



**CONTENTS**

	Page
<i>Agenda item 9:</i>	
<i>General debate (continued)</i>	
Speech by Mr. Subandrio (Indonesia) . . . . .	315
Speech by Mrs. Meir (Israel) . . . . .	326
Speech by Mr. Palamarchuk (Ukrainian So- viet Socialist Republic) . . . . .	330
Statement by the representative of the Neth- erlands . . . . .	336

**President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).**

**AGENDA ITEM 9:**

**General debate (continued)**

1. Mr. SUBANDRIO (Indonesia): Each session of the General Assembly is a time when we broaden our perspective and look at the world as a whole. Certainly we cannot escape from our own national problems which so intensely and daily preoccupy our minds. But we can and do gain a sharper realization of the fact that the existing world problems condition also the progress which we shall make towards our own national development and growth.
2. This is certainly true of peoples struggling for their national independence. It is true of newly independent countries in their efforts to achieve social and economic emancipation; and it is no less true of the old established nations maintaining their role in world affairs in a positive and constructive way.
3. For together we are caught up in this seething, changing world. Yes, our world is in transition. It is moving—moving fast and often painfully—from a past order based upon domination—political, economic and military—to a new world order responsive to the urgent demands of the majority of mankind, a world order based upon freedom for all nations and co-operation among all nations, where the exploitation of nation by nation, of man by man, has ceased to exist, and where equality and justice prevail in the relations between nations.
4. We are wending our tortuous way to this new equilibrium; and yet already, freedom, equality, justice for all are the prerequisites for stability in our present day world. They are the prerequisites for real peace in the world of today. It is then against this background of essentials that we must judge where we stand now. Have we made, and are we making, progress? The answer is: yes—definitely yes.
5. The movements for national freedom and independence have gained a momentum impossible to stop. Peoples everywhere are not only struggling for, but achieving, their liberation from oppression and domination. Within sixteen years the membership of the United Nations has increased from 51 to 100. There

is a growing consciousness that the world is no longer a place which any one nation or group of nations can aspire to dominate. There is a growing awareness of the fact that no nation can dominate any other nation. There is, too, a general and heightened realization of the social and economic forces in the world—forces which are breaking through the crust of centuries of silence and neglect and which, it is now being realized, must be satisfied if they are not to explode in the fulfilment of their destiny.

6. This is the principal progress which we have made since the Second World War. Not only has Hitler fascism been defeated, but the process towards a better foundation of a peaceful world has been established—and that, away from the pre-war world stability. A victory in war, if not followed by a strong foundation of world order based upon freedom for all, justice among and within nations, will not secure the fundamental ingredients for peace.

7. Yet, as I have said, we are still in the transitional stage. We have still not reached our final goal. We are still experiencing the turmoil and the tempest that are common to every period of transition. They give rise to dangerous moments. Yes, but these moments must not transfix us with fear. They are the natural hurdles in the path towards a new world order.

8. Let us not delude ourselves. The retreat of the dominating forces of the past, the retreat of the colonial forces, cannot be won without a struggle, not without dislocation and sometimes not without a physical confrontation between the emerging social forces and the old established forces of a bygone domination.

9. So let us not fear these moments of danger and crisis. For we cannot escape them. Our task is rather to marshal all our energies to ensure that they do not get out of hand and burst violently into a world conflagration.

10. As we meet here we indeed find ourselves again beset by the crises, the fever blisters, of a world in transition, writhing between those who seek to preserve the status quo and those who seek to promote the change towards a new world order based on freedom, equality and social justice. A look at our crowded agenda and we see that these crises occur in three spheres of international relations: in the sphere of the ideological struggle, in the sphere of the liberation struggle and in the sphere of the struggle for social and economic emancipation.

11. As to the ideological struggle, it is primarily confined to the great Powers. They have injected it as the cold war problem in international affairs. But for the emerging and newly-emerged nations the ideological question is an internal problem that each one must solve for itself. It is not a matter of adopting one ideology or another, but of each nation's finding its own progressive ideology, an ideology serving the

nations as a whole, its own synthesis, in conformity with its traditions, conditions and needs.

12. This is, as we know, a gruelling and difficult process. We Indonesians have gone through it ourselves. But we have emerged, strengthened and revived, with a national progressive ideology that binds our people together because it is rooted in our past heritage and suited to our present demands. With this national progressive ideology, all our energies are freed for the tremendous tasks of construction.

13. However, in this process of finding ourselves—yes, finding ourselves—we have learned a lesson which we consider to be of immense importance. We have learned that when external forces sought to bring pressure on us in our ideological conflict, turmoil and turbulence turned into hostility, violence and war. But when we were left to our own devices, turmoil and turbulence led to synthesis and a new advance.

14. Most of the new, emergent countries are now engaged in a similar process. Left alone they will reach their synthesis. Left alone they will find the ideology that can best promote the aspirations, expectations and demands of their people for a better and richer standard of life.

15. It is only when the ideological question is injected from outside, when nations are relentlessly subjected to the pull of opposing ideologies, and when they are given no breathing space for finding their own way of life, that they split in two. Then we get the two Germanys, the two Koreas, the two Viet-Nams. But even among these artificially divided States there exists the possibility of co-existence, leading to their re-unification on the basis of their own new synthesis.

16. But the first step for such a development is the recognition of the existing realities. In the specific case of Germany it means the recognition of the existence of two Germanys. It means the recognition of the existing realities in both East and West Berlin. It means the acceptance of the free passages from and to West Berlin. At the same time the great Powers must stop treating these nations which are divided against themselves as an ideological battleground. The peoples of these nations must be given the chance to decide their own future destiny, unhampered by external pressures or interference—in other words, strict observance of the principle of peaceful co-existence. And what do we mean by peaceful co-existence? Not the perpetuation of the *status quo*, but the right of every nation to develop according to its own traditions, concepts and needs.

17. Again I say that the ideological question is one for each nation to decide for itself. The ideological struggle, which has come to be known as the cold war problem, does not involve the majority of mankind. It is not the main problem of our time.

18. But the biggest problem today is the attainment of a world order in which all peoples and nations enjoy freedom, equality and social justice. It is the complete and irrevocable eradication of colonialism in all its manifestations. For this is the basic source of conflict in the world. It is in Algeria, in Angola, in the Congo that blood is flowing. There men suffer and die to win the right to a new tomorrow.

19. Look at the colonial cancers that infest the African continent alone.

20. In Algeria the colonial war has entered its seventh year. The people of Algeria are fighting for their

freedom and independence, and will continue the fight until victory is theirs. This is a reality that France must accept. Certainly, for our part, we will not rest until this criminal bloodshed and terror, perpetrated to preserve the old, established order, are halted. We will continue to give our support to the provisional government of the Algerian Republic as well as all possible aid. We pray only that victory will be theirs soon.

21. In Angola the situation can only be described as one of unspeakable horror. It is the duty of the United Nations to reveal to world public opinion this dark blot, this reversion to barbarity, in all its cruelty and inhumanity. Further, the Organization must take the necessary steps to compel the Government of Portugal to end its military operation of liquidation, terror and oppression. The killing of innocent men, women and children must stop. The servitude of the Angolan people must stop. They have the right to freedom and independence now.

22. And what of the situation in South Africa? There the Government continues to practise its infamous policy of apartheid, openly flouting the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. How long can this abhorrent practice go on before it explodes into another tragedy? Not satisfied with courting disaster in its own land, the Government of South Africa has even extended this policy of apartheid to the Territory of South West Africa. By force it has prevented the United Nations from exercising its rightful authority in that Territory. Surely the time has come to put an end to this defiance of the Organization by the Government of South Africa, and to free the people of South West Africa from that Government's clutches.

23. There is also the problem of the Congo. Here we have witnessed both open colonial aggression and the more devious manoeuvres of neo-colonialism. The abuse of the principle of self-determination is here obvious to everybody. Instead of transforming the old colonial relationship into an interdependence of two sovereign States, Belgium and the Congo, as one national entity, the old colonial Power preferred to preserve its interest by instigating and provoking a separatist movement. Finally it was recognized that self-determination for secession did not work, and at last the efforts were concentrated upon the restoration of the integrity of the Congo. But this only after bloodshed and only after a march of tragic events. A tragedy because of the suffering of the Congolese people themselves, a tragedy because of the loss of lives of the United Nations military forces and a great tragedy because of the loss by the United Nations of one of its eminent and devoted civil servants in the person of the Secretary-General, Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld. In fact, because of its very deviousness, neo-colonialism has been and still is the greatest danger to the independence and territorial integrity of the Congo.

24. The tragic events in the Congo must not be repeated. And more than that, they must not be allowed to bear fruit for the neo-colonialists and their mercenaries. The province of Katanga must remain an integral part of the national territory of the Congo. The United Nations, pledged to preserve the sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of the Congo, cannot relent in its efforts until the Central Government of the Congo has restored its full and rightful authority in the province of Katanga. The Conference of Non-Aligned Countries held in Belgrade in September 1961, declared firmly and clearly:

"... it is the duty of the world community to continue to do everything in its power in order to erase the consequences and to prevent any further foreign intervention in this young African State, and to enable the Congo to embark freely upon the road of its independent development based on respect for its sovereignty, unity and its territorial integrity".

25. Yes, every step of progress must be nurtured and guarded against the colonialism and neo-colonialism that are still rife in Africa, as in other regions of the world. The colonial mentality and attitude still prevail. We must struggle against it to transform old ideas into revolutionary ideas and dreams, into a new reality.

26. Yes, we are revolutionaries in our struggle for liberation, but no less revolutionary in the process of emancipation, which is also one of the essentials of the new world order.

27. We are revolutionary in thought and in action. We must be, to catch up with developments and to emancipate ourselves socially and economically after centuries of omission and domination. While we do not expect others, who do not share our urgency and need, to share our revolutionary approach within their particular national sphere, we do ask of everyone to look at the world as one of transition, convulsed with revolutionary outlook—and if not to accept it, then to understand it. At least do not obstruct this process of emancipation towards a new world order. For at best it is in every nation's interest that this transition be swift and peaceful. It is in the common interest of the international community of nations that the ever-widening gap between the standards of living and the economic progress of the economically advanced and the less developed countries be bridged in conformity with the tenets of justice, in conformity with the social conscience of man.

28. But to remove this source of tension and crisis, to advance to a more equitable and just order in the world community—an order in the interest, and to the mutual benefit, of all—requires the application of new and bold approaches to international economic co-operation. Static concepts based on the old order cannot possibly meet the challenge. If the 1960's are truly to become the "Decade of Development", of economic and social emancipation, then all peoples and all nations must pool their human and material resources for the common good. Only a multilateral undertaking, which enlists the wholehearted co-operation of all nations, can solve the problem of economic and social development of less developed nations, the problem upon which the entire future rests.

29. There are indeed indications that the economically advanced countries are aware of the need for such a new approach. But moves in that direction are still hesitant and groping. The path to the future must be bold, straight and clear. And it is for the United Nations to chart this path, though we all are aware that in the first place each nation itself is responsible for the growth of economic development. In this respect Indonesia is making great progress within its Eight-Year Overall Development Plan, 1961-1968, covering the reconstruction of the whole national life: economic, industrial, cultural, educational and social. It comprises altogether 343 projects, with a budget of 240 billion rupiahs, equal to approximately 5.5 billion United States dollars.

30. If in 1945 the United Nations was the bright hope of a war-shattered weary world, today it must be the catalyst to build the world anew. The requirements and the challenges are different today from yesteryear. Even the United Nations today is not the United Nations of sixteen years ago. With the emergence of the newly-independent nations of Asia and Africa, its membership has doubled in number and continues to increase from year to year. It too finds itself in a transitional period, with all the dangers and moments of crises it involves.

31. It faces such a crisis now, a crisis accentuated, though not created, by the untimely and tragic death of the Secretary-General, Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld. He was a man with whom we did not always agree. But he was a man whose sincerity and integrity we never doubted. He was a man we deeply respected. Foremost, he was an international civil servant, dedicated to the life of the Organization in whose service he lost his own life.

32. Yes, the Organization has a life. And life requires growth and change. Above all, it requires that the United Nations should face the realities of today.

33. One such reality is the existence of the People's Republic of China, a nation of more than 600 million people still deprived of its rightful seat in this Organization. The principle on which the Organization was founded, the principle of the universality of membership, will remain no more than a slogan as long as China and other nations are still excluded from this international forum. As in the past, we will press for a rectification of this situation, guided in this matter by political realism and the determination to make the United Nations strong, universal, and able to fulfil its proper function.

34. Present realities also make it imperative that the nations of Asia and Africa be adequately represented in the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, as well as in other main bodies and agencies of the Organization. We consider that positive steps towards the expansion of these organs, in conformity with the principle of equitable geographical distribution, should be taken at this session of the General Assembly.

35. Finally, the Secretariat of the United Nations itself must conform to present realities. The office of Secretary-General has become an enormous one, too great for any man to carry alone. It is not a question of finding a neutral man, of finding a true civil servant. It is a problem of the office itself, which has come to be more than a purely administrative organ. The responsibilities of the Secretary-General now embrace decisions that are vital, and sometimes political in their consequences. No man can be asked to shoulder this great burden alone, despite his sincerity and honesty and his personal ability. We believe therefore that the Secretary-General should have the assistance of a number of close advisers. This will be of benefit both to the Secretary-General and in making the office of Secretary-General correspond more to the existing world realities. It is true that the Secretary-General must be given full freedom in the choice of his advisers, but on the other hand, to balance the guidance of the Secretariat, the choice of the advisers must also be in conformity with the existing political division of this world.

36. Let us have the vision to make the United Nations a forceful and effective instrument for guiding us in

the present to the promises of the future. But let us also acknowledge today the progress that has already been made.

37. This Assembly of 100 sovereign Member States is visible proof of the advances made in the march towards freedom and independence. Resolution 1514 (XV) adopted by the General Assembly at its fifteenth session represented another forward stride in solving the basic problem afflicting international relations today. We have made progress, but much more needs to be done.

38. General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) must still be implemented in full and everywhere. We must see to it that the provisions of this noble resolution serve the cause of liberation and justice, and are not perverted by the forces of the old established order to serve their own desperate ends. Further, the United Nations must still bring about the realization of its resolutions on the question of Palestine. The plight of the Palestine refugees represents a human tragedy that cannot but touch and affect us all. The misery of these people is our misery and our responsibility to remove.

39. Yet another problem still confronting the Assembly is the problem of disarmament, including the cessation of nuclear weapons tests. The armaments race, the accumulation and testing of ever more devilish weapons of mass destruction, are the physical embodiment of the confrontation and struggle between the old established forces and the new social forces, in particular affecting the relationship between the two big Powers of the world; as such it demands immediate and urgent solution.

40. As a matter of principle, Indonesia is opposed to the testing of nuclear weapons by any nation—whether in the atmosphere or underground, in the depth of the oceans or the far reaches of outer space. Popular movements representing every stratum of our national life have come out against these tests, particularly as they are only too often conducted in areas other than that of the testing nation.

41. However, harmful as these tests may be in polluting the air we breathe, immoral as they may be in constituting a means for perfecting instruments for the destruction of mankind, we know, too, that the prohibition of these tests is not sufficient in itself. At the same time, agreement must be reached on general and complete disarmament, under an effective system of international control. For we know from reliable sources that the great Powers—the United States and the Soviet Union—already have enough weapons in their respective arsenals to set the world ablaze. These deadly stockpiles must be destroyed before they destroy us. This is the crux of the problem. Only with general and complete disarmament can we end the present madness, return to the path of sanity, and remove the threat of mutual annihilation that hangs over the confrontation between the two opposing world forces.

42. It is indeed our conviction that the fruits of science and technology must be used to heal instead of wound, to promote well-being not misery, to make man's every dawn an exclamation of hope not a question mark of fear. It is our conviction that the genius of man must be used for peace not war.

43. It was in this conviction, and with the desire to promote as best we can the peaceful transition to a new world order, that we, the non-aligned nations, met

in conference in Belgrade from 1 to 6 September of this year. We met in the belief that time was running short, and that we must seek to uproot the source of tension and strife in present international relations. Thus, in its final declaration, the Conference stated:

"That to eradicate basically the source of conflict is to eradicate colonialism in all its manifestations and to accept and practice a policy of peaceful co-existence in the world; that guided by these principles the period of transition and conflict can lay a firm foundation of co-operation and brotherhood between the nations . . .".

44. The Belgrade Conference represented indeed our feeling of responsibility for promoting a relaxation of international tension and safeguarding peace. Our sole aim was to contribute our moral force towards the implementation of a new world order based upon independence, equality and social justice.

45. So do not try to judge or approach this Conference with a power-bloc mentality. Do not try to keep a box score on whether we, the non-aligned nations, batted to the left or to the right; whether we condemned one side or praised the other. For we came to Belgrade neither to condemn nor to praise, but to voice the aspirations of the vast majority of peoples in the world. Judge us by this: whether the Belgrade Conference voiced the hopes, the aspirations and expectations of the seething masses everywhere on earth. This is the demanding, but objective, yardstick by which we will stand or fall.

46. Likewise, it is the yardstick by which the success or failure of this session of the Assembly will be measured. And success will not be easy. Success will necessitate a clear-headed and realistic appraisal of the forces loose in the world today and of their interaction in the inexorable march of history.

47. Allow me to turn now to the question of West Iranian—or West New Guinea—which still constitutes a serious dispute between Indonesia and the Netherlands and has greatly worsened relations between our two countries. I do so, in particular, to reply to and to comment on the statement of the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands on 26 September 1961 [1016th meeting], which was devoted almost entirely to this question of West Irian. He even suggested, on behalf of the Netherlands Government, that the Assembly, the United Nations, now intervene and lend its hand to solve the problem—an intervention that the Netherlands Government has so far opposed.

48. While it was the Government of Indonesia which brought this issue before the United Nations a few years ago, the last time in 1957, against the strong opposition of the Netherlands Government, it is now the Netherlands Government which has come to the Assembly for the solution, the peaceful solution of the same basic problem.

49. What is this conflict, what is really the dispute on West Irian between Indonesia and the Netherlands? What are the issues at stake?

50. It is a remnant of a colonial problem, regarding a certain territory of Indonesia, which was unresolved when Indonesia gained formal recognition of its independence at the end of 1949. It was, however, agreed that the issue in dispute, the political status of West Irian, would be settled by the Governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands through negotiations within one year. Complete and unconditional sovereign-



ty over Indonesia was formally transferred by the Netherlands, irrevocably, as the Agreement<sup>1</sup> clearly stated. And what Indonesia was and is, one could read in the Netherlands Constitution of 1948, which replaced the term "Netherlands East Indies" by "Indonesia", the newly accepted name for the former Dutch colony.

51. West Irian was part and parcel of this colonial territory, and indeed for the newly independent Republic of Indonesia, it was and still is part and parcel of its national territory. West Irian is now one of the twenty-three regional provinces of the territory of the Republic. Therefore, there is no such thing as a territorial claim of the Republic of Indonesia. It cannot have a claim on its own territory. Sovereignty over Indonesia has already been transferred, completely and unconditionally.

52. What thus only remained to be removed was Dutch control and, at that time, the Dutch military administration in West Irian, re-established by the Netherlands after its reoccupation of that part of Indonesia during the course of the colonial war.

53. We may recall, among others, the statement of the Netherlands representative, Mr. van Roijen, to the United Nations Security Council at the end of 1948, when the question of Indonesia's independence was settled through the intervention of the United Nations. The Netherlands representative made the following statement, which was clear to us and to everyone else, on 22 December 1948:

"As I explained at the outset, the dispute is not about the question of whether or not Indonesia will become independent. All parties agree that what used to be the Netherlands East Indies—I repeat: "what used to be the Netherlands East Indies"—"should become an independent State as soon as possible."<sup>2</sup>

54. That statement, that official recognition, was indeed greatly instrumental in bringing the colonial war to an end. It laid the common, agreed basis for the round-table negotiations which produced the formal transfer of sovereignty over Indonesia on 27 December 1949.

55. We therefore felt confident that the remaining difficulty over West Irian could be settled by further negotiations, in fulfilment of the pledge to make Indonesia's independence really complete and unconditional.

56. What were the reasons of the Netherlands at that time for retaining its hold and colonial administration over that part of Indonesia after independence? Was this to be understood as a necessary, though temporary, condition? We were told at that time by the Netherlands Government that the reasons were twofold.

57. First, on the eve of the formal transfer to Indonesia, recognizing Indonesia's independence, a seemingly important section of the Netherlands people was strongly opposed to the idea of losing the former rich and most important colony of the Netherlands. This opposition had to be appeased. The round-table agreements would maintain Dutch economic interests

in the newly independent Indonesia to a satisfactory degree. And, as for the remaining feeling about colonial prestige, a colonial hold should be retained. In this respect, the easiest possibility at that time seemed to be the almost unexplored and economically unexploited territory of West Irian, inhabited by 700,000 people. The whole population of Indonesia at that time was 70 million.

58. Only on those conditions could the Netherlands Parliament be brought to agree on the transfer of sovereignty to independent Indonesia, with a two-thirds majority in favour of the policy of the Netherlands Government. The Netherlands Government succeeded in this political manoeuvre, with the further assumption that within one year the problem of West Irian would be solved.

59. The second reason was that many Indo-Netherlands, having lived in colonial Indonesia, might no longer feel comfortable in newly independent Indonesia. A new home for a new life—a "safe haven", as they called it—might well be reserved for them, although from the beginning it was rather questionable whether West Irian could serve that purpose.

60. What did this issue of West Irian, thus created, mean to the Netherlands and to Indonesia?

61. To the Netherlands, it may have meant a success in political expediency, adopted to a certain kind of colonial prestige desired at that time. Economically, West Irian meant nothing; either militarily or strategically. Never, as we knew, had there been a demand by the Netherlands people for the annexation of West Irian or its secession from Indonesia. As a matter of fact, the round-table agreements still referred to West Irian as a "Residency"—that is, an administrative unit of the Indonesian State administration.

62. To Indonesia, this political expediency of the Netherlands meant that the whole Indonesian people—numbering about 70 million at that time—would freely enjoy the independence of their country, except the 1 percent, about 700,000, living in West Irian. But we took some comfort from the fact that this setback could soon be corrected, by negotiations with the Netherlands Government within one year. Never was there a demand by the people of West Irian—to the Netherlands Government or to the Indonesian Government—for separation or secession in favour of any other country. Why should they have made such a demand?

63. In fact, the population of West Irian participated fully in the defence of the Independence Proclamation of 17 August 1945. It is true that they were partially suppressed after Netherlands troops had reoccupied that territory, but, nevertheless, their sentiments as part of a great Indonesia were never in doubt. The local leaders of West Irian were happy that Indonesia, their own country—of which West Irian had been part for centuries—had become a free, independent country.

64. The issue for Indonesia, then, was not to let down its people in West Irian, and to bring about the restoration of West Irian to the control and administration of the Republic of Indonesia as soon as possible. This was a national issue of great importance to my Government and my people.

65. In 1950, negotiations started between the Netherlands and Indonesia to settle the issue. However, they failed to settle it within one year. Further negotiations were necessary. Gradually, however, we were con-

<sup>1</sup> Round-Table Conference Agreement between the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Government of the Republic of Indonesia, Came into force on 27 December 1949. United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 69 (1950), I, No. 894.

<sup>2</sup> See Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, No. 132, 388th meeting, p. 11.

fronted with a Netherlands position which showed not only reluctance but, in fact, ill-will about settling the issue, which had become a serious dispute indeed. The Netherlands claimed sovereignty over that part of the territory of Indonesia.

66. Though speaking about the right of self-determination for the people of West Irian, the Netherlands Government conveniently proposed a bill to its Parliament in 1952 to annex West Irian to the territory of the Netherlands Kingdom.

67. While speaking of educating the people of West Irian for the exercise of the right of self-determination, the Netherlands colonial régime in West Irian, supported by military force which it still retained in that part of Indonesia, oppressed and crushed the Irian party for Indonesian independence, imprisoned their leaders or forced them to flee into "safer haven" in other parts of Indonesia. They reopened the notorious concentration camp "Boven Digul", familiar from before the Second World War. Led by old colonial officials and the police, they embarked upon a régime of terror to "de-Indonesianize" that part of Indonesia. They started to educate the poor people of West Irian in the Netherlands language, in colonial fashion, in order to make them good colonial subjects whom they could govern. Everything was done to educate the people of West Irian in an anti-Indonesian direction.

68. Against this background, it was no wonder that negotiations to settle the West Irian issue with the Netherlands could only fail. It seemed that the Netherlands Government now harboured the intention of keeping its colonial grip on West Irian, with a view to separating it definitely from the free, independent Indonesia. The Netherlands attitude was a flagrant violation not only of the agreement and understandings, but, indeed, of the spirit of the agreement on Indonesian independence reached at the end of 1949.

69. When bilateral negotiations with the Netherlands completely and finally failed in 1954, owing to the adamant refusal of the Netherlands to negotiate the real issues at stake, we turned to the United Nations, still seeking the peaceful solution of the dispute between the two countries. The conflict became more and more serious. It had become a purely colonial problem. The Netherlands Government contested United Nations competence to deal with the question, but that failed. However, the deliberations in the United Nations General Assembly came to no result. A draft resolution,<sup>3/</sup> merely expressing the hope for further negotiations, was strongly-opposed by the Netherlands, and its adoption by the Assembly was blocked.

70. However, the Indonesian Government showed patience in seeking the possible peaceful solution of the question, vital as that was to the freedom of its people.

71. In the following years, despite the ill-will of the Netherlands, the Indonesian Government again followed its peaceful course of action, through the United Nations. Apart from that, we permitted the Netherlands to preserve its privileged economic position, a position which it still maintained after the recognition of the Republic of Indonesia at the end of 1949.

72. Again, however, we only met with Dutch opposition and resolutions for a peaceful solution of the dispute could not be adopted by the General Assembly.

When that happened, in 1957, our patience and goodwill were really exhausted. The United Nations, unable, or more correctly, not wanting to lend its assistance in the solution of this problem, left my Government with no other alternative than to find a solution in our own way. In the present world, it meant relying basically upon our own national strength. It was, however, a comfort that the great majority in the Assembly supported our case—our case for freedom for our peoples. That strengthened our determination to continue our struggle for the freedom of the people of West Irian with all the means at our disposal.

73. Patience and goodwill found no place any more in the strained relations between Indonesia and the Netherlands. The Netherlands contention, previously held, that they could retain their economic positions in Indonesia—a kind of privileged position indeed—could no longer be maintained. That would have been an anomalous situation. Their military and repressive measures in West Irian, their subversion of the freedom and national integrity of the Republic, which, in fact, started with the very independence of Indonesia—all this had to be stopped. The colonial policy which, even after the establishment of our Indonesian independence, they still harboured in their minds, had to be eliminated, once and for all, from Indonesian soil.

74. We have every reason to believe that gradually their colonial policy towards Indonesia came to be no longer based on the consideration of the preservation of Netherlands interest in that region—nor even upon the standard of national prestige—but that the emotional anti-Indonesian sentiment of some of the leaders in the Netherlands was becoming increasingly the irrational guiding principle of the Netherlands Government's approach to Indonesia.

75. My Government thus embarked on a policy of total confrontation vis-à-vis the Netherlands, not only politically but also economically and militarily. We took the necessary measures against their economic interest, a hold-over from colonial days; their military build-up in and around West Irian, a base of intimidation and subversion, we faced with the building up of our own military strength. Relations with the Netherlands have already been broken off entirely.

76. In the meantime, we are happy to have been able to consolidate our national political and physical strength, and embark also upon a national over-all development programme for the rapid economic and social development and emancipation of our peoples. West Irian is not excluded, although the materialization of the programme there is hampered by the prolonged Dutch colonial occupation of that territory.

77. Indonesia's freedom has always been posed as a spectre to the Netherlands public. We know it is not easy for a colonial Power to lose its colonial territory, though it is for the sake of human freedom. In fact, we had to gain our freedom bitterly through a colonial war, from 1945 to 1949. Feelings of hostility and disillusionment might prevail, indeed, amongst sections of the Netherlands people after Indonesia's accession to independence.

78. Goodwill and understanding had to be built up on both sides to establish new, friendly relations between the two peoples—based now, however, on the mutual freedom of their two countries. However, the West Irian issue, which became ever more serious, was detrimental to these efforts. The relations between

<sup>3/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Session, Annexes, agenda item 61, document A/C.1/L.110.

the two Governments became worse until all relations, including, naturally, economic relations, were broken off entirely.

79. How is the public opinion in the Netherlands now? Now many people—well-meaning people—in the Netherlands realize what this all means, what interests are really at stake. They realize now that this West Irian issue between the Netherlands and Indonesia has brought the Netherlands people only trouble, only hostility from Indonesia, no sympathy from the peoples of Asia and Africa and, indeed, no sympathy from the greater part of the world.

80. The loss of the greater interests in Indonesia is very evident. And let us not forget the trouble in West Irian itself. Fear, unrest and uncertainty prevail among the population in West Irian; not only among the native population, but also among the Netherlands officials and settlers. The thousands of men and women jailed because of their anti-Netherlands actions is only evidence of the failure of the Netherlands colonial adventure in West Irian. Indonesians who disagree with the colonial policy are expelled and sent to Republican territory at the rate of a hundred a month. An exodus of Dutch officials and settlers has already taken place, during the last two years—they have been either returning to the Netherlands or emigrating to Australia. Up to June last, 13,000 Netherlands people in West Irian had left this inhospitable country—inhabitable for the Netherlands, that is to say—for Australia. More than 1,000 Netherlands people are expected to leave this year for the Netherlands. At this very moment, 400 of these people are sailing back from West Irian to Holland.

81. The theory of a "safe haven" for Indo-Netherlands, as once envisaged, has turned out to be a complete failure. So this West Irian dispute, and conflict with Indonesia, has now become a real liability for the Netherlands people and budget. Serious doubts about the wisdom of the Netherlands Government in maintaining its colonial hold—in West Irian—against its greater interests in Indonesia and in the world as a whole, have been growing. And, as we are told, it has gone so far already that the Netherlands Parliament now would consider the definite relinquishing of Netherlands authority—sovereignty, as they say—over West Irian.

82. Well, many people in the Netherlands now think that the time has come for West Irian which is, after all, part of Indonesian territory, to be fully restored to the Republic of Indonesia. Indeed, obstacles which existed in 1949 in the Netherlands, which at that time was responsible for the Netherlands policy of expediency to retain colonial hold on West Irian, today exist no longer in the Netherlands.

83. A number of Dutch people, some prominent and representing a discernible body of public interest and opinion in the Netherlands, have, during the last two years, made persistent efforts to approach my Government, and indeed President Sukarno himself, so as to contribute to a satisfactory solution of the West Irian dispute in the light of the changed or changing circumstances. They are agreed on the transfer of authority over West Irian, in order not only to restore the territorial integrity of the Republic of Indonesia, but also to make possible the re-establishment of normal relations between the Netherlands and Indonesia, especially in the economic field.

84. In this process it has been suggested that in no way should this settlement be interpreted as a victory for one of the party and a loss of face for the other. We in Indonesia are fully aware of this problem, and we will do everything to accommodate the Netherlands in this respect, even at the sacrifice of some of our own national prestige.

85. My Government, and President Sukarno himself, appreciate the endeavours of these well-meaning Netherlands people, sincere as they seem to us, and representing presumably the more realistic and honest Netherlands view held by important groups in the Netherlands national life.

86. As far as my Government is concerned, and my President recently, and indeed repeatedly, has declared, if the Netherlands Government indicates—due to the changed circumstances—that it is now prepared to relinquish its so-called sovereignty over West Irian and to seek a satisfactory solution of the dispute with the Republic of Indonesia, my Government is prepared to enter into new negotiations to solve the problem at its very roots. My Government holds the view that the best solution still would be the transfer of administration in West Irian to the Republic of Indonesia, to end colonialism completely in Indonesia in the best interest of the relationship between the two countries. A normal relationship between the two countries would thus be restored, with all its beneficial possibilities for the two countries. Moreover, we would be contributing to stability and peace in an important area of the world.

*Mr. Nosek (Czechoslovakia), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

87. But so far we have not seen any sign of realism from the Netherlands Government. Meanwhile, our efforts to regain the freedom of our people in West Irian, to end colonialism in that part of the country, cannot be lessened. It has become a matter of peace and security for my country and for our people. We are preparing to face the worst vis-à-vis the Dutch in West Irian. This is our task, our national task, from which we do not shrink.

88. One might not be aware that in reality, West Irian, as part of my country, has never been actually separated from the Republic of Indonesia, despite sixteen years of protracted colonial occupation by the Netherlands in that Territory and its endeavours towards that end. It has never been separated from the Republic of Indonesia, politically, socially or even constitutionally.

89. Subject only to restrictions imposed by the emergency situation of continued Dutch occupation, we have treated West Irian as an integral part of our country. It has its rightful place in the Republic.

90. West Irian, as I have said, constitutes a province of the Republic of Indonesia, one of the twenty-three provinces into which the Republic of Indonesia is divided administratively. It is true that our administration cannot be fully exercised in the main island of West Irian so far. But we do have a provincial government of West Irian, seated near the main island of West Irian, but still within the administrative territory of the West Irian province.

91. The provinces of the Republic of Indonesia have full local autonomy. They have their own local assembly, the administration is headed by Governors from their own local people, and even the territorial



military commanders we have gone so far—are chosen from the local population. This principle applies equally in the province of West Irian. West Irian is already represented by its own sons in the Indonesian Parliament, in the Supreme Advisory Council, in the People's Congress—the highest body of the Republic—and all other constitutional organs of the State, including the State Planning Council.

92. A native son of West Irian is also represented in our delegation to this session of the General Assembly. Yes, a native son of West Irian, representing the free, sovereign Republic of Indonesia of more than 90 million people. Mr. Dimara—that is his name—has served seven years of imprisonment in a Dutch colonial gaol in West Irian, only because he wanted his people in West Irian to enjoy the freedom that the Republic of Indonesia has gained. He was released only last April, and he can tell you what is the real situation in West Irian: the reign of fear and frustration, the oppression and intimidation inherent in a colonial régime and the mockery of democracy and self-determination, so loudly proclaimed by the Netherlands Government.

93. West Irian remains backward, and the gap between the free development of this area and the other regions of Indonesia is ever widening. What is more, the people remain constantly subjected to fear, frustration and confusion. This is a human problem in itself.

94. As far as the Republic of Indonesia is concerned, West Irian as a province has naturally been included in the Eight-Year Overall National Development Plan of the Republic, now already under way. Schools, hospitals and roads will be built; industries will be founded, as in all other parts of Indonesia. Many native sons and daughters of West Irian are now already being educated or are finding work in other parts of Indonesia. For those who remain in West Irian, special attention and priority will be needed, indeed. This awaits only their liberation from the Netherlands' colonial grip. We cannot forget the human aspect of the problem. No one can be more concerned than my Government about the future and welfare of the people of West Irian, of people in our own province, our own people.

95. And let no one tell us what is best for them, or begin to tell us about the fairy tale of "self-determination", when he himself has never believed in it. And why should the right of self-determination for our people be decided by others? We exercised this right sixteen years ago. We have fought for it—it was not a matter of charity—and we won it only with blood, sweat and tears. We are now determined to defend this right which we have gained so bitterly, with all our strength and all the means at our disposal.

96. The Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, Mr. Luns, has now come to the Assembly to present a plan to solve the West Irian problem, the same problem his Government has left unsolved for eleven years. These eleven years have destroyed the relations between the Netherlands and Indonesia, to no one's benefit, certainly not to the interest of the Netherlands people themselves. They have not brought any change for the better to the people of West Irian itself. This is tragic. Yet the solution remains basically simple. It is basically a colonial question. It is still a question of freedom for West Irian in the framework of Indonesia's freedom and independence, as I have explained before. The best solution remains, therefore, also the same.

97. President Sukarno, commenting on Mr. Luns's plan, stated, on 27 September:.

"The best way for the Netherlands is to transfer immediately its authority directly to Indonesia. But if the Netherlands for different reasons would prefer the medium of the United Nations for the immediate transfer of authority to Indonesia, Indonesia is prepared to consider seriously that proposal.

"If not based upon this assumption, any intervention of the United Nations may only make the problem more acute and explosive. The problem of the urgent transfer of authority to Indonesia is becoming a security problem in this region of the world.

"Our task is to preserve peace in this part of the world, but the Netherlands and the United Nations should also give their urgent contribution to achieve this aim."

98. Let us now examine Mr. Luns's plan carefully. Let us see whether it could serve to bring about the best solution of the problem, not only viewed from the standpoint of my Government and the real situation in West Irian, not only from the viewpoint of the best interests of our people in West Irian, but also as regards the best interests of the people in the Netherlands, as we understand them. We are convinced that, especially at this present juncture, this problem can be solved peacefully in a way that is satisfactory and beneficial to all parties concerned. The Netherlands, after relinquishing its last vestige of colonialism in Indonesia, will no longer be inhibited from developing the best relations with Indonesia in particular and with the countries of Asia and Africa in general. The 700,000 people of West Irian itself will at last be allowed to share the national security of their 90 million compatriots within the Republic of Indonesia. The People of West Irian at last will be able to practise their full measure of local autonomy, as in other parts of Indonesia. Certainly, the Republic of Indonesia as a whole is also one of the beneficiaries of this peaceful solution.

99. Not only will the struggle for independence be completed, not only will peace and security in our region no longer be in danger, but, more than that, our relations with the Netherlands can be normalized, and subsequently the mutual inhibition in the relations between the West and Indonesia can be removed.

100. Unfortunately, one thing struck us immediately in Mr. Luns's plan. In my view, he has allowed himself to make two grave mistakes.

101. In the first place, he presented this plan for a solution of the West Irian issue as if it had no background of a conflict with my country—that is to say, as if it were a clear case of decolonization, as if he could come here with clean hands.

102. Second, he tried to suggest that a peaceful solution of the issue could be attained without a participation or co-operation of Indonesia.

103. Because of these two basic mistakes, his plan—if adopted—can and will solve nothing. It will not resolve the dispute, the conflict, with Indonesia which is the crux of the problem. Mr. Luns cannot with impunity ignore his counterpart in the conflict, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia, and, indeed, the people of my country. If he thinks he can, he is making a very grave mistake indeed.



104. What does he really want? What does he really mean? What kind of solution then does he really envisage? He wants a "decolonization" of West Irian. Is this not sixteen years too late, or at least eleven years? It does not seem too progressive to us. When West Irian—as part of Indonesia—was decolonized by the Republic of Indonesia, it was in fact his Government, the Netherlands Government, that afterwards recolonized this Territory again.

105. For that reason, the so-called decolonization plan of Mr. Luns does not impress us too much. It loses its moral ground. Its submission may only be attributed to an attempt by the Netherlands to get out of an untenable situation in West Irian, created by their own shortsighted and despotic colonial policy. Nevertheless, if it represents a serious attempt now to escape from his Government's dilemma, my Government will welcome it for the sake of our people in West Irian who have been suffering already too long from the prolonged Netherlands colonial rule in that part of Indonesia.

106. However, this "escape" policy should not have an anti-Indonesian spirit, with the design of promoting the forcible separation of West Irian from the Indonesian national body, even under the banner of "self-determination".

107. The facts of history as regards this issue, the Dutch policy of political expediency in this matter, should have shown the Assembly that the Netherlands policy on West Irian had and still has nothing to do with the right of self-determination for the people in West Irian. The people of West Irian were never asked for their consent, nor even their opinion, when the Netherlands Government recolonized them in 1949, and in 1952 annexed their territory into the territory of the Netherlands Kingdom. This new argument of self-determination for the people of West Irian was only adopted by the Netherlands as a matter of political expediency, to be used for international consumption. This has been so rightly pointed out by Professor B.V.A. Röling, a Netherlands professor of International Law and a member of the Netherlands delegation to the United Nations for several years until 1957, in his book: New Guinea, a World Problem,<sup>4/</sup> published in the Netherlands in 1958.

108. Let us look closely, for instance at the so-called "Papuan Council", set up by the Netherlands Government, of which the Assembly has been informed. It was set up in West Irian as a supposedly representative council of the people. According to Mr. Luns, it constitutes a first step towards self-government.

109. The Papuan Council, established only on 5 April 1961, is naturally headed by a Dutch official, appointed by the Dutch colonial Government. The same holds true as regards the Executive Secretary of the Council. Needless to say, the work and policy of this advisory council—which, by the way, is composed mostly of Netherlands and pro-Netherlands West Irianese, induced in various ways to become pro-Netherlands and most of them are officials of the colonial administration—is entirely under the guidance of the Dutch Chairman and Executive Secretary. Is there any sort of self-determination of the people of West Irian in such a Council?

110. It is evident that the Netherlands Government will tolerate the right of self-determination, if at all,

only for West Irianese who can be made pro-Netherlands, who are led and guided by Dutch officials and often intimidated by Dutch military forces.

111. As a matter of fact, the entire colonial administration and policy in West Irian can only be sustained by Netherlands military power.

112. It is interesting and pertinent in this connexion that the plan presented by Mr. Luns is silent on the cessation of all armed action or repressive measures of all kinds directed against independent peoples, as required by paragraph 4 of resolution 1514 (XV), in order to enable them to exercise peacefully and freely their right to complete independence and so that the integrity of their national territory shall be respected. Mr. Luns completely and conveniently ignored this paragraph, which is especially applicable to the situation in West Irian.

113. Self-determination without freedom is, of course, absurd. It was not surprising to us, therefore, that the first action of the so-called Papuan Council was of a rather peculiar character. The first decision of this Council is, in fact, very revealing. It consisted of a motion proposed, if not dictated, by the Netherlands Chairman and naturally adopted by the Council as a whole, to send a cable to the Netherlands Government at The Hague expressing, on behalf of the people of West Irian, the Council's abiding allegiance to the House of Orange—that is, to the Netherlands Crown—and its sentiments of strong ties with the Netherlands people.

114. Well, are the people of West Irian to be educated for independence or for perpetual dependence? This cable of the Papuan Council, though not surprising, is truly a remarkable indictment of the Dutch colonial mentality. Again it shows that the Dutch policy in West Irian is a colonial policy, pure and simple. And I may add, a rather old-fashioned one in this era of decolonization.

115. No wonder, therefore, that thinking people find it very difficult to accept seriously the pronouncements of the Netherlands Government on self-determination.

116. If the Netherlands slogan of "self-determination" in the present Netherlands Government plan still sounds rather appealing to some Members of the Assembly, which I doubt after knowing the real record of the Dutch colonial régime in West Irian, let me add the official Netherlands Government record in the United Nations itself.

117. When in 1955 the Third Committee included the right of self-determination of peoples in article 1 of the draft Covenants on Human Rights, the Netherlands delegation opposed it. The further record of the Netherlands delegation on other various items involving the exercise of the right of self-determination in the Assembly shows the following:

118. It did not support this right for the people of Morocco. It did not support this right for the people of Tunisia. It has not supported this right for the people of Algeria. It has not supported this right in the case of South West Africa or of any other Non-Self-Governing Territory. It has never cast its votes in the United Nations for the actual implementation of the right of self-determination.

119. Even though it did vote for Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) in December 1960, the record of the Netherlands delegations since that time shows still a curious

<sup>4/</sup> Nieuw Guinea als wereld probleem, Assen, Van Gorcum.

reluctance to support the right of self-determination of peoples. In April 1961, the Netherlands delegation withheld its support from a resolution [1603 (XV)] affirming the right of self-determination for the people of Angola, although this resolution is explicitly based upon resolution 1514 (XV) and seeks its application in regard to Angola. Again, as late as August 1961 the Netherlands delegation withheld its support when the people of Tunisia demanded their legitimate rights in the case of Bizerta.

120. No, I am sorry to say that we cannot take the Netherlands notion of self-determination too seriously. Let us not be deceived by this slogan of self-determination now so conspicuously advanced in Mr. Luns' plan with regard to West Irian. As a matter of fact, its fallacy has been noted before, both in the Assembly as well as in West Irian itself, and even now in the Netherlands itself.

121. A few years ago when the question of West Irian was debated in the United Nations, the representative of Iraq pointed out rightly:

"Apart from being a completely irrelevant argument, this game of self-determination, as played by colonial Powers, is nothing but a hypocritical endeavour to prolong their presence in colonial territories. Before taking such a position, it would be wise for the Netherlands Government to go over its negative record involving self-determination over the past ten years."<sup>5/</sup>

122. And may I remind the Assembly of what the representative of the Federation of Malaya, Mr. Ismail, said in respect to this aspect of the West Irian question during the last Assembly debate on this item in 1957. Mr. Ismail pointedly stated that the Netherlands' promises on the exercise of self-determination "ring hollow in the ears of colonial people". He went on to note:

"When Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves in this country [the United States], he did not do so after waiting for those negro slaves to express their will and to have the opportunity to decide for themselves. Abraham Lincoln abolished slavery because it is a crime against humanity. The United Nations must apply the same standard in considering the case against colonialism."<sup>6/</sup>

123. This enlightened view is shared by many. In the Netherlands itself, there are many people—well-meaning people—who think the same way. Professor Röling, in his book to which I already referred, wrote with respect to the debate on this issue in the United Nations—and I quote from page 72 of his book:

"There were understandably"—I repeat: "understandably"—"many delegates who definitely did not take the (Dutch) argument on the right of self-determination of the Papuans seriously."

124. Further, a prominent member of Mr. Luns' own Catholic Party, Professor Duynstee of the Catholic University in Nijmegen, stated only last month in an address to the Verech Student Association that the promise of the Netherlands Government to give the people of West Irian the right to make their own choice about their future status—this so-called right of self-determination—and I quote what he said: "in

<sup>5/</sup> This statement was made at the 912th meeting of the First Committee, the official record of which appears in summary form.

<sup>6/</sup> This statement was made at the 907th meeting of the First Committee, the official record of which appears only in summary form.

reality is nothing but a play upon words". In even harsher terms, Professor Duynstee described their so-called choice as "nothing but a swindle".

125. Yes, the Netherlands policy, including the present manoeuvre outlined in the plan submitted by Mr. Luns, has nothing to do with self-determination for the people of West Irian. Today, as in the past, it merely represents the self-determination of the Netherlands Government itself—with or without a Papuan Council.

126. What do we expect from Mr. Luns' plan? The Luns' plan as it is will not solve the West Irian issue, because it ignores the background, it ignores its conflict with Indonesia. The arguments on so-called decolonization and "right of self-determination" for West Irian are deceiving and may even be self-defeating.

127. Under this plan, the Netherlands will not relinquish its claim to sovereignty over West Irian until the right of self-determination for the people is "properly safeguarded". When will that be? Evidently no one knows except the Netherlands.

128. Moreover, the thousands of Dutch officials in West Irian will remain there indefinitely. This is, of course, nothing else but neo-colonialism. Another Congo. Another Katanga.

129. We say this because of our own bitter experiences in Indonesia when the Netherlands Government sold the slogan of "self-determination" in the various regions of Indonesia, in opposition to the already expressed self-determination of the Indonesian people as a whole. It was part of their policy of "divide and rule"; a policy we know only too well, and many Members of the Assembly also know it too well.

130. Under the cloak of self-determination they succeeded in creating at the time of the colonial war several small sub-States within Indonesia, headed by their puppets, to counter and subvert the Republic of Indonesia.

131. When this policy failed and the Republic of Indonesia survived this trial, they made another attempt in 1950. Supported by a revolt of Dutch colonial forces in the Moluccas, they created the so-called "Republic of the South Moluccas", which fortunately was crushed immediately by the Republic's National Army.

132. Is it any wonder that my Government, knowing the anti-Indonesian measures and propaganda of the Netherlands colonial régime in West Irian, their same old propaganda of the right of self-determination is seriously asking itself whether this plan of Mr. Luns may not be designed to promote the setting up of a so-called "independent" West Irian against Indonesia? It may appear incredible indeed, but we have a great responsibility towards our people, especially now towards our people in the province of West Irian.

133. If Mr. Luns harbours such an idea, it will indeed be against the natural growth of our people, against the logic and the real goal of decolonization for the building up of free nations. The right of self-determination is not to be applied for the division of a nation, but for the national unity and growth of a strong and stable nation. This is very important in the special case of nations fighting for freedom from colonialism. The boundary of such a nation is decided by the boundary of the former colonial territory. This is a clear and simple issue, which should not be complicated.

134. Let me recall, in this respect, the statement of the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Senegal, in which he stated clearly:

"From the very instant that a colonized territory accedes to independence, its new sovereignty must be exercised within the boundaries where colonial sovereignty extended." [1012th meeting, para.44.]\*

This is exactly what the Netherlands Government has tried with their West Irian issue to undo and prevent in the last twelve years.

135. The peoples of Asia and Africa who fought against colonialism and struggled for their freedom and independence will clearly identify this attempt and manoeuvre of the Netherlands Government for what it is: neo-colonialism and the subversion of freedom and independence.

136. I believe I can speak here for Asia and Africa, from Dakar to Manila. Yes, to Manila. Permit me to quote from an editorial on the plan presented by Mr. Luns that appeared in the influential Philippine nationalist paper, the Manila Chronicle, on 29 September 1961. It declares:

"Indonesia is rightfully claiming West Irian, a part of its territory, and the Dutch proposal is, of course, intended to frustrate the Indonesians so that the Netherlands can keep her sole remaining colony in Asia. But the Dutch proposal is as immoral as it is unoriginal."

It continued further:

"And there is no reason to believe that the United Nations will fall for this colonial subterfuge. For already the United Nations is in trouble because Belgium decided on keeping her diamond-rich colony in Africa by prodding puppets to declare Katanga—a rightful part of the Congo—as an independent nation... The Asians should particularly abhor the Dutch trick. Because if West Irian becomes Asia's Katanga, there will be uneasy peace in these parts."

137. Let us guard against another Congo, another Katanga in Asia, to which Mr. Luns' present plan may lead. It may even have graver consequences and lead to a graver conflict, one not confined to our two countries alone.

138. I believe that Mr. Luns is not entirely unaware of the possibility of a grave conflict of this West Irian issue as it has developed in the last few years. In fact, if I have read his statement of 26 September correctly, he based the introduction of his plan to the United Nations on the philosophy attributed to the late Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjöld, which considers that the United Nations should be utilized as a dynamic instrument not only for seeking reconciliation, but also with the aim of forestalling conflicts. In line with this basic philosophy Mr. Luns, as he implied, sought with his plan to "contribute to the removal of a dangerous development". Well, there seems to exist at least one area of agreement between Mr. Luns and us; namely, that the West Irian dispute represents a dangerous development and harbours the possibility of erupting into a grave conflict, which should be forestalled. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Luns' plan cannot and will not forestall a conflict. The conflict between the Netherlands and Indonesia will be left unsolved. It will be aggravated to an even wider extent.

It will not solve the West Irian problem at all. It will not serve the purpose of peace.

139. May I therefore conclude my statement with a suggestion. It is presented in an effort to contribute sincerely to the solution of the West Irian dispute, which has too long troubled the relations between Indonesia and the Netherlands, troubled too long the peace and the peaceful development of the people of West Irian.

140. First, the plan of Mr. Luns in its present form cannot solve the problem of West Irian peacefully, and consequently cannot solve the dispute between Indonesia and the Netherlands.

141. Secondly, if the Netherlands Government is really sincere in its wish to relinquish its claim to sovereignty over West Irian and end its colonial control over that Territory, this intention should be welcomed as the start of the real solution of the conflict between Indonesia and the Netherlands on the West Irian issue. In fact, the original source of the dispute between Indonesia and the Netherlands will then be removed.

142. Thirdly, to complete this settlement, it then requires only the orderly transfer of administration in West Irian from the Netherlands to the Republic of Indonesia, based upon a co-operative spirit between both countries and a mutual desire for normalization of relations between Indonesia and the Netherlands.

143. Fourthly, my Government would have no objection at all if the United Nations were to assist, if so required, in the realization of such a plan through the creation of a special body or special authority which, on behalf of the United Nations, would enable the orderly attainment of that solution.

144. Fifthly, if this plan is based on General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the resolution referred to in Mr. Luns' plan, it should pay due regard to the principle laid down in paragraph 6 of that resolution, which reads:

"Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

145. For its part, the Republic of Indonesia, with the assistance of the United Nations, will adhere to the principle that the local Indonesians of West Irian will have the full responsibility for the local autonomy of that region. This is in conformity with the other existing autonomous provinces within the Republic.

146. Sixthly, the right of self-determination, which is a living principle upheld by the Republic of Indonesia for which the Indonesian people fought in attaining their freedom and independence, should not be abused in its application and should not be used against the real interests of the people of West Irian by subverting national independence already gained.

147. Seventhly, if the West Irian problem is to be solved peacefully, it must be solved at the earliest possible time.

148. Eighthly, the Indonesian Government is prepared to contribute its share to a United Nations endeavour to solve the problem of West Irian speedily along the lines indicated, both in terms of personnel and in terms of technical as well as financial assistance.

149. I believe that this approach is a constructive one. The solution I have indicated is the best possible

\* Provisional English version taken from the interpretation.

solution to which the United Nations can lend its assistance. A "solution" such as that envisaged by Mr. Luns' plan, we will reject and reject strongly. If the Netherlands Government sees fit to implement this plan as it stands now—that is to say, to solve the West Irian problem without Indonesia, considering Indonesia as non-existing—then I can tell the Assembly in all seriousness that for the Indonesian Government and people there will be no alternative but to solve the West Irian problem in a reciprocal way.

150. We ourselves are confident that West Irian will be fully restored into the Republic of Indonesia. West Irian is, after all, a part of my country. The people are part of the Indonesian people. Let no one make a mistake about this.

151. May God bless us in our struggle for freedom, justice and peace.

152. Mrs. MEIR (Israel): As we meet year after year and continue our search for ways and means to assure peace in the world, two truths stand out above everything else:

153. First, all the peoples of the world want peace and not war. There are many fears in our world, but above all others is the all-embracing fear of war.

154. Secondly, from year to year, despite innumerable sessions on disarmament, and although everybody agrees that in our times fighting can solve no problem and its only result would be the destruction of civilization—this monster of war is drawing closer and the cold breath of death is felt by us all. The human mind is beset by an agonizing conflict. On the one hand, we now have almost unlimited possibilities of probing into the mysteries of the universe; there is man's scientific capability to reach out to other planets and to harness nature to his will. On the other hand, there is the spectre of disaster which is being augmented by these very achievements. Is it not a sad commentary on our times that, as soon as a new scientific achievement is announced, it is immediately translated into its capacity for destruction? Is it a wonder that one sometimes ponders over the question whether this thirst for more and more knowledge may not result in the drying up of the well of life itself?

155. Within the last fifty years the world has been plunged into two world wars. Most of us remember these wars as events in our own lifetimes. After both wars the victors realized that real victory would not be achieved until arrangements had been made to ensure that new wars would not break out in the future. It was this realization that brought about the creation of the two world organizations: the League of Nations after the First World War and the United Nations after the Second World War.

156. The generation that fought in the Second World War is justified in pointing an accusing finger at its elders for allowing the League of Nations to fail and allowing the world to slide into war again. Was that failure due to a lack of high principles in the Preamble to the Covenant of that body? No. The fault lay not in the lack of principles in the Covenant but in the lack of determination to put them into practice. This failure made it possible for the Hitler régime to plunge the world into the Second World War.

157. Between the two wars humanity progressed. Science made great strides, with the result that the second war was yet more ghastly and destructive than the first. And again, with even greater solemnity,

and with the ghost of many more millions of war victims looking over their shoulders, the victors sat down to build a world Organization to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

158. The Charter was drawn up. Are the high principles in the Preamble of our Charter lacking in any way? No.

"We the peoples of the United Nations determined... to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security..."

All the principles are there and they are spelt out in detail.

159. It was accepted in San Francisco that this is a world divided by conflicts and that clashes of interests among nations would continue to arise. Ways and means were therefore devised in the Charter as to how the organized family of nations should maintain the peace.

160. There is no doubt that the concept that stands out in bold relief in the very centre of the quest for peace and amity between nations is negotiation—negotiation as the only alternative to war as a method of settling international disputes.

161. When this means for solving international problems is thrown overboard, the ship is in danger of sinking with everybody on it. Negotiation need not mean compromising with principles and convictions. It does mean a real desire for coexistence—to live and let live despite different points of view. It negates war and the threat of war, hot and cold.

162. If there is a ray of hope in the present tense situation, it arises from the fact that the major Powers which are involved in the most dangerous of the international conflicts are engaged in direct talks. We fervently hope that even though the basic differences remain and the dangers to peace are still serious, the major Powers will not interrupt these talks.

163. However, it is not for us, the smaller countries, merely to exhort the major Powers to negotiate, while we ourselves sit back and do nothing. More is expected of us by way of a practical contribution to international peace.

164. The major conflicts are not the only ones besetting the international scene. In various parts of the world there are disputes between neighbours, unresolved problems, lack of peaceful relations, fears of aggression and competitive rearmament. We must recall that in our age both peace and war are even more indivisible than they were when this phrase was first coined. None of us can feel certain that local conflicts anywhere will not spread or bring about the involvement of the major Powers.

165. We have a duty, therefore, to practise ourselves what we say to the larger countries. It is up to us to enlarge the areas of peace, tranquillity and international amity, by dedicating ourselves to the mitigation of local tensions, to the halting of local arms build-up and to the solution, through direct and patient negotiations, of any conflicts in which we, the smaller nations, may be involved. Of this type of local conflicts there exist quite a few, and some of them have been mentioned by representatives in this debate. Perhaps we can show an example to the larger Powers.



166. At any rate, let no one of us preach the duty of negotiation to others whilst at the same time refusing to apply it to conflicts in which he himself is involved. The specific contribution of the smaller countries to the improvement of the international situation lies in the proper conduct of these smaller countries toward each other. Unhappily, there is in many cases a wide gap between the code of behaviour laid down in the Charter and the actual behaviour of States towards each other. In an effort to fortify observance of the provisions of the Charter, the General Assembly has, during the years, adopted a number of resolutions relating to the principles of peaceful coexistence and international co-operation between States. There were such resolutions, for instance, in 1947, 1949, 1950, 1957, 1958 and 1960.

167. There is no need for me to quote the texts. It is sufficient to say that they have solemnly reaffirmed over and over again certain basic principles for maintaining and strengthening peaceful and harmonious relations among States in conformity with the Charter—more specifically, respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-aggression, non-interference in one another's internal affairs, the settlement of disputes by peaceful means, and the condemnation of all forms of propaganda or incitement which might provoke a threat to or breach of the peace.

168. We all know that not all these resolutions have been translated into practice by all the Governments who voted for them. Surely the time has come for these principles to be reaffirmed and revitalized in a manner which would have binding force upon Member States. If we genuinely believe in the need to observe these principles, we should incorporate them into a formally binding instrument by which each Government would unreservedly pledge itself to implement the principles in the practical conduct of its relations with other States. Such an act would, in our opinion, have a far-reaching political and psychological impact. I hope that this idea will be earnestly explored.

169. Before I leave this subject there is another point I should like to mention which touches upon behaviour in accordance with the spirit of the Charter within this very building and in the course of the session of the General Assembly. I think we ought to make it a definite rule and practice to abstain from using bellicose and abusive language about other States, and to conduct our proceedings in accordance with accepted parliamentary standards, as behoves the dignity of this Organization. Criticism of each other's policies is certainly legitimate, though even there we should all practise the utmost restraint. But it appears to me that the vilification of another State and the incitement to war and the destruction of another Member country are definitely a transgression of the Charter and a contradiction of everything that the Organization stands for.

170. If the Assembly will succeed in rededicating itself to the universal and total implementation of the principle of negotiation, then indeed it will be an historic session.

171. Discussions and conferences on disarmament have been a permanent feature of the international landscape for more than thirty years. Discussions held in Geneva for many years under the auspices of the League of Nations were interrupted by the Second World War. They were resumed in 1945 under the auspices of the United Nations.

172. A further fifteen years have since passed. Conferences have been convened and adjourned. Innumerable resolutions have been adopted by the Assembly year in, year out. Yet, the arms race is in full swing, gaining more deadly momentum from year to year.

173. The idea of general and complete disarmament is as old as are man's Messianic longings for universal peace. The words of the Prophet Isaiah: "They shall beat their swords into ploughshares... nation shall not lift up sword against nation..." are as meaningful for us today as they were 2,600 years ago. They are not only engraved in stone at the entrance of our United Nations compound, but enshrined in the hearts of all peace-loving mankind.

174. Israel supports complete disarmament under a system of effective control and inspection. The motive that causes nations to arm is the very reason why one cannot speak of disarmament without emphasizing the need for effective control. Nations would not arm if they did not fear each other, if there were not a lack of confidence.

175. This lack of mutual trust can, therefore, only be allayed by perfecting the means of inspection and control to ensure the implementation of a disarmament agreement. One is often amazed at the ability to invent more and more complicated means of destruction, on the one hand, and the lack of ingenuity in setting up machinery for control, on the other.

176. We welcome the set of agreed principles on disarmament [A/4879] presented to this Assembly jointly by the United States and the Soviet Union. We regard this as a step forward. We concur with the authors of these principles when they stress the necessity to accompany measures of disarmament with the strengthening of means for the peaceful settlement of disputes. The two processes must move forward together.

177. My country is prepared to apply these principles in practice in the sphere of its own responsibilities and concern. As I have said earlier, we, the small countries, should not content ourselves with exhorting the great Powers to practise policies in conformity with the Charter. We can and should make our own contributions. There are areas of international tension in the world on the fringe of the great Power conflict, where a dangerous arms race imperils international peace. The countries involved are mostly poor ones, facing enormous problems of social and economic development. The arms race impoverishes them even more. Instead of lifting themselves up, they are sinking deeper under burden of armaments.

178. We propose that, simultaneously with the search for a general agreement on disarmament, we should seek to reach agreement also on disarmament with mutual inspection and control for specific zones or situations of international tension. Such a scheme could serve as a pilot project for the solution of the over-all problem. Israel is prepared to elaborate a programme to that end, and we call upon the Arab States to cooperate with us in this venture.

*Mr. Slim (Tunisia) resumed the Chair.*

179. For nearly three years humanity was spared the nightmare of nuclear explosions. The day the Soviet Union ended the moratorium and resumed nuclear testing was a sombre and grievous one. It opened a new period in the nuclear armaments race: it removed us further from agreement to end the atomic threat:

in fact it brought us nearer to the perfection of nuclear horror weapons of a destructive power beyond human imagination. If testing continues the radiation effect will maim our generation and endanger the very future of mankind on this planet. This world of ours was not created to be the testing ground for the perfection of weapons to wipe us out.

180. My delegation will vigorously support effective measures which will put an end to nuclear tests and which will guarantee that the cessation will be a lasting one, not to be abandoned at will.

181. Our age has been replete with struggles, sufferings and war, but humanity has also recorded great progress and achievements in many fields. Yet we believe that future generations, studying the history of this, will be struck above all by the greatest of all revolutions of our times: I refer to the revolution which has taken place in the consciousness of man and has brought about the recognition of the principle that no nation has the right to rule over another. This has led to the great process of decolonization.

182. To my mind this is the practical application in international life of the basic human concept that all men are created equal, that the classification of mankind into superior and inferior races is evil and ungodly. The assumption that colour, race or religion can be a reason for discrimination is immoral. It has been the unique privilege of our generation to see the liberation of hundreds of millions of people.

183. The independence of peoples is more than a political concept. Subjugated people, entering upon their sovereignty, feel as though a haze that has hung over their heads obscuring the skies has been removed. From then on the sun shines for them as it does for others.

184. May I here offer my heartiest congratulations to the people of Sierra Leone on being seated in the United Nations. It has been my privilege to visit their country before independence, to make acquaintance with them, to know and admire their leaders, to learn something about their problems and to witness how capable they are of solving them. It is good that they have achieved their independence peacefully. Israel is happy to enjoy the most friendly relations with Sierra Leone.

185. I have spoken about our joy at seeing the greater part of the African continent free and independent. We sincerely hope that very soon we will welcome into the United Nations all the peoples of that continent. Some of the countries, such as Tanganyika, have already set the date for their independence. We hope that the others will join them soon.

186. In Angola a fierce struggle is raging, with much tragic loss of life. Our sympathies are in favour of speedy self-determination for the Angolan people. We cannot see any feasible alternative policy. Wherever subjugated people are struggling today for their freedom and independence, they are bound to win, and all humanity should support their aspiration. Wherever colonial Powers have recognized this process as historically inevitable and have not resisted it, they too have gained. It is imperative that independence should come to Angola too, without further bloodshed.

187. Regarding Western New Guinea, we hope that the Assembly will give its serious attention to the proposal which was put forward by the distinguished Foreign Minister of the Netherlands [1016th meeting].

It suggests a novel and far-reaching method for the decolonization of this Territory, by transferring sovereignty to its people with the direct help of the United Nations. The claims of any other country to this Territory should rightly be deferred until its people are independent and can decide their future for themselves. What is suggested at this stage is that a United Nations commission should investigate and report, and we shall support that suggestion.

188. I now wish to say a few words about the Congo. Speaking before the Assembly last year I summed up the position of my Government in one phrase, "the Congo for the Congolese" [897th meeting, para. 139]. Since then, Congo's national leaders have demonstrated their statesmanlike ability to bring about the resumption of the constitutional process, resulting in the recovering of Parliament and the setting up of a Central Government in Leopoldville. This striking achievement leads us to hope that the chapter of secession will be ended and that every part of the Congo will be peacefully brought into the framework of a single and unified sovereign State, in which all its human and material resources should serve all its people.

189. I know nothing more objectionable and more dangerous than the desire of any country to see in the continents of liberated Africa and Asia a hunting ground for its own interests. Have these peoples achieved sovereignty only to have it undermined? Their natural right is not only to formal independence. It is equally their right to establish their social order, their economy, their way of life according to their own will, without the interference of others.

190. In this connexion I wish to reaffirm that Israel, in common with many countries represented here, favours the enlargement of the Security Council, and the Economic and Social Council, in order to have the membership of these important bodies reflect more accurately the composition of the United Nations as a whole, to enable representatives of the newly-independent States to make their contribution to the task of these Councils.

191. Different organs of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies have devoted much thought to the requirements of speedy economic development in the newly emerging States. The crying need is for capital and for skills. The world has sufficient of both, and more of our resources of capital and "know-how" must be brought to the new States. They need international co-operation for the practical application of scientific achievements, for the rapid development of their natural resources, and for the promotion of extensive and dynamic programmes of academic and vocational training.

192. At the fifteenth session of the General Assembly we reported that a Conference on the Role of Science in the Advancement of New States had been held in Rehovoth,<sup>2/</sup> in Israel, called by the Institute of Science named after Dr. Weizmann, the first President of Israel. The Conference was attended by outstanding scientists and by leading statesmen from African and Asian nations. The contribution that science can make to newly emerging States was discussed in detail, and I believe that the participants found the deliberations enlightening and important. A statement on principles and on lines of action was adopted, and committees have since been dealing further with various

<sup>2/</sup> 15-30 August 1960.

subjects raised at the Conference. We welcome the proposal<sup>8/</sup> that a conference on this same subject should be called by the United Nations.

193. We have long been convinced that in the field of assistance for development and the transmission of skills, the developing countries themselves can play an important role. We have been trying, to the best of our ability, to put this principle into practice. Ours is a small country, poor in natural resources. But we are willing to share the two assets which have been of most decisive importance in our own development: our experience in building a progressive modern society and our resources of trained manpower.

194. In the past year our ties of co-operation with other developing countries have expanded and today fifty-two countries have joined with Israel in a wide range of activities in the economic, social and scientific fields.

195. Since, on account of the Jewish Day of Atonement, my delegation was absent from the Assembly [1010th meeting] when tribute was being paid to the late Secretary-General, I wish to take this opportunity to express the sentiments of Israel regarding the human tragedy, and the great loss to the world, in his untimely death. The impact of this blow has been felt not only by our Organization, but in the hearts and minds of people everywhere who saw in him the personal symbol of their hopes for a secure and decent world. In the course of the years we had a close association with him on many matters with which the United Nations, our region, and my country were vitally concerned. He was an exceptional man, wholly dedicated to the United Nations and to the search for peace, which is the major objective of the Organization.

196. Our deep sympathy also goes out to the bereaved families of the devoted men who were Mr. Hammarskjöld's companions on his ill-fated journey, and who with him gave their lives in the cause of peace.

197. We should recognize the outstanding loyalty and ability of the Secretariat officials, who have continued to operate the many and complex activities of the Organization under such trying circumstances.

198. We should recognize the outstanding loyalty and ability of the Secretariat officials, who have continued to operate the many and complex activities of the Organization under such trying circumstances.

198. The unrelenting call of life makes it necessary that while we mourn the passing of Mr. Hammarskjöld, we deal with the problem of filling the void. The state of the world and the issues facing the Organization make it essential that we act forthwith. In this regard Israel's position in principle can be briefly stated.

199. First, as I stated at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly [897th meeting] we believe that in order to guarantee the effective functioning of the Organization, there should be one single Secretary-General, as called for by the Charter.

200. Secondly, the Secretary-General should not only possess the highest personal qualifications; he should, moreover, not be a national of a country involved in a serious conflict regarding which the Secretary-General is called upon to exercise responsibilities.

201. Thirdly, during his period of office, an Acting Secretary-General, who should be elected with due

regard to constitutional requirements, would have all the functions and responsibilities vested by the Charter in the Secretary-General.

202. Fourthly, while it is proper to take geographical distribution into account in the appointment by the Secretary-General of his deputies, they should not be representatives of blocs, but international civil servants within the meaning of Article 100 of the Charter, appointed for their personal qualifications, and owing their loyalty to the Organization as such.

203. It has been suggested that the office of Secretary-General, and the composition of the Secretariat, should be based on the concept that the world is divided into three blocs: capitalist, communist and neutralist. On this concept my delegation wishes to make certain observations.

204. Israel does not share the view that the world is divided into three blocs and that every country belongs to one or other of them. The majority of the States represented in this hall probably do not in fact belong to any such bloc at all. If the division into three blocs were to be the basis of international life, then it would suffice for each bloc to get together separately and elect its representatives to meet the representatives of the other two. But we are here one hundred Member States. Although, as I have said, most of us are not affiliated with any bloc, there is the strange phenomenon that representatives of a number of countries get together and decide what other countries are neutral or unaligned. In our view, here too the principle of self-determination should prevail. Should not each sovereign country decide for itself where it stands in world affairs?

205. How is a country like Israel to be classified? It has a democratic parliamentary régime. It possesses a highly developed co-operative movement, with collective and co-operative agricultural villages. A major part of Israel's basic and secondary industry is owned either by the Government, by the Federation of Labour, or by co-operatives. Its railroads, water and electricity are owned by the State. Most of its land resources are nationally owned. At the same time, Israel invites and encourages private investment and enterprise. Is Israel, therefore, to be labelled as socialist or capitalist or neutralist, or should it be the kernel of a new bloc? Israel is not a member of any bloc. We strive to judge each international issue on its merits. Our policy is based on the belief that friendship should rule among all nations, irrespective of their social order or internal régime.

206. This does not mean that Israel does not have a philosophy with regard to the social order and type of government that are preferable to it. But we sincerely believe that one of the conditions for peace in the world is non-interference in the internal régime of any other country.

207. I must now turn to the situation of the Middle East, which, as recent events have reminded us, remains one of the tension areas of the world. To get the Middle East picture into focus, two aspects should be borne in mind.

208. First, it is not just an Arab area; indeed it has more non-Arab than Arab inhabitants, and Israel enjoys relations of friendship with all its peoples, except those belonging to the Arab League.

209. Secondly, the Israel-Arab conflict is only one source of tension in the area. Disputes between Arab

<sup>8/</sup> See Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Thirty-Second Session, Supplement No. 1, resolution 834 (XXXII).



and non-Arab countries, quarrels among the Arab countries themselves, and outside influences have caused recurrent crises which from time to time have come before the Security Council or the General Assembly, and in 1958 produced an emergency special session of the Assembly. Hostility to Israel is largely a means used by Arab leaders to divert the attention of their peoples from their own unsolved problems and hardships. For instance, when listening last week to the usual diatribe of the representative of Saudi Arabia, I could not help wondering why he did not worry less about other countries and worry more about the state of affairs in his own.

210. As to the Arab population in Israel, we challenge any Arab country to match the progress in universal, free, compulsory education, health services, economic welfare, rate of employment, standards of living, status of women, which are enjoyed by our Arab citizens, who comprise about 12 per cent of our population. If there are border incidents, which cause unfortunate loss of life, then this is another regrettable result of the border warfare which is part of the belligerence practised by the Arab States against Israel.

211. One must not minimize the dangers of Arab belligerence, and its implications not only for Israel, but for the United Nations and world peace. The origin of the conflict was the war launched against Israel by the Arab States, in violation both of the Charter and the United Nations partition resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947. The crux of the conflict today is that, still in violation of the Charter and the United Nations resolutions, the Arab Governments practise policies of active hostility, such as an economic boycott, a blockade against our shipping in an international waterway—the Suez Canal—in defiance of the Security Council, and above all, the planning of military action, the piling up of weapons, and the training of armies, with the publicly proclaimed aim of destroying Israel. This has been said over and over again by Arab representatives, even from this rostrum.

212. The Arab refugees are kept as a potential spearhead for another attack on Israel. On the substance of the refugee problem, I shall state our view in the appropriate Committee. I would, however, say this. The number of Arabs who, upon the prompting of their leaders, left the area which is Israel today, is about equal to the number of Jewish refugees who came to Israel from Arab countries. We received these Jewish refugees as our brothers, took care of them and rehabilitated them. Had the Arab countries acted likewise, the Arab refugee problem would no longer be before us.

213. In the atmosphere of hostility which I have described, Israel lives and builds. We are thus compelled to spend far more than we would like on the preservation of our security. We admit that it is a heavy burden. We see no glory in deadly weapons. We find joy and satisfaction in irrigating deserts and planting forests on rocky hills. However, we will do everything within our power to be able to defend our country, if attacked. But we once more ask our neighbours—where is all this leading? We seek no military victories, all we want is peace. We want the development of our country and a decent life for our people. Is not this what the Arab masses need as well?

214. Surely we can find a more sensible and constructive way to settle our differences—a way in keeping with the needs of our peoples, and in the light of the common dangers which face our world. I have already

indicated our belief in negotiation, as the only alternative to war. No Israel-Arab issue can be solved without negotiation; every one of the issues can be solved by negotiation. The United Nations itself, in a series of resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, has called upon the parties to negotiate a settlement of all questions outstanding between them, and those who clamour for the implementation of resolutions would be well advised to bear this in mind. For our part, we remain ready to negotiate at any time or place, with any Arab leader, and without prior conditions, in order to settle the differences between us.

215. Meanwhile, pending the willingness of the Arab Governments to conclude a final peace settlement, certain measures could be adopted which would relax tension and allay mutual fears, and pave the road to peace. These include:

216. First, there should be an Arab-Israel non-aggression pact, the parties to which would undertake to respect each other's territorial integrity and political independence, to refrain from all hostile acts of a military, economic or political character, to settle all existing and future differences by pacific means, and to cease incitement and inflammatory propaganda.

217. Secondly, a fresh effort should be made to bring about regional co-operation in development programmes, particularly with regard to water resources.

218. My delegation feels that all responsible and peace-loving nations will do their utmost to support the policies which I have indicated. We are not unaware of the difficulties. However, nothing will shake our belief that peace will eventually come.

219. We welcome the fact that an item on racial discrimination is on the agenda of this session. It is opportune that racial and religious discrimination in all its forms should be dealt with effectively by the General Assembly. The trial of Adolf Eichmann in Israel has poignantly reminded us of the depth of human degradation and suffering to which racial hatred can lead—the so-called "Final Solution" of the gas chambers and the death factories. From the surviving victims we heard again the story of mass murder retold in its full horror. We who have experienced this great holocaust know too well the dangers inherent in discrimination and hatred on grounds of race, religion or colour, wherever they manifest themselves. The Israel delegation will actively participate in seeking measures designed to lead to effective action.

220. If we are convinced that the only result of modern warfare will be the annihilation of mankind, then we must accept the only decisive lesson that is left. This great Organization must have the strength to fulfil its supreme aim—the settlement of conflicts between nations in peace and for peace. For there is one fear that we all share—it is the awesome fear for the fate of the earth and of man upon it.

221. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (translated from Russian): May I, Mr. President, on behalf of the Ukrainian delegation, congratulate you on your election to the high post of President of the sixteenth session of the General Assembly and wish you success in the discharge of your duties in guiding the work of this important Assembly.



222. The United Nations has never before seemed so unanimous in recognizing the extreme gravity of the present international situation. Differ though they may in their views and evaluation of the causes of the prevailing tension, all agree on one point: unless the development of events in Central Europe is arrested, it may approach a very dangerous brink.

223. The value of the general discussion—and the Ukrainian delegation is taking part in it, sharing the general feelings of anxiety—lies not only in the fact that the very pithy and profound ideas expressed from this high international rostrum will exert a restraining effect on the instigators of war hysteria and the firebrands who are acting provocatively at the Brandenburger Gate. The discussion, at the plenary meetings of the United Nations General Assembly's sixteenth session of the most topical unsettled problems will enable us, from different points of view, to see from what source the international atmosphere is being charged with explosive matter and to ensure that the voice and conscience of the peoples will pass moral judgement on the atomic crusaders.

224. Happily, despite the clash of views, the wind of time is sweeping out of the Assembly hall the false conclusions about the policy of the Government of the Soviet Union and the other socialist States, more especially in regard to the question of concluding a peace treaty with Germany. It is no mere accident, I feel, that one of the speakers voiced his dissatisfaction at the fact that the Assembly, to put it plainly, is not dominated by anti-Soviet hysteria. He is convinced, or he feels (on this point I cannot be a judge), that the Assembly is impartial and objective only when it allows people to gamble on its authority for cold war purposes. The Assembly, he says, is biased and unfair if it tries to be objective in its judgement concerning the measures recently taken by the Government of the Soviet Union to strengthen peace throughout the world.

225. That, however, is merely a remark by the way. The delegation of the Ukraine would like to give its views on some highly important problems. Obviously, some of these are artificial levers in the hands of imperialist circles for the stimulation of a war psychosis, while others constitute the hub of an aggressive policy and of the maintenance of tension in the relations between countries and peoples.

226. In our complex and varied world the death of one man, regrettable though it be in itself, is regarded by some as a tragedy and an irreparable loss. Yet the loss of millions in the Second World War is reflected only in the flat mirror of statistics. They now figure merely as basic data for comparisons with the possible terrors of a new war, and are not lamented by General Staffs. The children of the fathers whose graves are scattered all over Europe and Asia have not yet managed to grow up, before the shadow of a new and more terrible extermination of people has descended upon them. Why and for whom?

227. Although the peace treaty with Germany proposed by the Government of the Soviet Union contains no secret threat either for the United States or the United Kingdom or for France, the President of the United States has declared that the proposals for a peace settlement with Germany involve provisions which would be fatal to peace.

228. The Second World War ended sixteen years ago. The world which survived that war was bound to

change, and it has indeed become another world; we are living in a new era. After the collapse of fascism Germany, too, became a different place. Instead of the German Reich there arose two independent and sovereign States—the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany. Much has changed in the world, yet no peace treaty has so far been concluded with the legal successors of the German Reich; in other words, the account for the Second World War has not been finally closed. And whereas the peace-loving forces of the German people have correctly learnt the lesson of history and have expelled militarism for ever from their State—the German Democratic Republic—in the Federal Republic of Germany the Western Powers have revived militarism and irredentism, which have again begun to threaten peace not only in Europe but throughout the world.

229. The Bonn Government—as several speakers have already pointed out from this rostrum—has now created the biggest army in Europe, an army which by the spring of 1962 will consist of twelve modern divisions equipped with rockets.

230. Recently Chancellor Adenauer declared that "the 'Bundeswehr' must have the right to dispose of atomic weapons", yet it may be remembered that only a few years ago he cloaked himself in the mantle of a "pacifist by principle". People in the West often refer to one or other public statement by ruling figures in the Federal Republic of Germany as evidence of their "love of peace". But Bonn has more than once gone back on its earlier declarations, with the gradual discarding of masks and changing of the "décor" on the political stage. In 1949, Adenauer said: "I resolutely reject any remilitarization of Germany", and Strauss, the Defence Minister, declared at the same time: "If any German takes up arms, may his hand wither". In 1951, the same Adenauer and the same Strauss loudly called for the speediest possible completion of the war machine in the Federal Republic of Germany, and for atomic equipment.

231. Let us turn, though, to the actual draft peace treaty with Germany proposed by the Government of the Soviet Union. It stipulates the right of Germany to form national armed forces, but definite restrictions are imposed on the arming of the two German States which are the legal successors of pre-war Germany. Article 26 of the draft treaty prohibits the manufacture and acquisition of any kind of nuclear weapon and other means of mass destruction, or the conducting of experiments with them. There is also a ban on the manufacture of all types of rockets and guided missiles, of submarines, and of aircraft basically designed as bombers.

232. It may well be asked what is "fatal to peace" in this provision of the draft peace treaty. On the contrary, peace will be consolidated when limits are set to the remilitarization of the Federal Republic of Germany.

233. German militarism has concentrated in its hands the material means of aggression. From the old roots, spiritual weapons too are springing up: irredentism and pan-Germanism. The militarist and neo-Nazi circles, Chancellor Adenauer and the members of his Government, evidently consider that the time has come to raise the question of revising the frontiers, of bringing back under their rule what they describe as all the "German lands". Germans are being imbued with a belief in their mission of conquest. Revision

of the frontiers of Czechoslovakia, Poland, the USSR—that is the subject now being discussed in the Federal Republic of Germany, and not in whispers either. In Bonn people cannot disabuse themselves of the idea that the policy of the Western Powers vis-à-vis of the ripening plans for a new "march to the East" under the flag of pan-Germanism is still as benevolent as it was in the not too remote past. I would venture to point out that in those days Western diplomacy considered even the Ukraine as part of the German race's "Lebensraum." On 6 December 1938, in connexion with the signing of a Franco-German treaty of friendship, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Bonnet, told Ribbentrop: "Leave us our colonial empire and you can keep the Ukraine for yourselves". On 1 January 1939, the German Ambassador in London, Dirksen, reported to Berlin that the United Kingdom Government would not oppose a German march on the Ukraine. A similar statement was made to Dirksen by the United States Ambassador in London, Joseph Kennedy, who agreed that Germany should have a free hand in Eastern Europe. The capitalist monopolies and financial manipulators turned the gaze of the fascist monster towards the East, and traded other peoples' lands and wealth in one place in order to hold on to what they had grabbed for themselves in another place.

234. The lessons learnt, and the sacrifices made, in the struggle against Hitlerism are too enormous for them to be forgotten. In this struggle the Ukrainian people lost as many of its sons and daughters as the present population of some of the States whose Governments are taking such an incredibly light-hearted view of the growth of irredentist cliques among the Bonn militarists. The fire of that struggle strengthened the Soviet peoples' brotherhood and friendship between themselves and with other peoples that have developed still further in the field of peaceful construction and the consolidation of peace. There is no guarantee that the West German irredentists have learnt the lessons of history. But they can be quite sure—and we say this quite clearly—that, if they try to repeat the "Drang nach Osten", it will be measured not by the distance between Berlin and Stalingrad; it will be buried on the threshold of its own home.

*Mr. Padilla Nervo (Mexico), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

235. Now about the frontiers of Germany. The Soviet draft peace treaty is based on the frontiers now actually existing in Europe, including the frontiers between the two German States. Under article 9 Germany will renounce all rights to the former German territories east of the Oder-Neisse line, and under article 10 it will recognize the territory of the former Sudetenland as an integral part of the Czechoslovak Republic. Similarly, articles 11, 12 and 13 of the draft peace treaty proclaim Germany's renunciation of all territorial and political claims against Austria, France and other Western European States. Thus Germany's existing frontiers are legally guaranteed in the peace treaty. The question again arises—where is there here any threat of peace being violated or, as somebody said, destroyed?

236. The Western Powers have artificially built up the so-called "Berlin crisis", and continue to assert that the Soviet Union is "threatening" West Berlin. In order to deceive public opinion they are deliberately and maliciously making no mention of the draft peace treaty, are trying to minimize its importance, and are

simultaneously stimulating war hysteria about West Berlin to a dangerous degree.

237. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR would like once again to emphasize, from this rostrum, that the important thing is a German peace treaty. I repeat, the main thing is a German peace treaty; and the USSR proposal to convert West Berlin into a Free City means nothing more than that the Soviet Union is ready to settle this problem on the basis of a German peace treaty.

238. It goes without saying that the question of the status of West Berlin will have to be decided, its social and economic structure and freedom of communications with all countries being maintained and respect for the sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic being ensured. West Berlin must contribute to peaceful coexistence in Europe, and not serve as a powder-keg or a place where a short-circuit might occur.

239. There is another trick whereby Adenauer and the Governments of the Western Powers hope to obstruct peace settlement with Germany. This is the speculation hazarded around the slogan of "self-determination for the German people". It is, however, an immutable fact that the German people has found its own self-determination in the form of two States—the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany. To play about with the slogan of self-determination for the German nation when there already exist two independent German States is a very primitive trick. Today, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany do not differ on the national issue; they are separated by profound differences in their internal ways of life; in other words, they are separated by deep social differences. To try to set the "self-determination" slogan up in reply to struggles within nations is to juggle with concepts. If it is a question of social structure—and this is precisely what is at stake in connexion with the formation of two independent German States—then these States have already made their choice. So far, however, the Western Powers have refused, or are still refusing, to recognize the existence of the German Democratic Republic, although it is a sovereign State, maintains diplomatic, trade and cultural relations with many countries in the world, and—a point to be specially emphasized—is practising a peaceful foreign policy. The reason for this, of course, is simply that the Western Powers feel no sympathy, or (to put it more correctly) cherish hostile feelings towards the new social system in East Germany; but this has no connexion with the problem of self-determination.

240. As Adenauer sees it, self-determination means the absorption of the German Democratic Republic by the Federal Republic of Germany and the removal of the social structure built up in the German Democratic Republic. That is the view of the problem taken by those who subscribe to Adenauer's fallacious theories. The Foreign Minister of Ecuador made it quite clear to us that self-determination for Germans in the German Democratic Republic is to be interpreted as a change in "the special status in the Eastern zone"—in other words, the liquidation of the socialist system in Eastern Germany.

241. Like all the peoples of Europe, the Ukrainian people well know, from their own experience, the meaning attached by the German imperialists to the term "self-determination". The Germans had self-determination in regard to the composition of their

State on the eve of both world wars. Nevertheless Germany started those world wars, and in each of them aggression and the conquest of "Lebensraum", as well as the notorious "Drang nach Osten", were presented as "self-determination of the German nation". Today people in Bonn talk of the "self-determination" of the German Democratic Republic; but tomorrow, as the experience of history shows, there will emerge a threat to the national sovereignty of Austria, Switzerland, Italy and other countries where a German-speaking population has "determined itself" outside the frontiers of Federal Germany.

242. The essence of the German problem, therefore, is to guarantee lasting peace in Europe—to prevent the German militarists from plunging the world, under any pretext whatsoever, into the gulf of a new nuclear war of extermination. This is what the Soviet Union and all our socialist countries call upon the Western Powers to do. In the words of the Head of the Soviet Government, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev:

"We want to clear away the remnants of the Second World War, to cleanse the atmosphere in Europe and so throughout the world, in order that all peoples of the world may breathe clean air, that countries may live as good neighbours, establishing relations of peace with each other, and that the peoples may live free from the fear of war."

243. Unfavourable critics of the Soviet draft peace treaty describe it as "fatal to peace", as I have already said; but, strangely enough, they themselves put forward no proposals of their own for a peace settlement with Germany. The Ukrainian delegation cannot but view the attitude of the Western Powers as one of deliberately maintaining a dangerous situation in Europe, an attitude that is alien to the interests of peace.

244. The Soviet proposals on the German problem are calculated to ensure the existence of the two German States and, not to put it too highly, the peaceful co-existence of States with different social and political systems in Europe and throughout the world. It is no mere chance that the opponents of a peace settlement with Germany are, at the same time, the opponents of the ideas and principles of peaceful co-existence and of their translation into practice.

245. Chancellor Adenauer, for instance, calls peaceful co-existence an illusion and is even worried because the idea has been "too widely disseminated". Certain other political leaders in NATO countries, attacking the principles of peaceful co-existence, refer to it irritably as "the most sterile and negative conception of international life". These are the words used by the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom.

246. What was it he did not like about peaceful co-existence? According to him, one-third of the world—and here he apparently means the socialist countries—was devoting itself to destroying the way of life of the other two-thirds—meaning, apparently, the capitalist countries. He affirmed that he had "invented" (to use his own words) this piece of nonsense but had found it in the Declaration of a Congress of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties held at Moscow. He did not, however, quote this Declaration; he did not, that is, give the reference on which he based on conclusions. And this is no mere coincidence, for in fact there is nothing even remotely similar in the Declaration. As regards the aims of the socialist countries, the Congress of Representatives of Com-

munist and Workers' Parties, in its appeal to the peoples of the world, defined those aims in the following terms:

"The goal of each socialist country individually, and of the socialist community as a whole, is to ensure a lasting peace for all peoples. Socialism has no need of war. The historic struggle between the old and the new system, between socialism and capitalism, must be settled not by world war but by peaceful competition—competition to determine which social system achieves the higher level in the economic, technological and cultural fields and ensures the best living conditions for the people at large."

247. From this there is only one, and possibly even quite a small, moral to be drawn: if you wish to avoid finding yourself in an embarrassing situation, you should treat important documents, and quote and interpret them, with a sense of responsibility.

248. The reluctance of the NATO States to base their relations with other countries on the principle of peaceful co-existence continues to exert a negative influence on United Nations activities also. The Western Powers, with the United States at their head, are trying to turn this Organization into a tool of their own foreign policy.

249. In so doing, they sometimes reach a point of such absurdity that policy becomes no more than petty intriguing, a complete mockery of common sense. Is there, for instance, one single person, even in the governing circles of the Western countries, who believes that the Chiang Kai-shek faction represents a great Power and should sit here in the United Nations? Yet that is a fact which vividly depicts the attitude of the Western Powers, and especially the United States, to the People's Republic of China and, in point of fact, to the United Nations itself. We categorically declare that there can be no further toleration of such a violation of the United Nations Charter. The great People's Republic of China must be represented here by its lawful Government, the sole expression of the will of China's 700 million people.

250. At this session the Mongolian People's Republic, too, should be admitted to membership of the United Nations.

251. Another example of the way in which the United States defies the principles of peaceful co-existence is its aggressive policy towards revolutionary Cuba. Economic blockade, arson and subversive acts, the landing of mercenaries—such are the practical instruments of this policy. The Government of the United States must, therefore, be called upon to respect, not in words but in deeds, the will of the people.

252. For the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, as for the Governments of all the socialist countries, general and complete disarmament is an international problem which must be solved without further delay.

253. Nowadays, this problem can be described not only as an important and urgent one but also as a problem which is obviously ripe for solution. Although the last General Assembly session could not, because of the stand adopted by the West, take a positive step forward, it did show an increase in the strength and activity of those forces which favour the issue of clear and precise directives for negotiations on a treaty of general and complete disarmament.



254. Now, as the upshot of an exchange of views between the Soviet Union and the United States on disarmament problems, we have before us the "Joint statement of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations" [A/4879]. That is a small but good beginning; but this infant project may wither away, even before the first step is taken, and the structure of disarmament outlined in these joint principles may turn out to be a mirage. That is the real danger; it lies in the fact that during the discussions it was impossible to eliminate the basic difference—whether negotiations were to be about general and complete disarmament with effective control, or about control of armaments. The Soviet Union advocates the former and the United States the latter cause. The United States' insistent demand that control should guarantee not only that the agreed limitations or reductions are carried into effect, but also that the remaining armed forces and armaments would never at any stage exceed the agreed levels, left an unfavourable impression. According to the statement of the United States representative, this thesis constitutes the key factor in the position of the United States. But in this demand we discern only one thing—that control of armaments is still the key element in the position of the United States.

255. Our delegation is making a study of the new American disarmament programme [A/4891] which the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, has tabled for consideration at this session. We would like, for the present, to make a few preliminary comments. To begin with, may I refer to The New York Times of 1 October. This paper wrote, with reference to the new United States programme, that its novelty resided mainly in its terminology—in other respects this plan calls for more or less the same approach as that called for by previous Western disarmament proposals—many people in this hall know very well that that approach was basically wrong, for it meant control without disarmament, control before disarmament, control over armaments. It is quite understandable that such an approach could not contribute to an agreement on general and complete disarmament. You can control armaments as much as you like without thereby lessening, in the slightest degree, the threat of war; on the contrary, that threat will even grow since control of armaments, control without disarmament, will become espionage, a weapon for intelligence activities, and merely play into the hands of those contemplating and making ready for aggression.

256. We have also noticed that no dates are set, in the programme, for the execution of the various measures. It might be that the first stage (where it talks, in particular, of reducing the armed forces of the USSR and the United States to 2.1 million men, and mentions other obviously not very important measures) would be protracted for an indefinitely long period and then nothing more would happen. In the meantime we, once we have agreed to these extremely limited and, to be quite frank, illusory measures of the first stage, are invited to accept the principle of control over the remaining armaments and armed forces. In other words, we are, figuratively speaking, offered 5 per cent disarmament with 100 per cent control. Yet in the agreed principles it is stated that "the nature and extent of such control depend... on the requirements for verification of the disarmament measures being carried out in each stage"; in other words, the scope of control should be in strict conformity with

the character of the disarmament measures executed. But the very first stage of the United States programme shows that, in it, this very important and agreed principle is not taken into account.

257. Or, let us look at another agreed principle: that all disarmament measures should be balanced "so that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty could any State or group of States gain military advantage and that security is ensured equally for all". Is this provided for in the new United States programme? We are convinced that it is not. On the contrary, the programme in fact provides for unilateral military advantages for the United States. What other interpretation can be placed on the fact that the ban on the sending into orbit, or the placing in space, of weapons of mass destruction is included in the first stage, and the abolition of military bases in the second?

258. Moreover, the question of liquidating intercontinental ballistic missiles and cosmic rockets, and establishing control over them, cannot be considered apart from the question of liquidating military bases on foreign territories. It is quite understandable that, if States came to an agreement on liquidating the means of delivering atomic weapons but some of them objected to liquidating their bases on foreign territories, suspicion might be engendered that they really had no intention of fulfilling their obligations concerning destruction of the means of delivery and were expecting to abstract those means from control in order to use them for aggressive ends.

259. All this cannot but serve to make us alive to the fact that, in agreeing to disarmament principles, the United States is trying to interpret these provisions so as to give them a content alien to genuine disarmament.

260. The aggressive policy of the Western Powers, which has recently received unprecedented strengthening, placed the USSR and the other socialist countries before an inescapable choice. It was a harsh choice, but the only possible one. The Soviet people endorsed the step taken by our Government. There was only one thing to do: to take all the necessary steps to be fully prepared, militarily, to render an aggressor impotent if he tried to engage in an attack. One such measure is the decision, which has been taken, to carry out experimental explosions of nuclear weapons. The resumption of nuclear weapon tests was a necessary step, if the world was not to fall a victim to war.

261. The bitter experience of history teaches us that mere pacifist appeals for peace have never halted the aggressors. The socialist countries consider it their sacred duty to point out, not only that we are wholeheartedly striving for peace, but that we are ready to defend it with all our might. And the strengthening of this might is in the interests not only of the peoples of the socialist community but of all those who have the cause of peace at heart.

262. The measures taken by the socialist countries as a riposte to the aggressive threats of the United States, the United Kingdom and France help us to feel confident that the militarists will not utterly lose their common sense but will come to a halt, since they will be faced with the probability of nuclear destruction—for a grave is not the life aim even of inveterate atomic enthusiasts.

263. We would like to hope that the anxiety about the resumption of tests, which has been voiced here by a number of speakers, will be converted into a useful



propellent force aimed at achieving agreement on general and complete disarmament. In present circumstances, the proposal to solve the problem of the suspension of nuclear tests on the basis of complete and general disarmament is the only correct and realistic one.

264. The resolution, adopted at the fifteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly, containing the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [A/1514 (XV)] was an expression of the demand of all mankind that an end be put to the most shameful phenomenon of our time—colonialism—in all its forms and manifestations. That decision was evidence of the desire of an absolute majority of countries that the United Nations should move with the times and help the peoples in their struggle against the colonial slavery setup by the imperialist Powers.

265. The powerful wave of national-liberation revolutions is sweeping the colonial system away. After the Second World War, the peoples of more than fifty countries gained national independence. The year 1960 was rightly called the "year of Africa". In the course of it, the number of independent African States more than doubled. Recently, the former British colony of Sierra Leone entered the family of that continent's liberated States. On behalf of the Ukrainian Government, I congratulate the people of Sierra Leone on the creation of its own independent State and its entry into the United Nations.

266. Nevertheless, colonialism in its "classical form" still exists on territory more than twice as large as that of the United States. Fifty million Africans, 10 million people in Asia, 7 million people on the American continent and more than 3 million inhabitants of Oceania await the hour when the last colonial shackles will fall.

267. Events since the fifteenth session of the General Assembly have shown that the bloc of the Western Powers is doing everything possible to prolong the life of stricken colonialism. France continues, as before, the war of extermination against the heroic Algerian people. Encouraged by the moral and material backing of their NATO allies, the Portuguese colonizers have organized orgies of bloodshed in Angola. British bombs are raining down on the heads of the inhabitants of Oman and Hadramaut. Reprisals continue to be taken against the fighters for freedom and independence in the Belgian Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, in Mozambique, in South West Africa, in Uganda and in other colonial possessions. The local government in the Federation of Rhodesia is following a policy of completely transforming the country into a State of white colonizers on the model of South Africa.

268. What is the conclusion to be drawn from the intensifying of military preparations and the strengthening and expansion of the military bases of the colonial Powers in Africa and Asia, where more than half the armed forces of France and the United Kingdom, as well as United States troops, are now stationed? It hardly means that they are preparing in this way to help the peoples of these continents to attain and consolidate their national independence! The artificial accentuation of international tension, in addition to justifying the arms race in the eyes of the world, makes it easier for the colonial Powers to delay the disintegration of the colonial system and the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. The

capitalist monopolies still hope that, as before, they will be able to exploit the wealth and toil of the peoples of the countries which are being liberated from foreign domination.

269. The real reason for the still unfinished tragedy of the Congo lies precisely in the efforts being made to preserve the sources of the big foreign monopolies' wealth and to safeguard their privileges. The Belgian and other foreign colonizers have now concentrated their efforts in Katanga and are trying, with the help of their mercenary and hanger-on Tshombé, to grab from the Congolese people that very rich storehouse of Africa.

270. In West Irian, the Netherlands is trying to achieve the same objective though in another way, as eloquently described from this rostrum by the Indonesian Minister for Foreign Affairs. Under the plausible pretext of "self-determination", it is preparing to snatch from Indonesia an original, integral part of Indonesian territory. Nevertheless, whatever kind of oxygen masks may be used for prolonging the life of the colonial world, nothing will avail to avert its inevitable collapse.

271. The Ukrainian Government regards it as one of the most important tasks of the United Nations to secure the immediate implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. We are confident that, when it discusses the situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration—a question placed on the agenda of the present session at the proposal of the Soviet Union delegation—the General Assembly will work out and approve the measures required to help the peoples put a speedy and final end to the colonial order of things.

272. The world is full of alarms, anxieties, exciting achievements and projects. When the time comes to compute the results of the stormy year of 1961, mankind will note that its progressive development has been raised a step higher and that its horizons for the future have broadened.

273. The different peoples of the world have one very lofty aim in common—the maintenance of peace. The extremely bitter struggle that reactionary and aggressive forces are waging against peace, against freedom and independence, is a reminder that the struggling peoples have one common enemy: imperialism and colonialism.

274. Most of the people on earth are directly interested in peace. That is why, in the Assembly, every means must be used to paralyse aggressive movements in those countries where monopolies are closely associated with war industry and for which the arms race is nothing but an enormous and continuing business deal.

275. The international situation is heated and fraught with dangers. But peace can, and must, be preserved—if all those on whom the fate of the world depends will display common sense and an understanding of their responsibility to mankind, to those who are alive today and will be alive tomorrow.

276. As Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev has said, the Soviet Government has been doing, and will do, everything possible to ensure that the Soviet people and the peoples of all countries emerge from this difficult time without war.

277. The purpose of man's life is not war and ruin, but peace and construction. The socialist republics of the Soviet Union, following the new programme drafted by the Communist Party, will erect the mighty structure of communism—a society of freedom and equality, of peace and labour. The Ukrainian people is one of the builders of this society of brotherhood and true friendship between nations and peoples. Its flowing energy is directed towards creative construction, towards peace, the greatest blessing in the world and in life.

278. Today the Ukraine is in the economic sense one of the most highly developed countries. I would like to give you just a few figures. By the end of 1961, the first year of the twenty-year development plan of the Soviet Union, the metallurgical industry of the Ukraine will produce 28 million tons of steel and 26 million tons of pig iron, while the pits and mines will have an output of 170 million tons of coal and 64 million tons of iron ore. Our industry manufactures almost all types of modern machinery. We have gathered in a very fine harvest from our fields.

279. That is the fundamental basis from which we shall embark on implementing the twenty-year plan for laying the foundations of a communist society in which every man will labour according to his abilities and receive according to his needs.

280. That is a programme holding out—I would say embracing—prospects. For instance, by 1980 the Ukraine will be producing 75 million tons of steel, 62 million tons of pig iron and 60.5 million tons of rolling mill products; it will have an output of 160 million tons of iron ore and 290 million tons of coal. The volume of industrial production will increase six-fold, and the output of the machine industry thirteen-fold. The grain crop will be 2.5 times, meat production 3.6 times and milk production 2.7 times greater.

281. Of course, figures are a little boring, but these particular ones are as music to our ears and reflect the majestic rhythm of our progress towards the building of a communist society.

282. We are firmly convinced that, shoulder to shoulder with the other peoples of the Soviet Union, we shall succeed in coping with all the tasks we have set ourselves. As the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, N. V. Podgorny, said at the twelfth congress of the Party:

"We are proud of the fact that our successes go to swell the single mighty current of the great victories of the entire Soviet people in the building of communism, that they add to the glory and power of the whole socialist camp...."

*Mr. Slim (Tunisia) resumed the Chair.*

283. The programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is not only a great document of work for the happiness of man; it is also a manifesto for peace. It solemnly proclaims that "... the Communist Party of the Soviet Union regards it as the main aim of its foreign policy to guarantee peaceful conditions for the construction of a communist society in the USSR and the development of a world system of socialism and, together with all the peaceful peoples, to free mankind from a world war of extermination".

284. Work produces all that is needed for human life. Peace preserves all the wealth created by man, and mankind itself, from the conflagration of war. We call upon all countries and peoples to unite their ef-

forts in the struggle for peace, the struggle for our happy future.

285. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I give the floor to the representative of the Netherlands, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

286. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands): I thank the President for having given me the opportunity of saying just a few words in reply to the remarks made by the Foreign Minister of Indonesia this afternoon. My observations will be very brief not only because of the lateness of the hour, but also because at this stage we, the Netherlands, have done no more than announce certain plans of the Netherlands Government for New Guinea in the general debate [1016th meeting] and a full discussion of those proposals should, in our opinion, wait until the draft resolution [A/L.354] which my delegation has just submitted will be dealt with by the Assembly under the proper item on its agenda.

287. Mr. Subandrio has said a number of unwarranted and unpleasant things about my country and my people. I shall not follow him on the path of controversy, even though his Government has gone so far as to organize and cause to be carried out a number of armed infiltrations into New Guinea. In due course we shall answer the many erroneous statements that have been made this afternoon. What I wish to say at this moment is that my delegation regrets that Indonesia has so quickly and without further study adopted a negative attitude with regard to our plans which, by the way—and I say this in connexion with the remark made by the Foreign Minister of Indonesia—had the full support of 97 per cent of the members of our Parliament, including the opposition.

288. For our part, we had scrupulously avoided introducing any controversial matters in our statement, and our Foreign Minister had merely mentioned the fact that Indonesia maintains a territorial claim to the Territory. In regard to that claim all that needs to be said at present is that the Netherlands has many times offered to submit Indonesia's thesis that Netherlands New Guinea is an integral part of Indonesia to the International Court of Justice—and that offer still stands.

289. Even from the Indonesian point of view, we fail to see what objection Indonesia can have to our plans. As was explained in the Netherlands speech in the general debate, our plans contain just four points.

290. The first point is that the Netherlands is willing to relinquish its sovereignty over Netherlands New Guinea to the people of that territory. To that Indonesia cannot possibly object, nor does it, as Mr. Subandrio said this afternoon.

291. The second point is that in the transitional period, that is, so long as the population is not yet able itself to exercise all the attributes of sovereignty, the United Nations should set up an international development authority which would assume the necessary powers in order to assist the population in its development. Certainly Indonesia could but welcome a development under which the administration of the Territory could be taken over from the Netherlands by the United Nations. And indeed, if I did understand Mr. Subandrio rightly this afternoon, Indonesia would raise no objection to the establishment of such a United Nations authority.

292. The third point, which Mr. Subandrio did not find worth mentioning even, is that the Netherlands

offers to continue to contribute to the development of Netherlands New Guinea at the rate of \$30 million per annum. Can anyone object to that?

293. Finally, the last point is that the people of Netherlands New Guinea should be granted the right of self-determination.

294. I know that this is really the only principle which is not palatable to Indonesia. Mr. Sastroamidjojo stated the other day [1016th meeting, para. 246], and Mr. Subandrio repeated this afternoon, that the right of self-determination was already exercised in 1945 when Indonesia declared itself independent. Now I would remind my colleagues here that in 1945 Indonesia was occupied by Japan and had been so occupied for three years, the whole duration of the war, whereas the greater part of Netherlands New Guinea had remained free and was under Allied administration. All during the occupation there had been no communication whatsoever between Netherlands New Guinea and Indonesia. The Papuan people were never consulted about the declaration; and when Indonesia now says that the people of Netherlands New Guinea exercised their right of self-determination in 1945 what it really means is that Indonesia did it for them without having received any mandate to do so—and I for one do not believe that anyone will consider that a *bona fide* exercise of this fundamental right under the Charter. Hence it is perhaps not surprising that Mr. Subandrio spoke this afternoon of "the fairy-tale of self-determination".

295. If the Indonesian conviction that the people of Netherlands New Guinea consider themselves part of Indonesia is correct, then that will be clearly shown in due time when a plebiscite is to be held by the United Nations. If the Indonesian thesis is sincerely held, then again Indonesia should welcome this means of proving to the world that its estimate was correct. We have said this many times, and I now repeat it:

if the Papuan population declares in a free plebiscite that it wishes to join Indonesia, the Netherlands will raise no objection whatsoever and will abide by that decision. Therefore it is incorrect to say, as did Mr. Subandrio this afternoon, that our plans have necessarily an anti-Indonesian spirit.

296. Instead of self-determination, the Foreign Minister of Indonesia has this afternoon recommended what he calls "full responsibility for the local autonomy of New Guinea within Indonesia". When he made that recommendation I was irresistibly reminded of the story of the cook who gave the chicken a free choice as to whether it wished to be eaten with a thick sauce or with a thin sauce; he did not leave it free to say that it would prefer not to be eaten at all. If the Papuan people are to be told that they must be incorporated into Indonesia and that they can choose only what amount of autonomy they would like to have within that State, that means that the most important choice is to be withheld from them. It has been argued over and over again in the Assembly by many delegations that any decision of a territory to be incorporated into another State must be taken after independence has been attained, and that any hand-over of a Non-Self-Governing Territory by the administering Power to another State is not permissible and is contrary to the letter and the spirit of the Charter.

297. May I end by appealing to the representatives of Indonesia to reconsider this matter and to think over what I have just said. Our proposals, which are entirely in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations, ought not really to be unacceptable to Indonesia. And the true interests of the Papuan people of New Guinea would be greatly served if this matter could be dealt with without acrimony.

*The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.*