CLAIM

Chapter 1: Preliminary matters	105
Section I: The elements of the dispute	105
Section II: The alleged basis of responsibility	107
Section III: The intertemporal issue.....	112
A. The legal principle	112
B. Application of the intertemporal principle to the facts	115
Section IV: Relationship between the Trusteeship and 1919 Agreement.....	117
Chapter 2: Novel allegations of breach in relation to the claim for rehabilitation deriving from Trusteeship	120
Section I: The nature of the obligations of the Administering Authority	120
A. Obligations of result	120
B. Domestic law analogies	123
Section II: The choice of means by the Administering Authority.....	129
Section III: Absence of any specific provision to rehabilitate in the Trusteeship Agreement	133
Section IV: Absence of any allegation of breach prior to termination	135
Section V: Relevance and effect of General Assembly recommendations	136
Section VI: The unconditional termination of the Trusteeship precludes any complaint of breach of the Trusteeship Agreement	138
Section VII: The benefits from phosphate mining	141
A. Introduction.....	141
B. Royalties and trust funds.....	143
C. The value of the phosphate settlement.....	145
D. Financial situation at time of independence	152
Section VIII: Conclusion.....	155
Chapter 3: Novel allegations of breach based upon international standards or duties arising independently from Trusteeship	158
Introduction.....	158
Section I: There was full compliance with the principles of self-determination and permanent sovereignty over natural resources	159
A. The United Nations would not have permitted a breach of these principles.....	159
B. Australia's record with regard to self-determination is exemplary.....	165
C. Australia respected the principle of permanent sovereignty absolutely	168
Section II: There was no breach of any other general principle of international law	175
A. Denial of justice	175
B. Breach of duties of a predecessor State	177
C. Abuse of rights and acts of maladministration.....	179
Chapter 4: Novel allegations of breach of Trusteeship unrelated to rehabilitation	
Introduction.....	181
Section I: There is no factual basis for any of these allegations	181
A. The alleged failure to report fully and fairly has no basis in fact	182
B. The alleged failure to exercise governmental authority has no basis in fact.....	184
C. The alleged failure to promote political advancement has no basis in fact.....	186

	D. The alleged failure to promote economic, social, educational and cultural advancement has no basis in fact.....	186
	E. The alleged failure to respect land rights has no basis in fact.....	188
Section II:	The termination of the Trusteeship and the judgment of the Court preclude the consideration of allegations unrelated to the rehabilitation claim	190
Section III:	The conduct of the United Nations bodies during the Trusteeship excludes the possibility of any other supposed wrongdoing	191

PART III

THE REMEDIAL POSITION

Introduction	197
Chapter 1: Nauru has disqualified itself from the relief it seeks	198
Chapter 2: Australia, if responsible, cannot be liable on the facts for the whole of the damage claimed.....	202
Section I: No damages are recoverable in respect of the pre-1947 period	202
Section II: Australia would not be liable for the whole of the damages claimed for the Trusteeship period	204
A. The United Kingdom and New Zealand shared equal responsibility with Australia in fact	204
B. Whatever Australia's role on Nauru, Australia acted not only for itself but for the United Kingdom and New Zealand.....	206
C. No one Partner Government could make unilateral decisions of major importance to the territory	207
D. The phosphate industry was owned by all three States	208
E. Any liability under the Trusteeship Agreement is equal and collective with the United Kingdom and New Zealand	210
Section III: The international community and Nauru regarded the three States as equally responsible for the territory	211
Chapter 3: The legal consequences of shared responsibility.....	214
Section I: Equity would take account of the roles of the United Kingdom, New Zealand and the United Nations in deciding Australia's liability	214
Section II: There must be equitable apportionment in the absence of effective rights of contribution	217
Section III: Joint and several liability is not a part of general international law	218
Section IV: If Australia were to bear any liability at all, it would be lessened by the failure of the United Nations to exercise adequate supervisory authority	220
Section V: Australia's liability, if any, would be diminished by Nauru's conduct	222
Section VI: Summation	226
Submissions.....	227
Annexes	229

