

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1055th
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 15 November 1961,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

<i>Agenda items 88 and 22:</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>The situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (continued)</i>	649
<i>Assistance to Africa (continued):</i>	
<i>(a) A United Nations programme for independence</i>	

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEMS 88 AND 22

The situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (continued).

Assistance to Africa (continued):

(a) A United Nations Programme for independence

1. Mr. PLIMSOLL (Australia): This debate provides a useful occasion for the General Assembly to review the problems and prospects in an important area of international and human relations. The General Assembly, from its outset, has very naturally and very properly devoted a great deal of its attention to the ending of colonialism all over the world. And in taking part in this debate today, I come before you quite frankly and without apologies as the representative of one of the Administering Powers, of a country which has the responsibility of administering two Trust Territories—Nauru and New Guinea—and a Non-Self-Governing Territory—Papua, which is south of the Trust Territory in New Guinea.

2. Australia has always recognized the legitimate interest and role of the United Nations in the aspirations and problems of dependent peoples. Australia has never felt that the United Nations was something that was imposed upon us in this field against our will. On the contrary, Australia played a major part at the San Francisco Conference in inserting in the Charter of the United Nations effective provisions on Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories. At San Francisco, it was Australia and New Zealand, and the Latin American countries, which bore a large part of the effort to make the role of the international community and, specifically, the role of this Organization, effective in ending the old colonial system. Last night [1054th meeting], the representative of Colombia made some remarks in this debate, outlining some of the historical considerations, some of the theoretical, emotional and legal concepts, that went into the working out of the Charter of the United Nations in this particular area of international concern. Moreover, Australia has always co-operated with the United

Nations in discharging our international obligations and responsibilities in this field.

3. The Charter of the United Nations is the basic document. The Charter of the United Nations is the document that defines the responsibilities of Administering Powers, defines the rights of the people of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, and defines also the responsibilities of this international Organization. As a consequence, Australia has a treaty obligation to the people of New Guinea. As Members of the United Nations, we have our international obligations to our fellow-Members, but we have also very clear obligations to the people of New Guinea themselves. They are obligations which we have tried to fulfil, and obligations which we are determined to fulfil. In pursuance of these obligations—gladly accepted obligations which we ourselves played a part in writing into the Charter—we have, for example, regularly since the United Nations began, submitted information on the various aspects of our administration, including, from the outset, information on political advancement. We have had, for example, visiting missions regularly to the Trust Territory in New Guinea and to the Trust Territory of Nauru—visiting missions that have had access to all the information they wanted, that had opportunities to talk to the indigenous inhabitants of the Territories, who have visited our national capital in Australia so that they could speak, not only as they have in the Territory, to the people on the spot, but to the Ministers who are responsible for Government policy and to the civil servants in Australia who are responsible for carrying out that policy.

4. There has been a regular accounting to the United Nations on our part of the way in which we are discharging our obligations under the Charter. This is done partly by submitting annual reports on our Territories, answering questionnaires and other inquiries on specific matters, appearing in the Fourth Committee and before the Trusteeship Council, answering questions, expounding our policy, considering recommendations and statements made by other Governments. We have regarded our role in this field as being something that should be discharged in both directions. We have tried to give an account to the United Nations of what we are doing, and we have tried, in reverse, to take account of what Governments and United Nations organs have expressed to us as being their views. The role of the General Assembly in this field is difficult and delicate. It is to promote the development of the remaining colonies without, for example, the kind of disorder that occurred in the Congo.

5. This requires realism and co-operation with the Administering Authorities on the part of the United Nations; and it also requires an honest effort by the administering Powers to give effect to the principle of self-determination. As I have said, this is a two-way co-operation. Something is needed—a great deal is needed—from the administering Power. Something is needed and expected from the United Nations.

6. The General Assembly must also recognize that colonialism varies in its effects and potentialities, with the policies and attitudes of the different colonial Powers and with the different Territories. As President Senghor of Senegal said when he addressed the Assembly recently [1054th meeting] all the colonial Powers are not in the same boat. This question cannot be approached on the assumption that all colonial Powers are following the same policy. And when I say that, I am not considering only the general question of whether Powers are making an honest and vigorous attempt to cope with the problems of their Territories; I am thinking also of the fact that because of the nature of the Territories—the differing nature of the Territories—different Administering Authorities have different sorts of problems to contend with, and different policies are appropriate in the different cases.

7. We have had, so far in this debate, two speeches—one by the representative of Ceylon, who spoke early in our debate on this subject [1048th meeting] and another by the Foreign Minister of Nigeria [1047th meeting] who presented a clear picture of the way in which different problems are presented by different Territories. For example, Territories vary so much in size and therefore present so many different problems. Australia, for example, has on the one hand Nauru, which is an island with a population of 2,000—fewer people than there are in this hall at the moment—and on the other hand, New Guinea, which has a population of 1,800,000. No one could say that the way in which those Territories develop or the eventual political outcome when they gain independence or self-government, or whatever is appropriate and chosen when they exercise self-determination, is to be the same for both Territories. The representative of Ceylon pointed out that there are many territories in many parts of the world which, because of either their smallness or some other factors, it is difficult to conceive of as completely independent, separate entities in the same way as much larger territories.

8. So size is one factor and past history is another. Some colonies, before they fell under their present control, were countries with long history, countries with complex and highly developed societies, countries perhaps with a strong sense of national entity, countries that perhaps had been flourishing, important, independent national States. Others perhaps never existed as national States and never had a sense of national consciousness. New Guinea is one of those. I shall return to that point in a few minutes.

9. Our colleague from Liberia, Mr. Dosumu Johnson, last night [1054th meeting] made some very interesting remarks about the state of some of the regions in Africa before they came under colonial control; and that is a state of affairs, a record of past history, that clearly does and must play a part in the political evolution and development of those African regions. That sort of history has not existed in all parts of the world. In our approach to colonial questions we have to take account of the fact that history varies from continent to continent and it may vary from area to area within a single continent.

10. Another factor which dictates that we should approach different colonies in different ways is the degree of homogeneity. Some areas have a homogeneous population; on the whole, they are the areas that can easily be brought into being as a single national State. Others consist of widely varying peoples, widely varying perhaps in their tribal or

racial composition or in their cultural outlook—and though it is by no means impossible to evolve a national State where you have great variety, it does present considerable difficulties unless there is some strong historical background that brings them quickly and easily together.

11. Then again, of course, the economic resources and the economic and other development of a country are factors that one must take into account when considering the appropriate policy and the appropriate rate of development of any country—not only a colonial country.

12. I submit that the conclusion from all this is that the United Nations cannot fix a single plan or date which would be practical and realistic, for all Territories. This, in fact, is one of the points made by the Foreign Minister of Nigeria, in his statement to this Assembly; a very sound approach, I think. We have a diversity of Territories and we must have a diversity of policies and their application, although the guiding principle, the principle of self-determination and adherence to the Charter, must apply to all of them.

13. With those remarks about colonial policy in general, I should like to turn now to the Australian Territory of New Guinea. This, as I have said, is the major Territory for whose administration Australia is responsible. We have a special interest in New Guinea. New Guinea, to us, is not a remote far-away country in which we are interested for some reason of economic or political aggrandizement; on the contrary, it is an island just next door to us, literally next door to us. The friendship and good will of the people of New Guinea are important to Australia; the prosperity and stability of New Guinea are important to Australia. If the people of New Guinea become independent—and they are moving, in accordance with our policy and the policy of the United Nations, towards self-determination—it is important that their independence be based upon their prosperity and stability. It is important to them—and it is important to all of us, I think—that it be based upon friendship and good will towards all their neighbours.

14. New Guinea is a country whose development, both politically and economically, has presented tremendous difficulties, physical difficulties. New Guinea was cut off from the rest of mankind for centuries. It was not, like colonies in many other parts of the world, an area in constant contact in some form with other peoples. For example, the Arabs who penetrated so much of Asia and the Pacific, right up to Indonesia and the Philippines, and further north, and brought great cultural and other contacts to the region, did not get into New Guinea. Until quite recently, New Guinea was completely cut off from contacts with the rest of mankind. It did not form even large groups of tribes in the same way as, for example, some of the people did about whom Mr. Dosumu Johnson of Liberia spoke last night. It consisted of a large number of very small tribes, whose only contact with one another was normally in warfare.

15. Although today it has a population of 1,800,000—which is more than it has ever had—it has four to five hundred languages; and you might have three tribes in a single small valley unable to talk to each other. But there has not been a sense of national existence; they were not aware of the concept of an island; they were not aware of the fact that there was this large area of people of roughly similar cultural background. This is a national consciousness which is emerging,

for which Australia is providing the conditions suitable for it to emerge; but it did not exist before. The establishment of an Australian administration of New Guinea did not mean that a flourishing indigenous State or group of cultures or political entities was being suppressed by an outside authority. It is the outside authority which has helped to foster the very conception of a nation and of a State. There has been this lack of traditions, of social and political unity beyond the family or tribal loyalties.

16. I have stated in this Assembly on a previous occasion some of the difficulties that have existed in the past in opening up the Territory physically. We can do things today—by "we" I mean mankind as a whole—that were not possible thirty years ago, twenty years ago, even ten years ago: aircraft, bulldozers, all the heavy equipment and so on that we are tending to take for granted now in development programmes, just did not exist. Australia in New Guinea really pioneered things for the whole world in the use of aircraft for the opening up of new territories. A whole town was built up in the highlands of New Guinea, using aircraft to bring up heavy machinery and the equipment for building houses. This was thirty years ago at a time when the use of aircraft for heavy transport was quite a new conception and presented very grave problems.

17. Then again, the conquest of malaria is something that has made it possible to develop a Territory that previously was very hard to open. There again Australia has played a very big part: Australia and Australians, in the conquest of malaria and in the devising of various ways of bringing malaria under control partly in the development of drugs, partly in the working out of techniques for draining swamps and lakes. This is part of a world-wide movement. We must accept the fact that a lot of things that we can do today, not only in New Guinea but in all countries of the world, just could not have been done even a few years ago, because man's development of knowledge and his development of techniques and his building up of capital equipment, etc., have made many things possible that were once not possible.

18. We believe that Australia is moving ahead steadily in New Guinea. We are conscious of our own responsibilities there; we are conscious of the needs and aspirations of the people; and we are conscious of the views and opinions of the international community. Our policies, our intentions, our courses, are expounded regularly in the various United Nations bodies: the Trusteeship Council, the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, the Fourth Committee and various *ad hoc* bodies. We have submitted our record to regular scrutiny and for that reason I am not going to go into it in detail on this occasion. I am not going to read out figures for the increase of expenditure in various sectors of the economy—the training of teachers, development of so many things that will help make a modern State—because these things are set out by us in these other bodies. We have, for example, only recently made important advances in the building up of a magisterial system giving scope to the indigenous people. We have made big steps in the last two years in political devolution and in increasing the number and proportion of indigenous inhabitants in the civil service.

19. We are conscious that much needs to be done. But that is not out of lack of desire on our part. It is

because of the immensity of the task that exists in New Guinea, a country of tremendously difficult terrain, a country where movement from place to place was almost impossible a few years ago and is still very difficult.

20. The expenditure by the Australian Government in grant to the Territory amounts to \$38 million this year; that is quite apart from any governmental expenditure that is met out of revenue in the Territory itself. That is a considerable sum of money—it is the sum in excess of any revenue which might be produced in the Territory or for Australia. That, I think, is some evidence that we do not regard New Guinea as a Territory for exploitation. We do, as I have said, regard it essentially as a country which is a neighbour of ours and a country whose welfare and development will contribute to peace, good relations and security in the region of the world of which we are a part.

21. The choice of a political future cannot take place in a vacuum. It must be related to economic, social and educational development. As the resolution [1514 (XV)] adopted last year by this Assembly says, inadequate preparation is not a pretext for delaying independence. But it is, I submit, something that requires us to bring caution and realism to our approach. The consequences of hasty and ill-formed judgements may be disastrous for the people concerned, and we cannot allow their future to be fixed by attitudes based largely on emotion or on political expediency or on false or misleading analogies.

22. I have set out our record in the Australian Territory of New Guinea. We are proud of our approach. We cannot abandon or disregard our responsibilities and we look to the United Nations for constructive criticism and for understanding; and we shall in future, as we have in the past, co-operate with the United Nations in discharging our responsibilities under the Charter.

23. I have spoken about Australian New Guinea. That occupies the eastern half of the island. New Guinea, of course, is an enormous island. It is the third largest island in the world, after Australia and Greenland. On the Australian side there are 1,800,000 people. The other half is administered by the Netherlands and has about 700,000 people.

24. Therefore, the question of West New Guinea, which has been brought before the General Assembly at this session by the Netherlands Government in its draft resolution [A/C.354] under item 88, is one which has been of particular interest to the Australian Government in recent years. I pointed out earlier in my statement that the island of New Guinea is close to Australia and we have all the interests that go with any country that is close to and is a neighbour of another. Of course, Netherlands New Guinea is side by side with the Australian Territory. Therefore we must be deeply concerned on this question brought before the Assembly by the Government of the Netherlands. Moreover, the question has involved two close friends of Australia—the Netherlands and Indonesia. But it is also of interest to the Members of the United Nations generally because it raises important principles of the Charter and the role of the United Nations in promoting the welfare and development of the people of dependent territories.

25. It has always been our hope, in Australia, that the principal parties would find a solution for this problem consistent with the principles of the Charter,

but in the past such a solution has not been possible because of the basic difference in approach between the Netherlands and Indonesia. It would have been normal, and thoroughly in accordance with the provisions and spirit of the Charter, that a dispute as to sovereignty over a territory should be referred to the International Court of Justice. Indeed, the Netherlands have throughout been prepared to do this, and this willingness has further confirmed the Australian conviction that the Netherlands had, and have, the law on their side. However, as we know, Indonesia was not prepared to submit to the Court, arguing that this was not a legal but a political question.

26. Until now, efforts to find the possible basis for a political solution have been unsuccessful. It is always most difficult for progress to be made towards a settlement with respect to territory when two States claim right of sovereignty. This was not a situation which could be resolved by simple recommendation of the Assembly, nor could it be resolved by bilateral negotiations, particularly when one of the two principal parties had broken off diplomatic relations with the other.

27. What has been missing in the past has been agreement on the fundamental principles which should apply. If a settlement based on legal principles was not acceptable, then a political approach had to be tried. Such an approach must accord with the Charter, and must therefore recognize that the interests of the inhabitants of the Territory are paramount, but that only the people themselves have the right to determine their own future, and that any settlement must take full account of the need to promote their welfare and develop the Territory. In the view of the Australian Government, the Netherlands proposal have drawn from the United Nations Charter principles which provide an excellent basis for the settlement of the West New Guinea problem. They also are fully in accordance with the principles of resolution 1514 (XV), which neither varies nor replaces the Charter, but states objectives which we can all applaud—even though some of us may have reservations about specific recommendations.

28. As we see them, the Netherlands proposals offer a practical path between the strongly conflicting viewpoints of the Netherlands and of our good friend and neighbour, Indonesia. This seems to us a major advance and we welcome it as a constructive, forward-looking and peaceful proposal.

29. Let us have a look at what the Netherlands is putting forward. In the first place, the Netherlands offers to surrender its sovereignty in favour of the inhabitants of West New Guinea themselves. This is a generous offer by a State whose legal assertion of sovereignty has not been legally tested.

30. Secondly, the Netherlands proposals emphasize the paramount importance of respect for the principle of self-determination, as recognized in the United Nations Charter. Australia has consistently made clear its view that it is of the greatest importance that the indigenous Papuan inhabitants of this territory—and they, after all, are the first principal party—be given an opportunity to decide their own future and their own status. I might refer, in this connexion, to the remarks made on the opening day of this debate, 7 November, by the representative of Ceylon. He referred to territories to whose sovereignty claims had been laid by various United Nations Members, and he mentioned West New Guinea. He said:

"The Assembly should have the opportunity of considering the legitimacy of the claims of certain Members and, if necessary of confronting them with the wishes of the people." [1048th meeting para. 124.]

Now the proposal made by the Netherlands would, we believe, accord with that general statement made by the representative of Ceylon.

31. The proposal made by the Netherlands is to confront national claims to sovereignty with the wishes of the people. The application of the principle of self-determination, which Australia firmly supports in all questions of colonial development, would provide an opportunity for the inhabitants of West New Guinea to choose their own future. The choices open would include the right to opt either for independence or for some form of free association with their neighbours or, indeed, for complete political integration with Indonesia, should this be their desire.

32. Again, the Dutch proposal would open the way for the direct association of the United Nations with the development of the Territory of West New Guinea and the final preparation of the people for self-determination. The generous offer of the Netherlands Government to continue its financial aid to the inhabitants of the Territory would be supplemented by the resources of the world community. The Australian Government, for its part, has reason to know the cost in manpower as well as in money of the development of New Guinea. The problems of preparing for self-determination in this undeveloped Territory, with its forbidding terrain and limited material resources, are at least as formidable as those in the Congo. The establishment of an international development authority, should this be the recommendation of the investigating commission, would enable us to avoid the errors and tragedies of the Congo and to lay the firmest and soundest basis for self-determination.

33. I might refer, in this connexion, to resolution 1541 (XV), adopted by the Assembly on 15 December 1960, the day after the adoption of the resolution [1514 (XV)] containing the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. This resolution has already been brought to our attention by the representative of Ceylon, and I have referred to his speech several times because it was an important speech on the opening day of this debate. It deserves careful reading, I think. We listened to it attentively, and it drew attention to many of the important aspects of this question—whether or not we all agree with some of the conclusions that were drawn.

34. Resolution 1541 (XV) was the one which was adopted on the report of the Fourth Committee last year—a very important resolution in our consideration of many problems associated with colonialism. In it certain important principles were emphasized in relation to the attainment of self-government and independence. The resolution states, in principle VI, that:

"A Non-Self-Governing Territory can be said to have reached a full measure of self-government by:

- "(a) Emergence as a sovereign independent State;
- "(b) Free association with an independent State; or
- "(c) Integration with an independent State."

35. There is one basic point common to these and carefully spelt out in the annex to the resolution. In regard to free association with an independent State, it was said that the free association should be the result of

"... free and voluntary choice by the peoples of the territory concerned expressed through informed and democratic processes".

That is in principle VII of the annex to resolution 1541 (XV).

36. It was repeated in principle IX in regard to integration with an independent State:

"The integration should be the result of the freely expressed wishes of the territory's peoples acting with full knowledge of the change in their status, their wishes having been expressed through informed and democratic processes, impartially conducted and based on universal adult suffrage."

That is principle IX of the resolution adopted last year by the General Assembly the day after it adopted the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

37. It is the opinion of the Australian delegation, that not only should these important principles be respected in the special circumstances of West New Guinea and its people, but that respect for them constitutes the only effective basis on which the future of these people can be settled permanently and justly and peacefully. A solution which disregarded the popular will, and which was not indeed clearly and openly endorsed by the people themselves, could, and almost certainly would, lead to the perpetuation of discord in and over Western New Guinea, with disruptive consequences in the Territory and perhaps in the surrounding areas.

38. The application of these principles would open up the possibilities of free association or integration of the Territory with Indonesia, should this be the decision of the indigenous people of West New Guinea themselves. It would be the responsibility of the proposed United Nations authority to ensure that the inhabitants made their choice in complete freedom from duress, and were fully and fairly informed on all the choices open to them under self-determination. It is our view that the application of these principles and procedures would take proper account of Indonesia's interests.

39. I should like to emphasize that the Netherlands proposal does not seek to determine the end result. It leaves the way open to various possibilities—but with this important proviso: that bona fide self-determination of the people must be safeguarded.

40. The proposals set out in the Netherlands draft resolution [A/L.354] and in its explanatory memorandum [A/4915] of 9 October 1961 do not cover every detail of every future contingency. These proposals represent in a sense terms of reference for a proposed United Nations commission. The draft resolution and the explanatory memorandum offer various points for consideration, and the draft resolution in its operative part asks us to agree at this stage only to the setting up of a commission which is to investigate the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV); the political, economic, social and educational conditions in the Territory; the opinion of the people there as to their present and future; the question of a plebiscite; and the question of an international development authority.

41. A study of these questions by a United Nations commission would, I suggest be completely consistent with Charter principles and with the trend of opinion and debate in this Assembly in recent years.

42. Perhaps I should say something more about something I touched on at the beginning, and that is Australia's special position in relation to Netherlands New Guinea. As I have said, Australia can, I think, justly claim to have a particular interest in this question and in these proposals because of Australia's own special responsibility for the whole eastern part of this large island, because of Australia's concern for the present and future welfare of the Papuans inhabiting the three Territories, and because of Australia's vital interest in the peace, prosperity and stability of this particular area. As I have said, New Guinea is not a remote, far-away country so far as Australia is concerned.

43. The Australian Government is responsible, as I have said, for the administration of the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Papua and for the Trust Territory of East New Guinea. The inhabitants of all the three Territories of New Guinea are really the same people. For its part, the Australian Government, in its administration of the two Territories for which it is responsible, has identical objectives for them both, namely, to bring the people as speedily as possible to the point of self-determination, the point at which they themselves will determine their own status and future.

44. This is why the Australian Government so warmly supports the Netherlands Government with regard to the importance which it attaches to the principle of self-determination, and to its application in West New Guinea in a way consistent with the interests and wishes of the inhabitants. In the particular circumstances of West New Guinea, the Australian Government also welcomes the Netherlands proposal to associate the United Nations directly with the process of development towards self-determination in that part of New Guinea, through the institution of a development authority.

45. What I am saying now represents no new development. On 6 November 1957 the Australian and Netherlands Governments publicly defined the jointly agreed principles which both Governments were following in relation to the respective Territories in New Guinea for which they were responsible. In that statement they declared, inter alia, that the Trust Territory of New Guinea, the Territory of Papua, and Netherlands New Guinea are geographically and ethnically related and that, pending self-determination in those Territories, the two Governments would accordingly continue to pursue policies directed towards the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the peoples concerned in a manner which recognized their ethnic and geographical affinity. That was a declaration by the two Governments in November 1957.

46. With the attainment of self-determination both in West New Guinea and in Papua-New Guinea, it will be for the inhabitants of these three Territories to determine what form their respective Governments are to take and what will be their relationship to each other and to their neighbours.

47. Australian support for the present Netherlands proposal is, therefore, based on the general application of the principle of self-determination in an area which is so obviously homogeneous, geographically and ethnically. The General Assembly should not do anything at this stage which might limit the choices open to the people in determining their own future. The possibility comes to mind, and it should, we believe, be allowed to remain open, that the people of the whole island of New Guinea might, at an appropri-

ate time, decide that their future lies together. No permanent barriers should be erected now which would deprive the people of the island of the possibility of making such a choice.

48. I shall turn now to one other question that was raised in connexion with New Guinea in one of the statements made in this Assembly last week. I would say this: we greatly regret that references have been made during this debate to a possible resort to force in certain contingencies. Such references are wholly inconsistent with assurances repeatedly given in the past, at the highest level of national responsibility, that force would not be used in this issue. They are the more regrettable in that the proposals put forward by the Netherlands Government are constructive and peaceful, are based on Charter provisions and principles, are directed towards objectives defined in resolutions adopted by this Assembly, and go no further than establishing a commission to investigate and report back to this Assembly without, at this stage, prejudging the future of the Territory.

49. Whatever their intent, statements that force will or may be used if the Assembly adopts a particular course of action involve by their nature a challenge to the independence and competence of the United Nations. Such statements can, I submit, have no legitimate place in our deliberations, recommendations or decisions.

50. All Members of this Assembly, moreover, have undertaken to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. Statements looking to the use of force in the contingency I have outlined are thus in clear breach of Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter.

51. The Netherlands proposal, on the other hand, opens up possibilities of a peaceful solution in accordance with established United Nations principles and procedures.

52. As I have indicated, it is not our intention in Australia to obstruct or oppose the eventual union of West New Guinea with Indonesia, if such should be the will of the indigenous Papuan inhabitants. Nor do we seek in any way to prejudge the outcome of the issues involved. What we are supporting is the establishment of a United Nations commission to investigate certain possibilities on the clear understanding that the right of self-determination by the peoples of New Guinea themselves will be safeguarded and applied unconditionally and impartially.

53. The Australian delegation will accordingly vote in favour of the Netherlands draft resolution.

54. There are two other draft resolutions so far before us. One has been submitted by the Soviet Union [A/L.355], and it is plainly unacceptable to my delegation. The other is the draft resolution submitted by Nigeria [A/L.357], which is devoted to Africa and has been introduced and explained to us by the Foreign Minister of Nigeria. That resolution does, in some respects, cause some difficulties to my delegation, particularly some difficulties of a legal nature. But the general approach is, we believe, a constructive and forward-looking one, and taking that draft resolution with the explanation which was given to us by Mr. Wachuku, and desiring also to give effect to the purposes and intentions of resolution 1514 (XV) Australia would be in a position to vote for the Nigerian draft resolution.

55. There is also, I understand, the possibility of a further draft resolution being submitted by a number of African-Asian States. Obviously I cannot comment on that until I have seen the text of the draft resolution, but it will be approached by Australia in the spirit in which we are approaching questions in this field generally. We will approach it with understanding of the intentions of those who are introducing it. We shall, as far as we can, support anything which gives effect to the principles of the Charter and which is trying to produce as speedily as possible the right of self-determination for all peoples in the world.

56. We have already, during this session of the General Assembly, been able to welcome some new Members to our midst. Sierra Leone, for example has become a fellow-member of the Commonwealth and an independent State here, and before we adjourn Tanganyika will also come in. Very soon, if existing time-tables are held to, we shall have more new Members. I have no doubt that the whole process of the emancipation of colonies, the development of the world community will go ahead at a greater rate than perhaps some of us ever thought possible. In this general development of the world, this gradual emancipation of people, the United Nations has been able to play a key part and it will, I am sure, continue to play a good role in stimulating, in advising, in helping the Administering Powers in the Territories for which they still have responsibilities.

57. Sir Muhammad Zafrulla KHAN (Pakistan): I have asked for the floor for leave to introduce a draft resolution [A/L.365 and Add.1] as a matter of urgency and urgent importance. The draft resolution relates to a humanitarian question of great importance and great urgency. It relates to several thousand Algerian prisoners in France who are on hunger strike. This draft resolution is sponsored by thirty-four Member States, of which Pakistan has the honour to be one. I now introduce the draft resolution.

58. Mr. BERARD (France) (translated from French): The representative of Pakistan has seen fit to raise here a matter which is completely irrelevant to the item under discussion. If I understand rightly, he is asking that the present debate should be interrupted so that this question can be discussed. Such a move, manifestly inspired by propaganda motives, is justified neither by the Rules of Procedure nor by the practice of the General Assembly.

59. I shall refrain from going into the substance of the question, although it would be easy for me to enlighten the Assembly by refuting, as the French Government has already done, certain tendentious allegations which have been spread abroad in this connexion. I shall limit myself to pointing out that the manoeuvre we are witnessing is not likely to contribute to the settlement of the question. I can only hope—and I should like to stress these words—I can only hope that it will not have the effect of hindering a happy settlement of this particular question and of the more general question which is at stake.

60. The French delegation cannot, for its part, accept the proposal which has just been made. We leave the General Assembly full responsibility for any action that it may take on this proposal.

61. Mr. FEKINI (Libya) (translated from French): The extremely serious situation created by the circumstances which have led to the detention of more than 14,000 Algerian political prisoners is a grave cause of concern and anxiety to us.

62. The Algerian political prisoners—faced with the French authorities' refusal to meet their legitimate requests in accordance with humanitarian principles and established international practice—have resorted to the last means available to them, by embarking on a hunger strike which has now continued for more than two weeks. After so long a period of fasting, the state of health of these Algerian patriots, who include both men and women, gives cause for grave anxiety. Their lives are in very serious danger. In these circumstances, we regard it as the inescapable duty of the United Nations, at a time when we are discussing the situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration of the granting of independence to colonial countries and people, to take urgent action to help the Algerian prisoners, whose case calls for consideration on a strictly humanitarian basis.

63. Furthermore, this situation has already had serious international repercussions throughout the world and in France itself, especially following the publication of the parliamentary report on the treatment of the Algerian prisoners; and particularly strong feelings have been aroused among the peoples of the region to which we belong.

64. The dictates of international solidarity, humanitarian principles, and the responsibilities of Members of the United Nations, who have spoken so eloquently during the present debate on agenda item 88, require that immediate action be taken with a view of appealing to the Government of France to redress the legitimate grievances of the Algerian prisoners in recognizing their status as political prisoners, with a view to making possible the termination of this hunger strike, which is gravely threatening their existence.

65. Every hour and minute that goes by sees a serious deterioration in the state of health of these political prisoners. We appeal to the humanity of Members of the Assembly and to their sense of international responsibilities, within the general framework of this noble debate, with a view to the draft resolution [A/L.365 and Add.1] submitted today being adopted as speedily as possible. We hope most sincerely that the appeal which it contains, and the moral force of that appeal, will be heeded by France. We also hope that, by responding favourably to this appeal, the French Government will help to strengthen the cause of peace and co-operation.

66. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (translated from French): I would like to draw attention to the operative paragraph of the draft resolution [A/L.365 and Add.1] which has been submitted for the approval of the General Assembly. This paragraph reads:

"The General Assembly,

" ...

"Appeals to the Government of France, in accordance with established international practice and humanitarian principles, to redress the legitimate grievances of the Algerian prisoners in recognizing their status as political prisoners with a view of making possible the immediate termination of the hunger strike."

The urgency which has given rise to the submission of this draft resolution has been explained from this rostrum by the representatives of Pakistan and Libya. The representative of France has set forth the considerations which make him extremely anxious that this draft resolution shall not hinder the achievement of a happy settlement. I believe that the Moroccan

delegation is in a particularly favourable position to echo this sentiment expressed by the representative of France, since at this very moment a governmental delegation comprising two Ministers of State and the Minister of the Interior has been sent by his Majesty the King of Morocco to meet with General de Gaulle.

67. The news of the plight of several thousand Algerian prisoners—men, women and children, many of whom were arrested recently in circumstances contrary to the very law brought into operation against these prisoners—has provoked an outburst of popular feeling in Morocco and led to demonstrations, some of which are to be regretted. These reactions indicate the urgency of the situation resulting from the treatment meted out to the Algerian prisoners in disregard of international practice and of the law of France itself.

68. I deliberately read out the last paragraph of the draft resolution in order to make it clear that the considerations prompting us to request urgent discussion of the matter are moral and humanitarian in nature. They will perhaps make it possible for France to respond to our appeal and to make a positive gesture in a situation which for several weeks has been, not simply supplying fuel for anti-French propaganda, but jeopardizing once more France's reputation in this field. We would urge that the decision to be taken regarding the examination of this question and the adoption of the draft resolution should be considered as an appeal by the General Assembly supplementary to the appeals made by several Heads of State and several international bodies, and to the representations made to General de Gaulle by the President of Pakistan and by his Majesty the King of Morocco.

69. We are convinced that the subject-matter of this discussion is not irrelevant to the question about which we are exercised. The request that we are making to France was addressed to it indirectly in 1960 in a resolution concerning this whole problem. We are not therefore asking the Assembly to make an exception to its rules of procedure or to take a decision on a matter which is outside its competence. The drama being lived out by thousands of Algerian prisoners and the feelings provoked throughout the world by this situation demand a response from us. The General Assembly is undoubtedly the most suitable body, both to be the interpreter of these feelings and to support the representations being made, in several capitals and by several distinguished persons, to the Head of the French State.

70. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I give the floor to the representative of Pakistan, on a point of order.

71. Sir Muhammad Zafrulla KHAN (Pakistan): I beg to move that the general debate on item 88 be suspended and that the draft resolution [A/L.365 and Add.1] which I have had the honour to introduce may be brought under immediate consideration.

72. I should like to say a word or two in reply to the objections raised by the representative of France to the submission of this draft resolution. He has said, in the first place, that the draft resolution is completely irrelevant to the item under discussion. I beg to submit that the draft resolution is wholly relevant to, and is within the framework of, the item.

73. I would invite the attention of the Assembly to the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution

which refers to resolution 1514 (XV), adopted last year, on colonialism, and quotes from it:

"All ... repressive measures of all kinds ... shall cease in order to enable them"—peoples under alien domination—"to exercise ... freely their right to complete independence."

74. The representative of France also said that this draft resolution was a propaganda move. I was extremely sorry to hear him say that. The draft resolution is sponsored by thirty-four States. The grave situation to which it refers has arisen in France and has not been created by any of the sponsoring States. It is the existing situation which has moved the sponsors to present the matter as one of urgency.

75. The representative of France also referred to the jeopardy to which the resumption of negotiations between France and Algeria on the question of the independence of Algeria might be subjected by this move. Again, I was extremely sorry to hear him say that, for, as a matter of fact, it is the earnest desire of the sponsoring States that this grave situation—which is likely not only to retard but to endanger the resumption of negotiations—should be removed, so that resumption of negotiations may be made easier, facilitated and, as a matter of fact, also expedited.

76. It is not possible for any one to imagine that while this situation continues, and 14,000 peoples are on a hunger strike which endangers their lives, negotiations could be resumed in that atmosphere, or that if—assuming the impossible—they were resumed, they could lead to any fruitful result. I am sure that it will be realized that this situation—into which I hope that no emotional considerations will be introduced by either side, but that it will be considered purely on a humanitarian basis—should be resolved, in order that the object so earnestly desired by all of us here and, we are quite sure, by France and Algeria, may be speedily achieved.

77. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The General Assembly has before it a formal motion that the present debate be suspended in order that a draft resolution [A/L.365 and Add.1] may be examined as a matter of urgency. The Chair would like to know the Assembly's reaction to this proposal. Is there any objection to the proposal?

78. The Chair would like to take every precaution to ensure that the Assembly cannot consider that it has been taken by surprise. I repeat the formal proposal made by the representative of Pakistan: he proposes the suspension of the present debate in order that this draft resolution may be examined as a matter of urgency.

79. As I note that there is no request for the floor and consequently no objection, I conclude that the General Assembly decides, without objection, to suspend the present debate in order to give urgent consideration to the draft resolution concerning Algerian prisoners in France.

It was so decided.

80. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I now request the Assembly to direct its attention to the draft resolution [A/L.365 and Add.1]; thereafter we will resume the debate which was in progress.

81. Mr. SHUKAIRY (Saudi Arabia): It is a good mistake that permits me to make a statement on this question, because I did not really ask for the floor in order to speak at this moment.

82. The draft resolution [A/L.365 and Add.1] before us commends itself to the Assembly for approval.

83. I have listened with a great deal of respect and interest to the statement of our colleague, the representative of France, and I should like to admit that he made a very balanced statement, except with regard to the inference that this draft resolution was a manoeuvre and was motivated by propaganda purposes. These two points have been correctly answered by the representative of Pakistan.

84. I should like to seize this occasion to assure our distinguished and honourable colleague of France that this draft resolution is not motivated by any propaganda purposes, because what is at stake is the life of several thousands of prisoners now held in France. I should like to assure our distinguished and honourable colleague that this draft resolution is not a manoeuvre in any sense. We shall not talk politics. We shall not deal with the question of Algeria. This draft resolution does not involve any political implications in any sense. The question of Algeria will be dealt with at the proper time in the First Committee. But it is our humble submission that this draft resolution will clarify the atmosphere, will pave the way, first of all, for a calm discussion of the problem before the Committee and, secondly, for a speedy negotiation between the parties. This is a very innocent and a very modest draft resolution now before the Assembly. It is neither condemnatory nor offensive in any sense, either to France or to anyone.

85. I should like to appeal to our colleagues to receive this draft resolution in the noble spirit which underlies this appeal. There is nothing controversial about this draft resolution: the preamble refers to the hunger strike of thousands of Algerians now imprisoned in France. I humbly submit this as a fact which cannot be denied. This appeared in the newspapers in Paris itself, as well as in those in New York. This is a fact which admits of no controversy and the Assembly should find it very easy to adopt this draft resolution.

86. With regard to the second and third preambular paragraphs, I respectfully submit that they do no more than recall past resolutions which have been adopted by the General Assembly. It is quite proper that we recall those pertinent resolutions. There is no question but that we adopted those resolutions at our last session, and it is quite proper at this time to have this idea referred to in the draft resolution now standing in our name.

87. There is only one operative paragraph; it is hardly an operative paragraph; it is hardly a draft resolution. And were it not for the procedures regularly followed by the Assembly, I humbly submit, there is hardly any need to table a draft resolution, because it is simply an appeal made in a very honourable way, a very modest way, expressing ourselves in the noblest terms, as the paragraph states, to "redress the legitimate grievances of the Algerian prisoners ... making possible the immediate termination of the hunger strike", which might entail—God forbid—a catastrophe that would create a great deal of ill-will between nations and between the two parties mainly concerned, and might, perhaps, impede the negotiations which I hope will take place very soon.

88. I sincerely appeal to the General Assembly to adopt this draft resolution, to accept the ideas embodied in it and accept the appeal—the only request this Assembly can make under the circumstances—

as the minimum of justice and humanitarianism. This is not a political draft resolution; this is simply a draft resolution based solely and exclusively on humanitarian considerations to save the lives of thousands of prisoners—and many of you representatives here must have been political prisoners at one time or another, so they know, feel and sense what it means to be a political prisoner and what a hunger strike means.

89. Mr. GUIRMA (Upper Volta) (translated from French): It is with deep feeling that my delegation takes the floor on the subject of the draft resolution before us [A/L.365 and Add.1]. We are concerned to make clear the reasons which have prompted us to join in sponsoring this draft resolution.

90. International practice authorizes intervention on behalf of prisoners and of those sentenced to death, as well as on behalf of those who generally speaking are suffering, even when the people concerned have been charged with all kinds of acts which are universally condemned, and a fortiori when they are accused of acts which have subsequently been recognized as legitimate.

91. For us, then, it is not a matter of taking a position against, or of manifesting our hostility towards, any particular country. We are simply joining in an expression of world-wide human feeling on behalf of persons and leaders whose representative character, from a political standpoint, has been recognized even by those who are keeping them in their present situation.

92. We wish to express clearly our position on the Algerian policy defined by General de Gaulle. In voting for this draft resolution and supporting it, we do not propose to range ourselves among the enemies of France, as the newspapers may tomorrow allege. We simply wish to range ourselves among those supporting the liberal policy of General de Gaulle, who desires to give Algeria its independence despite the reactions of the French right wing.

93. What might be the consequences of the hunger strike of the Algerian political prisoners in France? It is supposed that, if the hunger strike which the Algerian leaders have kept up for two weeks now had a fatal outcome, the solution of the problem as we see it would thereby be facilitated? I think that it would be difficult for anyone to say so, from this rostrum or anywhere else.

94. Facts must be recognized; and the fact is that Algerian prisoners are on a hunger strike, that these same prisoners are indispensable for a peace settlement between Algeria and France, and that if the lives and the rights of these Algerian prisoners are protected the problem of peace in Algeria will be much easier to solve. Thus our position is really one of unconditional support for the liberal policy of General de Gaulle, who wants to achieve a final settlement of this Algerian problem but is faced with an explosive domestic situation which prevents him from settling it in a spirit of justice.

95. This is why we, the Upper Volta and a number of its friends, have decided to co-sponsor this draft resolution and to support it.

96. Mr. SUBANDRIO (Indonesia): I will be brief on this matter. The attitude of Indonesia on struggles for independence is clear. We are also one of the sponsors of this draft resolution [A/L.365 and Add.1]. We are

sponsoring and supporting this draft resolution to make an appeal, as has been said by previous speakers, to President de Gaulle to release these prisoners of war.

97. We in Indonesia recognize the provisional government of the Algerian Republic as the legitimate government of Algeria, and we recognize that it is engaged in a colonial war with France. We also recognize that the soldiers who are fighting for their independence should be treated according to existing international humanitarian principles.

98. It is for this reason that, without in any way prejudging the future negotiations between France and Algeria, we would recommend this matter to be treated as a matter of urgency by this Assembly. Especially after the clear and lucid speech of the Australian representative, in which the principle of self-determination was defended, a principle that has been accepted as a rule by this Assembly, and after the threat of force has been applied to the case of West Irian, I would say that this Assembly should recommend to President de Gaulle that duress or threat of force should not be used against prisoners of war.

99. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I give the floor to the representative of Pakistan, on a point of order.

100. Sir Muhammad Zafrulla KHAN (Pakistan): I apologize for having asked for the floor a third time, but I have no doubt my colleagues will appreciate that my previous interventions were on procedural matters. Even now I will not take too much of the time of the Assembly, in view of the urgency of the matter that we have put forward.

101. We fully appreciate the difficulties, over both this and other matters, that have confronted and continued to confront that great country, France, whose culture and whose stand on behalf of liberty, fraternity and equality all of us admire so much.

102. The present Head of the French Government, to whom this modest appeal is addressed, on more occasions than one has risen to great heights in a time of emergency in the service of his country and of his people. If I might say so without impertinence, today he embodies all that is highest and worthiest in the spirit and tradition of France. We are quite convinced that this modest appeal, respectively addressed to his Government, will not be in vain.

103. I can say on behalf of all the sponsors of this draft resolution [A/L.365 and Add.1] that that is the spirit in which this move has been made in the Assembly and we hope that it is in that spirit that it will be received by the Assembly and by the Government of France.

104. I beg to move that the debate on this draft resolution be closed now and that if it so please the Assembly we now proceed to vote on it.

105. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): A procedural motion has just been submitted to the effect that we close the debate immediately and proceed to a vote.

106. Before putting this proposal to the vote in accordance with rule 77 of the Rules of Procedure, I would like to draw the attention of the representative of Pakistan to the fact that there is only one more speaker on my list. Could we not give the floor to this last speaker and then close the debate on this question and proceed to the vote?

107. With the consent of the representative of Pakistan, I call upon the representative of Italy.

108. Mr. THEODOLI (Italy): I thank the President for giving me the floor. I am indeed the last speaker on the list. But since I have been approached by some of the sponsors of the draft resolution who asked me if I could speak in explanation of my vote after the vote has been taken, I am ready to do so if that is preferred.

109. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): In accordance with the motion tabled by the representative of Pakistan, we shall regard the debate on the draft resolution [A/L.365 and Add.1] as closed. We shall therefore proceed to a vote on this draft, but first I shall call upon two speakers who have asked for the floor to explain their votes in advance.

110. Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America): The United States strongly supports any and all measures to further a peaceful solution of the Algerian conflict. We have been and continue to be hopeful that negotiations will make possible rapid progress toward accommodation and a lasting settlement.

111. We wonder, however, whether this draft resolution [A/L.365 and Add.1] might not impede and prejudice those negotiations and not advance the prospects for an early negotiated settlement.

112. We are, of course, most concerned that the Algerian prisoners should be treated according to the highest humanitarian standards. The conditions of their imprisonment are a matter of active and sympathetic interest to the United States, as we have already made clear to the parties concerned who are already working on the problem. But we are concerned lest this proposed action by the General Assembly should have an unfavourable effect on the situation of the prisoners and on the progress of negotiations. Furthermore, we have doubts about the procedure that has been followed as to this draft resolution and we do not think that that procedure should be considered a precedent.

113. The United States will abstain on the draft resolution.

114. Mr. BINDZI (Cameroun) (translated from French): I have asked for the floor in order to explain, very briefly, the meaning of the vote which my delegation will shortly cast. Cameroun is not a co-sponsor of the draft resolution [A/L.365 and Add.1]. We shall however vote in favour of the text submitted to us. My delegation like others, is not prejudging the substance of the question, although it has definite opinions which it will make known in due course. All we are doing by voting in favour is to make an appeal to France. We would point out that under the terms of the resolution we are not even asking that the prisoners should be freed, eagerly though we desire this. We are asking only that France do everything possible to stop this strike, which, if it continues, may leave that country with 14,000 corpses on its hands.

115. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We shall now vote on the draft resolution by the Pakistan representative [A/L.365 and Add.1]. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Uruguay, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Austria, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorus-

sian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroun, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentinian, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Panama, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 62 votes to none, with 31 abstentions.**

116. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I shall now give the floor to a number of speakers who have asked for permission to explain their vote.

117. Mr. BOLAND (Ireland): As this is the first time on which I have had occasion to address the Assembly, since the President was elected to the high office which he occupies with so much distinction, may I take the opportunity to express to him my sincere congratulations, as well as the sense of pleasure and privilege which I feel in addressing the Assembly under his Presidency.

118. My delegation felt constrained to abstain in the vote on the resolution which has just been adopted by the General Assembly. I should like to make clear the reasons for my delegation's abstention.

119. The attitude of the Irish delegation on the question of Algeria's right to self-determination and independence is well known. In the light of our own history, no attitude is possible for us but that which we have always adopted here in the United Nations. Nor can we in the Irish delegation fail to sympathize with and deplore the plight of the Algerian prisoners now on hunger strike in France. National liberation movements must, on occasion, make severe demands on the resolve and the powers of endurance of their adherents. The plight of the Algerian prisoners at present on hunger strike in defence of the values they uphold and the things in which they believe strikes a particularly responsive chord in the hearts of peoples like ourselves. It must also make an instinctive appeal to the humanitarian sentiments of every delegation here in the Assembly.

120. It is indeed tragic that, at a moment when, thanks to the high statesmanship of the Head of the French State and of the Algerian national leaders, the opening of negotiations appeared to be so close at hand, the high hopes and expectations for the peaceful settlement of the Algerian question should once again be threatened with disappointment owing to the crisis which has arisen with regard to the Algerian prisoners on hunger strike in France.

*The delegation of the Niger later informed the Secretariat that, as one of sponsors of the draft resolution, it would have voted in favour of the draft if it had been present at the meeting.

121. We in the Irish delegation fully realize the extreme urgency of this situation and we accept that consideration as the reason why this resolution was introduced in the Assembly at such very short notice, but some delegations, including my own, have had no opportunity of informing their Governments with regard to it and of receiving instructions before the resolution was put to the vote. I should like to make it clear that it was because of this, and because the Irish delegation had no opportunity of receiving instructions in the time available, that it abstained in the vote, and that it was not because of any lack of support of Algeria's legitimate national claims or because of any lack of deep and, indeed, anguished, concern for the fate of the men at present facing the self-sacrificial test of moral strength which the weapon of the hunger strike always involves.

122. Sir Hugh FOOT (United Kingdom): My delegation abstained in the vote on the resolution. The sponsors were moved by humanitarian motives and we do not for one moment question those motives; nor are we prepared to express any view at all on that issue at this time. For that reason we did not oppose the resolution.

123. At the same time I must make clear that my delegation has misgivings about the proposal and serious objection to the method by which it was presented to us. In the first place, this is clearly a question within the jurisdiction of France; that, I understand, is not in question and I believe, indeed, that the sponsors of the resolution admitted that that was so. Second, the resolution must have political implications. Third, we saw this resolution, with its important political aspects, for the first time this afternoon, and it seems to my delegation quite wrong to face the Assembly with an immediate vote on a resolution of this character in this way. Indeed, we wish to put on record that, in our view, the procedure is open to serious objection.

124. Mr. THEODOLI (Italy): I would just like to explain the reasons why my delegation abstained in the recent voting. We fully understand and appreciate the motives which inspired the sponsors of this resolution, among whom we have so many good friends. We are very concerned with the plight of the Algerian political prisoners. Italy has a long tradition of humanity and justice, and I trust that nobody will think that the question does not touch us. However, we had some doubts concerning the procedure which has been followed in this case and we feared, also, that it could perhaps be misinterpreted by the French Government. This, in the opinion of my delegation, is the thing to bear in mind. We feel sure that General de Gaulle will not be insensible to the plight of these political prisoners and will find a way to redress the situation, especially since three important members of the Moroccan Government are now in Paris.

125. Mr. DEMETROPOULOS (Greece) (translated from French): The Greek delegation sincerely deplores the situation created by the hunger strike of Algerian political prisoners in France, and the events which have given rise to it. We feel that nothing should be done which might delay or compromise the negotiations which alone can bring about a solution of the Algerian question. We would like to hope that the French Government, in what we know to be its sincere desire to arrive at a just solution of the Algerian question as soon as possible, will do everything in its power to eliminate the causes of this strike. We are convinced that the eloquent and restrained speeches

made in support of this resolution cannot go unheeded in high places; and we considered that, in a political context, we should render the best service to the humanitarian aim of the resolution just adopted if we abstained, so as to avoid making a delicate situation even more delicate.

126. Mr. NORIEGA (COLOMBIA) (translated from Spanish): Leaving aside possibly important considerations of procedure, as well as the pertinence and substance of the resolution just adopted by the Assembly, I should like to explain that Colombia has traditionally, for the settlement of the delicate Algerian problem, favoured direct conversations between the parties concerned and has always sought to avoid even the semblance of any form of interference that might in any way disturb the happy outcome, which we earnestly desire, of this procedure. We therefore abstained from voting.

127. Mr. COMAY (Israel): My delegation deeply sympathizes with an appeal on behalf of any prisoners on humanitarian grounds. However, we have abstained in this case because the appeal is put in terms which appear to make it unacceptable to the Government concerned. We are therefore not convinced that it would have the desired effect or would promote the Algerian negotiations, for the success of which we all so ardently hope.

128. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): I should like briefly to explain the reasons why the Venezuelan delegation was obliged to abstain from voting on the draft resolution [A/L.365] which has just been adopted.

129. Venezuela's abstention in no way changes its basic position with regard to the problem of Algeria. That position is well known to the Assembly. We have always supported the right of the Algerian people to self-determination and independence, and our attitude in this regard is unaltered. We also understand the humanitarian motives by which the draft resolution's sponsors were inspired; however, in the view of my delegation, this resolution cannot be said to reflect solely humanitarian principles. It also involves considerations of a political nature, which oblige us to examine its terms in order to see whether or not they are in conformity with the provisions of the Charter, and more particularly with Article 2 (7).

130. In view of the haste with which this resolution was submitted—so that we had no time to study it or even to consult our Government—my delegation found it impossible to do otherwise than abstain in the voting.

131. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): There is no one else on my list wishing to speak on the resolution which has just been adopted, or in explanation of vote. We shall therefore resume the general debate on the two agenda items 88 and 22 (a).

132. Mr. MOD (Hungary) (translated from French): The subject of the present debate is "The situation with regard to the implementation of the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples". This Declaration [resolution 1514 (XV)] was adopted in 1960, and its historic importance is now manifest. One of the characteristic features of the age in which we live is the definitive disintegration of the colonial empires, the final liquidation of the colonial system. Under the impetus of life itself, the question of the total liquidation of the colonial system was placed on the agenda of the United Nations as a result of the discussion begun at the initiative of the

Soviet Union^{1/} and after the adoption of the Declaration. The adoption of the Declaration has given the United Nations both the possibility and the duty, as an organization, of taking an active part in this struggle.

133. A number of clear and important conclusions may be drawn from the events of the year which has elapsed since the adoption of the Declaration, and from the discussions about its implementation.

134. Today, as so often in the history of human society, the international situation is essentially characterized by the struggle between two forces. One represents development, progress, what is new; the other represents lack of change, stagnation, the status quo—not, however, the status quo of freedom, but that of slavery. The adoption of the Declaration by the General Assembly marked a victory for progress. Let us glance at the records of the fifteenth session, to see which were the States that did everything possible to oppose it and, when there was nothing else to do, abstained from voting. We find that the States in question are, for instance, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Portugal, Spain, Belgium, South Africa, and Australia.

135. I think that, despite the various kinds of theoretical and practical juggling, the whole world sees clearly which of the great Powers represents progress and which the status quo; however, for the benefit of sceptics, I shall quote from a work by an American expert in ideology, now occupying an important post. This work, the Necessity for Choice,^{2/} was in fact written before the Declaration was adopted. But the alternatives facing the United States when the Declaration was being discussed were similar in nature to the problems upon which the author, Professor Henry A. Kissinger, bases his argument. Analysing the international situation, the author writes:

"... when ... the balance of power is so tenuous, it is no accident that the existing dividing lines are so rigidly maintained. For the status quo has at least the advantage of familiarity ..."^{3/}

136. Then, as if he wished to raise doubts as to who represents the status quo, he goes on:

"A status quo power always has difficulty in coming to grips with a revolutionary period. Since everything it considers 'normal' is tied up with the existing order, it usually recognizes too late that another state means to overthrow the international system. This is a problem especially if a revolutionary state presents each demand as a specific, limited objective which in itself may seem quite reasonable."^{4/}

137. The Declaration is indeed "specific" for those who took the initiative and supported it at the time; it remains specific now that it is a question of implementing it. It is indeed specific, I say, in that it is directed against the specific phenomenon of colonialism, and it is also "quite reasonable", for it can be carried into effect on the basis of the existing international balance of power. In short, the truth is that the forces of imperialism are using every means to oppose and obstruct the Declaration's implementation, whereas the socialist countries and the national forces

of the newly independent States are endeavouring to give effect to it.

Mr. Rossides (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.

138. The Declaration "solemnly proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations". Yet in 1962, after this session of the General Assembly, eighty-eight territories, comprising an area of 13 million square kilometres and 71 million inhabitants, will still be under colonial domination. The majority of them are in Africa, but there are colonies in Asia, on the American continent and in Oceania.

139. To which countries do these colonies belong? Portugal is the principal defendant at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly. Its acts and attitudes are making work for the Fourth Committee as well as for the General Assembly itself. The whole world is familiar with the colonial methods of inhuman massacre, bordering on genocide, practised by that country in Angola in defiance of the provisions of the Declaration. If the United Nations does not take the necessary steps in time, these atrocities may spread to Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea.

140. The name of Belgium became notorious in 1960 as a result of its aggression against the Congolese people. In the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, adjacent to the Congo, Belgium is stirring up the tribes and nationalities against one another in order to suppress the people's independence movement.

141. The Netherlands, having lost most of its colonial territories, is following the principle of divide et impera and does not want to let go of West Irian—an integral part of Indonesia, which has regained its national independence; and since the Netherlands suspects that it will not be able to maintain its position, it is now appealing to the United Nations, and offering the Organization a part—fortunately, only a part—of Indonesian territory as a Trust Territory. My delegation quite naturally does not lend its support to this proposal, which in our opinion is not only unacceptable but represents an attempt to use the United Nations for colonialist ends.

142. France, for long years, has been waging its murderous war against the Algerian people. One unhappy aspect of this merciless war was evoked by the resolution which the Assembly has just adopted. Hundreds of thousands of Algerian patriots and French citizens have sacrificed their lives to the colonial greed of French imperialism—fruitlessly so far as France is concerned, for, as the experience of a number of former French colonies demonstrates, France is doomed to failure in advance when faced with the will of the people, in this case the Algerian people. Despite all this, in June 1960 the French Prime Minister formulated the principles of French colonial policy thus:

"... We intend to protect our country's political interests, its strategic interests, its intellectual "influence and its economic opportunities".

143. South Africa has likewise introduced the system of mediæval slavery, already established on its own soil, into South West Africa, a Territory formerly under League of Nations Mandate; and it is sabotaging the placing of the Territory under United Nations trusteeship. The problem of South West Africa is also on our agenda.

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 87, document A/4501.

^{2/} Henry A. Kissinger, The Necessity for Choice, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1960.

^{3/} *Ibid.*, p. 173.

^{4/} *Ibid.*

144. The United Kingdom, which has vast territories in Africa and elsewhere, is still the greatest colonial empire of our age. Its methods in no way differ from those of other colonizers. To mention merely the situation prevailing in one of its territories, if we are to believe the British Press the militarization of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland is being accompanied by an extension of the emergency legislation which, according to Mr. Tredgold, Chief Justice of the Federal Supreme Court—these are his own words—violates almost every fundamental human right.

145. The question of Oman is on the Assembly's agenda, but I cannot refrain from mentioning the cruel colonial war which the British colonizers are there inflicting on a small people. In this case, too, their methods are no different from those of other colonizers.

146. And lastly we come to the principal international protector of colonialism, the United States. Despite all its diversionary tactics, the United States has not succeeded and will not succeed in denying that it too is a colonialist Power. Puerto Rico is merely one of its colonies. The Pacific Islands, which are of strategic importance, nominally constitute a Trust Territory administered by the United States. At the twenty-seventh session of the Trusteeship Council, in April 1960, a petitioner from the Marshall Islands said:

"... our standard of living under United States rule has gone down Our island home has been made an atomic testing ground"

147. And the speaker continued as follows:

"Many many years ago we protected ourselves without help from any other nations. Then came the Spanish who protected us, and we became a colonial possession. Next the Germans came to protect us. This was more colonialism. The Japanese protected us for the League of Nations. Now the United States is protecting us. We are still a part of colonialism."^{5/}

148. As a result of the development of technology and civilization, the present international situation has become such that we need no longer examine each colonial Power separately. On the one hand, the Powers of lesser importance such as Belgium, the Netherlands, Portugal and even France could not, of themselves, bring sufficient material and military strength to bear for the struggle against the colonial peoples; on the other, we see that a new "Holy Alliance" has taken shape for the purpose of perpetuating colonialism. The name may vary with the continent. Its objective, however, is everywhere the same: oppression, militarization, maintenance of the colonial status quo at all costs. Let us glance at the facts.

149. Since the bloody war in Angola began, Portugal has received \$300 million in the form of United States military aid. The napalm bombs dropped on Angolan patriots bear the inscription "Made in USA".

150. France has received almost \$4,500 million in military aid from the United States for its struggle against the Algerian people. It is common knowledge that B-26 bombers, built in the United States, took part in the attack on Bizerta. To complete the picture it must be pointed out that the Federal Republic of

Germany, which is playing an ever more prominent role in NATO, has also appeared on the scene. It has given the French colonizers some \$2,000 million of aid for the purposes of the colonial war in Algeria.

151. Belgium has received \$1,200 million in United States military aid—and so on. I could list all the other colonizers, from Great Britain to Spain and South Africa.

152. In ancient times, it was said: "All roads lead to Rome". Today it could be said that the roads of all the colonizers lead to Washington. Of course, it is not disinterested help that the United States provides. The great United States monopolies are making several thousand million dollars of profit from this colonial "business".

153. The dominating position of certain colonizing Powers is arrived at mainly through NATO. In this regard I will mention only two examples.

154. The use of Africa in a nuclear missile war is an important feature of NATO's plan. One specific project was outlined in the book entitled War and Peace in the Space Age,^{6/} by General Gavin, a prominent United States military theoretician.

"Europe and Africa", writes General Gavin, "are part of one tactical theater. Africa, in fact, is the key to the defense of Europe."^{7/}

The author goes on to say:

"Missiles from Kenya, the Middle East and Southern Europe can accomplish as much in defence as missiles fired from UK. At the same time, they will be far less vulnerable to being destroyed"^{8/}

155. General Gavin regards Africa as the best place for the deployment of NATO's mobile strategic reserves, composed of armoured and rocket units, which can be air-lifted from North and West Africa to any part of the world.

156. The ideas put forward by General Gavin seem to have made a strong impression on certain circles in the United States. The new President has appointed him United States Ambassador to France, and this appointment—according to Carrefour, the French weekly—is connected with the United States intention to prevent Algeria from slipping out of Western hands and to keep the negotiations with the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic from exerting a decisively weakening effect on NATO.

157. The other example is this. The British colony of Kenya has now been integrated into the network of NATO's strategic air bases in Africa. This is a result of the United Kingdom Government's decision to disperse its stockpiles of nuclear bombs and shells along the strategic axis of the British Empire, at the airfields of Cyprus, Aden and East Africa. An article in the Daily Express states that jet bombers are to rotate continuously between Britain and the arms depots "so that it will be impossible for the Russians to know the force's position at any given moment". This system was put to the test in May 1961, when over 200 V-class bombers left the airfields of this network to stage a simulated attack.

158. The objectives of the colonizers have not changed. Today, as a century ago, they want to grow

^{6/} James M. Gavin, War and Peace in the Space Age, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1958.

^{7/} Ibid., p. 275.

^{8/} Ibid., p. 276.

^{5/} This statement was made at the 1061st meeting of the Trusteeship Council, the records of which are available in summary form only.

rich at the expense of the peoples of Africa, Asia and other continents. But they have changed their methods over the years.

159. It is abundantly clear that countries as small as Belgium or Portugal would have been obliged to give up their colonies long ago if NATO and the European Common Market had not created the military and economic conditions enabling them to continue their colonial oppression.

160. One of the characteristics of the present-day methods of colonialism is "collective colonization". Thanks to the European Common Market, the French and Belgian colonies, rather than being dominated by a single country, have been made the prey of a community of colonizers motivated by the "noble idea" of collective exploitation. The British colonies will soon suffer the same fate.

161. The many years of deliberation in the Fourth Committee have produced a sufficient amount of information on this subject. I think therefore that I need not cite examples. It will suffice if I refer to two flagrant cases: the collective aggression of NATO against the Congo, and the position adopted by the NATO Powers on the question of the French military base at Bizerta during the third special session of the General Assembly. To justify this position, it was even found necessary in the United States to develop a supporting ideological argument.

162. In a collection entitled The Idea of Colonialism,^{9/} we find it frankly stated that "Only the most naïve idealist believes that, at this time of world crisis, the metropolitan nations could afford to withdraw" from their colonies.

163. We all remember that President de Gaulle advanced the same ideological argument when he refused to evacuate the Bizerta base.

164. Another method of the colonizing Powers—aptly termed neo-colonialism—is to grant a semblance of independence to a colony or Trust Territory while at the same time paralysing the newly independent country by means of secret economic and military agreements.

165. It cannot be repeated too often that political independence does not mean economic independence, but is merely a first step in that direction. By retaining their economic position the colonialists have in their hands a certain political power, and they will use this power, sooner or later to trample on the independence which they granted under constraint.

166. A number of the newly independent States are still economically dependent on the former metropolitan country, and more than one of them has been obliged, before obtaining independence, to enter into secret military agreements. We all know that in the case of the French Cameroons and Western Samoa, for instance, the question of secret agreements gave rise to lengthy debates in the General Assembly, debates which lasted several years.

167. Neo-colonialism is one of the greatest enemies of the newly independent States. As a symptom, however, it is not of very recent origin. I know that there are representatives in this hall who do not like to hear the name of Lenin, especially because he was the most

consistent foe of imperialism and colonialism. Yet I cannot abstain from quoting him. In 1920 he put the problem as follows:

"Before the broadest labouring masses of all countries and especially of the under-developed countries, we must denounce and unmask the deception which the imperialist Powers systematically perpetrate with a view, under the guise of establishing politically independent States, to creating States which are totally subservient to them in the economic, financial and military spheres".

168. When the colonial empires were being formed, the borders between colonies were in every case determined by the balance of power among the colonizers. Ethnic and historical conditions were never considered. Some ethnic groups were split up, while others were unified by force.

169. Today, when the colonial empires are crumbling, the colonizers are trying to make use of this artificially created situation—the Balkanization of Africa—to sow discord among the newly independent States of Africa and thus to protract their influence by applying the principle of divide et impera. A classic example is provided by the Cameroons, where the British and French colonizers joined forces to promote the Balkanization of Africa.

170. One could give virtually endless examples of the ways in which the colonial Powers try to frustrate the implementation of the principles set forth in the resolution adopted at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly, but I do not wish to take up our time by citing examples at length.

171. Since the raising by the General Assembly, at the Soviet Union's request, of the question of the final liquidation of the colonial system, sufficient time has elapsed for us to understand clearly the real intentions of the various Governments in regard to one of the most important problems of our age. Sufficient time has likewise elapsed for us to draw the major conclusions from the different positions adopted.

172. The first conclusion we must draw is that, on the issue of colonialism, there is no neutrality. One may advocate the liquidation or the retention of the colonial system, but one must take a stand. The actions of the colonial Powers and their allies, however they may be embellished by misleading commentary, show that they take a stand for the retention of the colonial system. In abstaining in the vote on the Declaration in 1960, they in fact cast a negative vote, and that is how the majority of the Assembly interpreted their abstention. A year has since passed, and it is now time to lift the mask.

173. Another conclusion, which nobody can ignore, stems from the fact that the total and final liquidation of the colonial system is now an integral question which cannot be subdivided. We know, for one thing, that the methods and tactics of the colonial Powers are based on an integral objective and an integral policy. We also know that the strategic aims of the colonialists extend far beyond the frontiers of the colonies and Trust Territories. The colonial Powers propose to use the African colonies as military bases against Europe, and to use the military bases as a means of terrorizing the indigenous peoples. The islands of the Pacific are not part of Asia, yet they function as military bases in the war plans against Asia or Europe.

^{9/} The Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania, The Idea of Colonialism, New York, Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1958, chap. 2: "Problems in Perspective", by Stefan T. Possony, p. 33.

174. The drive to liquidate the colonial system is therefore not the affair of any one continent or group of countries and is not an issue of the "cold war", even if the question is raised by one major Power to the distaste of another major Power.

175. No, the problem of liquidating the colonial system is not a "cold war" problem; but it is, indeed, part of the problem of "war or peace". It is part of this problem because, as we must realize, while we are discussing here the question of abolishing the colonial system, real wars are going on nearly everywhere in the colonies. It is part of this problem because, if we put an end to colonialism, we shall be doing away with one of the principal causes of war. It is part of this problem because the foreign bases in the colonial territories represent an important factor in present international tension.

176. The social system and political principles of the socialist countries make these countries anti-colonialist and firm allies of the newly independent States. That is why the colonialists have established, as a double-edged weapon, the bases in Kenya and elsewhere which I have mentioned. One edge of the weapon is to be used for the perpetuation of colonialism, the other for aggression against the socialist system. It follows logically, therefore, that it is precisely in order to prevent a "hot war", and because there can be no neutrality on the question of colonialism, that all Governments must not only decide whether they are for or against colonialism but draw the necessary conclusions regarding all problems related to colonialism.

177. What is involved here, I think, is not the demand of any particular delegation but rather the very logic of events. When events occur, we all react to them by voting or acting in a certain manner; but some events can and should be induced by us, just as we can and should take deliberate steps to avert others.

178. The third and last conclusion is the following. The experience gained since the founding of the United Nations, and particularly during the last few years, shows more and more clearly that those who oppose the liquidation of colonialism are precisely those who stimulate world tension, who in Professor Kissinger's book that I mentioned are called "the status quo Powers", who are opposed to progress and are in favour of social stagnation. As Professor Kissinger says, "A status quo power always has difficulty in coming to grips with a revolutionary period".

179. Now, whether or not it pleases certain quarters, one of the characteristic features of our time is that it is a revolutionary period. And this is not a matter of opinion but an objective lesson drawn from the events of our day.

180. The revolutionary process which the breakdown of the colonial system represents for the history of mankind cannot be stopped. Those who wish to obstruct it may make the final solution more difficult, more complicated and doubtless more costly in human life, but they cannot check the process itself. The chairman of the Hungarian delegation at the Fifteenth session of the General Assembly, Mr. János Kádár, aptly declared:

"The foundations of the colonial system have been shaken so much that any attempt at obstructing the progress of liberation will not stop but accelerate it." [883rd meeting, paragraph 30.]

181. The Charter makes it incumbent on the United Nations to encourage the process of the liberation of colonial peoples. If the world Organization works out the ways and means of a peaceful solution, it will render an immense service not only to the peoples living under colonial oppression but also to the colonial Powers themselves.

182. The important Declaration on the independence of colonial peoples adopted at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly raised the hopes of millions of oppressed people. We must not allow these people to feel that the United Nations has deceived them. We must not allow the Declaration to be no more than a scrap of paper. The colonial peoples hope that this declaration of principle will be followed by appropriate action. They hope that we shall reply unequivocally to the question: "When and how will the United Nations assist in our liberation?"

183. The Hungarian delegation supports the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union [A/L.355] precisely because it gives to these questions a clear and definite reply.

Mr. Slim (Tunisia) resumed the Chair.

184. Mr. LIU Chieh (China): A year ago the General Assembly adopted the resolution containing the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples [1514 (XV)] which was sponsored by an unprecedented number of delegations from Africa and Asia. That Declaration was a fitting testament of a historic session, which saw the simultaneous admission of no less than seventeen Members who had newly attained the status of full nationhood. It was an emphatic reaffirmation of the great principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, and marked the culmination of a series of Assembly resolutions, relating to equal rights and self-determination of peoples. Before we discuss the problem of implementation, I think it would be well to examine anew the role of the United Nations in relation to this most complex and explosive issue of modern times.

185. At San Francisco, the architects of the United Nations were among the first to feel the wind of change and devoted no less than three Chapters in the Charter to the problem of dependent peoples. These Chapters deal specifically with the promotion of progressive development towards self-government or independence. For the first time, the well-being of the dependent peoples was made a matter of international concern, and the Administering Powers voluntarily accepted the obligation of promoting, to the utmost, the educational, social, economic and political advancement of the inhabitants. It was established beyond all question that the interests of the inhabitants were paramount and that the right of the people in determining their own destinies was unchallengeable.

186. In the intervening years, the basic objectives of the Charter provisions have been vigorously pursued by the United Nations Trusteeship Council and the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, and have been stressed again and again by resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at successive sessions. Thus, under the impetus given by the Charter, the process of decolonization has been accelerated. In this process the valiant efforts of the peoples concerned and the co-operation of the Administering Authorities have been essential factors, but the role of the United Nations in giving encouragement and assistance cannot be denied or overlooked.

The result is that in the short span of fifteen years, more than thirty formerly dependent Territories have become independent nations, and a few more are well on the way to sovereign statehood. The number of people in dependent Territories has decreased from 215 million to about only 50 million. If we include the areas in Asia that were parts of the British Empire, the ratio would be even more impressive. Surely, in no other fields of its manifold activities can the United Nations boast of greater achievements or derive a greater measure of satisfaction.

187. In the light of what I have said, the resolution adopted last year, important as it is, constitutes but a reaffirmation of the principles and ideals already embodied in the Charter. The Declaration, however, is nevertheless highly significant in that it calls attention to the hard struggle that still lies ahead in the process of human liberation. The preamble to that resolution solemnly proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. The operative part declares that the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes the denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation.

188. Many speakers on this rostrum refer to colonialism as if it consisted only in the control by the Western Powers over their overseas territories in Asia and Africa. Little has been said of the overland expansion of Soviet imperialism by which non-Russian populations have been forcibly annexed, exploited, enslaved and sometimes annihilated. Mr. Khrushchev of the Soviet Union in his speech before the General Assembly at the fifteenth session described colonialism in Tsarist Russia in these terms:

"The Tsarist Government pursued in the borderlands of Russia an essentially colonialist policy which differed little from what can be observed today in colonial countries. Uzbeks, Kazakhs, Tadzhiks and other non-Russian nationalities were scornfully called 'aliens'. They were not considered human beings and were ruthlessly exploited. National differences, hatred and dissension were fomented between these nationalities, and the Tsarist Empire was held together only by bayonets and oppression." [869th meeting, para. 207.]

189. It is not my intention to visit the sins of the Tsars on the heads of the men of the Kremlin, nor do I wish to divert attention from the present-day situation to chapters of history. The significant fact is that far from liberating them from Tsarist colonialism, the rulers of the Soviet Union have tightened their control over the non-Russian populations, notably the Ukrainians, Georgians, Azerbaijani, and Armenians, even after these peoples have proclaimed their independence following the 1917 Revolution. During the period of the Second World War, the world witnessed helplessly the forcible annexation of the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and also parts of other neighbouring countries, such as Finnish Karelia, eastern Poland, Czechoslovak Carpatho-Ruthenia, Romanian Bessarabia and northern Bukovina and a portion of East Prussia. The USSR emerged from the war with the gain of 262,000 square miles of territory and 22 million more people. In recent years, Soviet colonialism has taken the form of setting up a number of satellite States under the label of "People's Democracies". One need only recall the events of

1956 in Hungary to be convinced that the so-called "People's Democracies" are but camouflaged Soviet colonies. Today Soviet colonization has extended to Outer Mongolia, North Korea and North Viet-Nam in Asia, and is seeking new pastures in Africa as well as Latin America.

190. This very brief survey of Soviet imperialism is intended only to point up one fact. That is, while the colonialism of the Western Powers is being rapidly brought to an end, it is being replaced by a new form of colonialism more embracing in scope and more brutal in its methods. Allow me to quote from an Asian statesman in support of my thesis:

"There is another form of colonialism, however, about which many of us represented here are perhaps less clear in our minds and to which some of us would perhaps not agree to apply the term of colonialism at all. Think, for example, of these satellite states under communist domination in Central and Eastern Europe—of Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and Poland. Are not these colonies as much as any of the colonial territories in Africa or Asia? And if we are united in our opposition to colonialism, should it not be our duty openly to declare our opposition to Soviet colonialism as much as to Western imperialism?"

These are the words of Sir John Kotelawala, formerly Prime Minister of Ceylon, when he spoke at the Bandung Conference in 1955. Much has been heard in this hall in past years about the spirit of Bandung, but I think these words of an Asian leader pronounced six years ago have gained poignancy today when we are faced with the urgency of the colonial problem.

191. One may well ask why the Soviet Union, while demanding the immediate liberation of Western colonies, should seek at the same time to consolidate her control over the peoples in the communist captive orbit. The answer lies in the teachings of Lenin who wrote:

"We, as Communists, must and will support the bourgeois emancipation movements in colonial countries when those movements have a real revolutionary character and when the representatives of those movements will not hinder us in educating and organizing the peasants and the exploited masses in the revolutionary spirit."

This line of action has been faithfully pursued by both Stalin and Khrushchev, because it fits into the communist strategy of promoting unrest and chaos in sensitive areas for the purpose of infiltration, subversion and ultimate conquest.

192. Several distinguished delegates have declared from this rostrum that the present debate should not be turned into cold war propaganda. With these sentiments I heartily agree, but I would be less than truthful if I refrained from saying that the issue of colonialism has been used by the communists as an effective weapon in the cold war. In this connexion, I hope you will permit me to quote the distinguished President of your great country. In a recent speech on the Outlook for Africa before Chatham House, President Bourguiba had this to say:

"... At the present time the cold war centres round decolonization, round independence. Thus, insofar as the phenomenon of colonialism creates resentments and discontents, the cold war estab-

lished itself in those regions, and the Communist camp becomes the champion of the colonial peoples' liberty and independence. Obviously the Communists who become the champions of independence do not present themselves as Communists-as-such, but they consider that independence is a necessary preliminary state to bringing these people either into a Communist system or under the influence of the Communist Powers prior to satellization."

Mr. Slim (Tunisia) resumed the Chair.

193. I have ventured to invoke the view of an African statesman only to support my contention that in our desire to avoid involving this debate in cold war issues, we must not blind ourselves to the fact that the communists are using the slogans of colonial liberation not only to intensify the cold war but also to further their own grand design of world domination.

194. Turning to the draft resolutions now before the General Assembly, I would take this opportunity briefly to state the position of my delegation. On the question of Netherlands New Guinea, or West Irian, ever since it was brought before the United Nations, my delegation has maintained the opinion that no determination could be made until the freely-expressed wishes of the people were known. The proposal of the Netherlands Government appears to be in consonance with the principles in the Charter, in that the interests of the inhabitants and the will of the people are given primary consideration. The Netherlands Government has announced its intention to yield its sovereignty over that Territory. In the view of my delegation, the United Nations should assume its international responsibility and proceed as soon as possible to ascertain the wishes of the people. My delegation will vote in favour of the Netherlands draft resolution [A/L.354].

195. The other draft resolution [A/L.357] before the General Assembly, proposed by the Nigerian delegation, seeks to set a target date for the independence of all African territories. In general, it is difficult to set a uniform rule for various territories, especially in view of the report^{10/} by the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, which, after a thorough survey last year of the progress in Non-Self-Governing Territories, drew the Assembly's attention to the wide diversity of conditions in the territories. However, the target date of 1970 is proposed by an African representative and has been found acceptable to those countries immediately concerned. My delegation is therefore prepared to vote in favour of the draft resolution in the confident hope that this period of transition will encourage the efforts on the part of inhabitants and Administering Authorities alike to speed up progress towards independence.

196. In conclusion, let me assure the President that we of China are against colonialism in all forms, irrespective of origin and without distinction as to race, creed or colour. Indeed, the history of the Republic of China throughout half a century has been one of incessant struggle and resistance against foreign domination, including our long conflict with the forces of international communism. In the records of the United Nations we have supported every resolution and every action on the side of freedom. My delegation is second to none in its desire to see the historic Declaration of the General Assembly imple-

mented, so that colonialism in all its forms and manifestations will disappear from the earth. But we strongly urge that the General Assembly recognize the danger of Soviet imperialism, that seeks to spread its tentacles in all the areas where the old colonialism is being eradicated. We are equally firm in our belief that no implementation of this Declaration can be complete until the right of self-determination is exercised not only by the people now living in the Non-Self-Governing Territories but also by all the captive millions in communist-controlled lands, whose yearning for freedom can no longer be ignored by this General Assembly if it is to fulfil its role as guardian of peace and freedom.

197. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands): When the Netherlands Government decided to make the proposals which are contained in our draft resolution [A/L.354], it did so for two reasons. The first reason was that, having voted in favour of resolution 1514 (XV) at the fifteenth session of the Assembly, we felt in honour bound to comply with its terms in respect of the only remaining Non-Self-Governing Territory under Netherlands administration—West New Guinea—and therefore to take immediate steps to transfer all powers to the people of the Territory, to ensure that they can, by exercising the right of self-determination, freely determine their future political status, and to recognize the important role the United Nations has to play in this development, as the resolution itself has it.

198. The second reason was that we felt confident that in pursuing the course set by the General Assembly, we would be making the best possible contribution towards the peaceful transition of West New Guinea from dependence to complete self-government, which would also bring about the settlement of our long-lasting dispute with Indonesia.

199. It was for this second reason that the Netherlands Minister for Foreign Affairs, when he made his two statements—first, in the general debate [1016th meeting] and later on, during the discussion of this item [1049th meeting]—carefully avoided making any references to the past which might have sounded unpleasant, or even controversial, in Indonesian ears, and that he concentrated his attention on the future of the Territory when the main stumbling block for Indonesia—namely, the Netherlands presence in West New Guinea—would be removed.

200. We had hoped that this prudence and this moderation would be met by Indonesia in an equal spirit of co-operation. To our great regret, however, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia ignored the hand we held out to him, and to the United Nations, and, in the statement he made on 9 November [1050th meeting], instead of discussing our proposals in reasonable terms, had recourse to recriminations and even to threats of violence.

201. It is true that the Indonesian Minister made a fleeting reference to the possibility that a formula on the questions of self-determination and the authority of the United Nations might be found, but it has been made clear to us that the formula he had in mind was that Indonesia should take over the administration and would then—at some time in the far off future—allow the Papuans to "confirm" that they wished to remain with Indonesia. Such a formula, it is obvious, would make a mockery of the principle of free choice.

^{10/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Supplement No. 15.

202. In his statement, Mr. Subandrio repeated all the old accusations and utterances of resentment we have, unfortunately, heard only too often before in the gatherings of the United Nations; he then asserted his country's claim to incorporate West New Guinea without any plebiscite; and finally he ended up by repeatedly threatening military action in the near future unless we agreed to hand over West New Guinea and its people at once to Indonesia.

203. Although we in the Netherlands have a list of real grievances against Indonesia just as long as their fictitious ones against us, I shall refrain from mentioning them because we do not want to see a calm and sensible discussion of the decolonization of West New Guinea diverted into a squabble over past happenings which, in the present context, are irrelevant. Nor do I intend to take up the distinguished Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia on what we can only regard as unseemly threats, from which all Members of the United Nations have, by signing the Charter, undertaken to refrain.

204. The purpose of my intervention is merely to comment, *sine ira et studio*, on the arguments adduced by Indonesia in support of its contention that West New Guinea is not at present a Non-Self-Governing Territory under Netherlands administration, but that it is part of the territory of the Republic of Indonesia and that therefore we were not entitled to make the proposals which we have made.

205. These arguments are: (1) that, when Dr. Sukarno and Dr. Hatta proclaimed the independence of Indonesia on 17 August 1945, they acted not only in the name of all Indonesians, but also in the name of the Papuans of West New Guinea, and thereby exercised the right of self-determination of the Papuans on behalf of the Papuans; (2) that Indonesia, being the successor State to the Netherlands, should include all the territories which had formerly formed part of the Netherlands East Indies; and (3) that, under the terms of the Charter of Transfer of Sovereignty dated 2 November 1949,^{11/} sovereignty over West New Guinea was transferred by the Netherlands to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia. Let us take a quiet look at these assertions.

206. With regard to the background to the Proclamation of Independence of 17 August 1945 and the intentions of its two signatories, I am fortunate in having at my disposal a document of which the Indonesian delegation cannot very well deny the authority, namely, a book written by Professor Muhammad Yamin, the eminent historian and statesman, who is a Cabinet Minister and also a prominent member of the Indonesian delegation. That book—I have it here and it is only the first volume; there are two of them—is called *Naskah persiapan undang-undang dasar 1945*, which means "The preparing of the draft for the Constitution of 1945".

207. In that very interesting book, Professor Yamin relates verbatim the discussions that were held between the leaders of the Indonesian independence movement during the days immediately preceding the Proclamation of Independence. I should like to read to you, in translation of course, a few of the statements that were then made.

208. On page 203 of part I of his book, which was published in 1959, Professor Yamin reproduces a

statement made by Mr. Hatta on 11 July 1945—just a few days before the Proclamation of Independence—concerning the extent of the future Indonesia. It reads as follows:

"I base"—said Mr. Hatta—"the frontiers of Indonesia on our previous claims. Our previous claims went no further than Indonesia or the former Netherlands Indies and, on some occasions, when I was present at Indonesian meetings, I have even wanted to reduce that territory. The territory of Papua I would like to leave to others. But if the Japanese government"—Indonesia was, of course, at that time occupied by Japan—"wishes to relinquish Papua, which formerly was under Netherlands rule, to Indonesia, I have no objection to that, but I would not wish to ask for it, and if the territory of Papua could be exchanged for North Borneo I would have no objection to that either, but, rather, I would be grateful for it."

Further on he said:

"Personally I am quite willing to state that I do not bother at all about Papua; that can be left to the people of Papua themselves. I recognize"—said Mr. Hatta—"that the people of Papua too has the right to become a free nation."

209. On page 212, Professor Yamin gives Mr. Hatta's summing up of his own views, where he quotes Mr. Hatta as saying:

"My stand is: Netherlands Indies minus Papua, but I would have no objection if the population of Malaya should wish to join Indonesia." Previously, Mr. Hatta had said—and this quotation is to be found on pages 201-202 of the book:

"Only in respect of Papua I heard statements yesterday which are rather disquieting, because they can create the impression abroad that we would start by making claims which seem imperialistic. Yesterday I heard the thesis that Malaya and Papua should be asked to join the Indonesian fatherland for strategic reasons. I am not a strategist, but in connexion with what I have read about international politics I understand that strategy does not stand alone but is dependent on the political constellation in the international world. Chamberlain, for instance, said that England's frontiers were not on the Channel but on the Rhine. If one continues this thought, we would not be content with Papua alone but we would also have to claim the Solomon Islands and so on, up to the Pacific Ocean. Would we be able to maintain such a large territory? Have we enough strength to be able to rule such a great territory?"

Those were the words of Mr. Hatta just before the Proclamation of Independence.

210. And what did Mr. Sukarno have to say on this matter? We find his views quoted on pages 204 to 207 of Professor Yamin's book. This is what Mr. Sukarno said:

„I have never taken the view that Indonesia should consist only of the former Netherlands Indies. Never have I contended that Indonesia is no more than the territory ruled by the Dutch. There was even a time in my life when I cherished the thought of a Pan-Indonesia; a Pan-Indonesia which would include not only Malaya and Papua but also the Philippines. But the Philippines are free already and we must respect their sovereignty"

^{11/} See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 69 (1950), I, No. 894, p. 206.

Mr. Sukarno then went on to say:

"Japan has asked us how large the territory of Indonesia would have to be. I say therefore that I agree with the Honourable Member Mr. Yamin that we are not obliged, either on moral or on international grounds, to become heirs of the Dutch."

211. Now comes a very significant passage of what Mr. Sukarno said at that time:

"As to Papua, I do not know the desires of the people of Papua, but I am willing to assume that the people of Papua has as yet no understanding of politics".

He then went on to say:

"We are not the heirs of the Dutch"—I repeat, we are not the heirs of the Dutch—"We will not negotiate with the Dutch or with the British, but we will talk with Japan and Japan will decide what the territory of Indonesia will be".

212. I would be tempted to quote more from this most fascinating book, but the quotations I have made suffice to prove that of the two Indonesian leaders who proclaimed Indonesian independence, Mr. Sukarno and Mr. Hatta, Mr. Hatta held the view that Papua—and, by the way, he and Mr. Sukarno, both used the word "Papua" which apparently was not considered insulting at that time, as Mr. Sukarno would have us believe it is now considered—I repeat that Mr. Hatta held the view that Papua should be left to the people of that Territory themselves, and that it should not be included in Indonesia because that would seem imperialistic. He would rather have North Borneo, he said. And Mr. Sukarno said that Indonesia should not consider itself the successor to the Netherlands East Indies, that he did not know the desires of the Papuan people, who did not understand politics anyway, and that it was up to Japan to determine Indonesia's frontiers.

213. Now I ask the President, how can one reconcile these statements with the assertion that is now being made by Indonesia that West New Guinea is a natural part of Indonesia, that its inhabitants are Indonesians, and that Mr. Sukarno and Mr. Hatta proclaimed independence on their behalf? As I have pointed out before in meetings during this session of the General Assembly, at the time of its proclamation of independence, on 17 August 1945, Indonesia had been for three years, and still was, occupied by Japan, whereas New Guinea had remained largely under Netherlands administration. There was naturally no communication between the two and it was therefore only natural and perfectly understandable, that Mr. Sukarno should say that he did not know what the desires of the Papuans were.

214. There remains, then, only the argument that West New Guinea was transferred to Indonesia under the terms of the Charter of Transfer of Sovereignty—a treaty, by the way, which Indonesia has unilaterally rescinded and which would therefore seem to be—to say the least—a curious document on which to base one's claim. Now, article 2 of that Charter states that:

"in view of the fact that it has not yet been possible to reconcile the views of the parties on New Guinea, which remain therefore in dispute"

It then goes on to enumerate five other reasons, one among them being

"in view of the limited research that has been undertaken and completed with respect to the problems involved in the question of New Guinea"

There, again, that tallies with what Mr. Sukarno said—that they did not know enough about it at the time. The article continues:

"... it is decided

"that the status quo of the residency of New Guinea shall be maintained with the stipulation that within a year from the date of transfer of sovereignty to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia the question of the political status of New Guinea be determined through negotiations between the Republic of the United States of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands".

215. The decision therefore was that in regard to New Guinea, the status quo was maintained. Now, what was that status quo? In an exchange of letters between the parties, dated 2 November 1949, it was laid down that:

"The clause in article 2 of the Draft Charter of Transfer of Sovereignty reading: the status quo of the residency of New Guinea shall be maintained means: through continuing under the Government of the Netherlands".

216. In the minutes of the Round Table Conference it is stated that it was agreed that the proviso that the status quo of New Guinea was to be maintained meant that the Territory would remain "under Netherlands sovereignty". That sovereignty over West New Guinea was not transferred to Indonesia, and that it was not even taken for granted that it would be transferred to Indonesia appears from a note to one of the other agreements signed at the Round Table Conference, which reads as follows:

"None of the provisions in this agreement shall apply to the nationality of the inhabitants of the residency of New Guinea in case the sovereignty over this territory is not transferred to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia".^{12/}

217. In keeping with the agreement that had been made at the Round Table Conference, the Netherlands negotiated with Indonesia, not for one, but for two years. It negotiated about a solution to the problem of New Guinea. All our proposals were rejected and Indonesia insisted that we should transfer sovereignty over West New Guinea to Indonesia. It was only at the end of 1951—two years later—that Indonesia suddenly took up a new position, namely, that sovereignty had already been transferred to it. On that new interpretation of the agreements, we offered to ask for—and to abide by—the decision of the International Court of Justice. Indonesia refused to do so and has since then steadfastly adhered to this refusal.

218. Meanwhile, however, the General Assembly itself decided this question. On 29 June 1950, the permanent representative of the Netherlands informed the Secretary-General of the United Nations that^{13/} the Government of the Netherlands would no longer present a report pursuant to Article 73 e of the Charter of Indonesia since sovereignty over Indonesia, with the exception of the Netherlands New Guinea, had been transferred to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia.

^{12/} Ibid.

^{13/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Annexes, agenda item 34, document A/1302/Rev.1.

219. And on 12 December 1950 the General Assembly adopted a resolution, proposed by the delegation of India—resolution 448 (V)—which reads as follows:

"The General Assembly,

" . . .

"Noting the communication dated 29 June 1950 from the Government of the Netherlands in which it is stated that the Netherlands will no longer present a report pursuant to Article 73 e on Indonesia with the exception of West New Guinea,

"1. Takes note with satisfaction of the communication of the Government of the Netherlands with reference to the cessation of the transmission of information on Indonesia;

"2. Requests the Special Committee on Information transmitted under Article 73 e of the Charter to examine such information as may be transmitted in future to the Secretary-General in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 222 (III), and to report thereon to the General Assembly".

220. Now, if sovereignty over West New Guinea had already been transferred to Indonesia, or even if Indonesia merely thought that sovereignty had been transferred to Indonesia, Indonesia would of course have made a violent protest against this recognition of West New Guinea as being under Netherlands administration and to be reported on by the Netherlands.

221. But lo and behold! The resolution was adopted, with 41 votes in favour and 8 abstentions. And what did Indonesia do? It voted in favour of the resolution, and the record mentions that the Indonesian representative in the Fourth Committee, Mr. Tajipnapi, "expressed his delegation's gratitude to the Indian delegation for its initiative of presenting the draft resolution, and to the Fourth Committee for approving it".^{14/}

222. And when the Netherlands submitted its first report on West New Guinea and this report was discussed in the Fourth Committee, Indonesia again raised no objection.

223. It was not until the next report was submitted—when Indonesia had, meanwhile, thought up the idea of a different interpretation of the Charter of Transfer of Sovereignty; it was not until then—that Indonesia protested. Nevertheless, although the Netherlands has submitted reports on West New Guinea for twelve years now, Indonesia has never submitted a draft resolution to the effect that this reporting should cease, and for twelve years the Committee on Information and the Fourth Committee have accepted the Dutch reports and have discussed them at length.

224. Consequently, as the General Assembly decided—back in 1950—that Netherlands New Guinea was a Non-Self-Governing Territory under Netherlands administration and has acted accordingly in respect of twelve yearly reports on that Territory, Indonesia cannot reverse that decision, except by a judgement of the International Court of Justice, which it has refused—and which it still refuses—to elicit.

225. When we voted for resolution 1514 (XV) last year, we also approved with our vote paragraph 6 of the Declaration contained in that resolution, stating that:

"Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial in-

tegrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations".

That is a principle of which we approve, and in the Congo question we have consistently upheld that the province of Katanga, which formed part of the Republic of the Congo at the time of its emergence and recognition as a national entity, should not be separated from it.

226. West New Guinea, however, never formed part either of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia or the Republic of Indonesia, as it now is. The application of the principle in the present case means, not that Indonesia should be allowed to incorporate in its territory a country which does not belong to it—although the population remains, of course, entitled to decide whether it wishes to join Indonesia—but, in this case, on the contrary, it means that the national unity and territorial integrity of West New Guinea should be respected, not only by the Netherlands but also by Indonesia.

227. This being so, it follows that there can be not the slightest doubt that the Netherlands was legally entitled to make the proposals which we have made concerning the Non-Self-Governing Territory of West New Guinea under Netherlands administration.

228. Therefore, the only question that the Assembly must now decide is whether these legitimate proposals are sound and reasonable and in line with the policies in respect of Non-Self-Governing Territories laid down by the Charter and by the various resolutions on the subject, which our Foreign Minister analysed in his intervention on 8 November. Our plan is simple and unambiguous. If adopted, it will mean: (1) that we will transfer sovereignty over West New Guinea to the people of the Territory at the earliest possible moment when the United Nations says that we can do so; (2) that the Papuan people will be allowed to exercise its right to determine its own future, by voting either for integration with Indonesia or for any other political status, as soon as a plebiscite can be held by the United Nations; (3) that the United Nations will assist the Papuan people to carry out the administration of the Territory during the interim period between our withdrawal and the holding of the Plebiscite; (4) that all Dutch military as well as civilian personnel will be withdrawn, unless the United Nations specifically requests some of them to stay on temporarily; (5) that the Netherlands will continue to pay for the administration on the basis of its present contribution even after our withdrawal; and (6) that the initial measure should be the sending of a United Nations fact-finding commission to West New Guinea to report on the situation and on the practical feasibility of our plan.

229. I do not think that anyone could design a plan more strictly in accordance with the relevant Assembly resolutions. If such a plan can be designed, then we are certainly willing to consider it.

230. One of the particulars of our plan is that the only immediately effective decision it requests the Members of the General Assembly to take is that a commission should be appointed to go to West New Guinea and to report back to the next Assembly. It is only next year that the final decision on our plan will have to be made—and at that time the making of that decision will be facilitated by the fact that the Assembly will then have before it an impartial report and will, consequently, be able to decide with full knowledge of the situation.

^{14/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Fourth Committee, 190th meeting, para. 18.

231. We have sincerely done our best. I hope that my fellow representatives will judge our proposals with the same sincerity. In particular, it is our fervent hope that Indonesia will yet become convinced that the best solution is to assist the United Nations in eliminating colonialism from West New Guinea in an honourable, an orderly and a peaceful way on the basis of self-determination.

232. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of Indonesia, who wishes to speak briefly in exercise of his right of reply.

233. Mr. SUBANDRIO (Indonesia): In asking for the floor, I am fully conscious of the late hour, so I promise the President that I will be brief and I certainly will not give immediate replies on the statement made either by the representative of Australia or by the representative of the Netherlands.

234. We in Indonesia are also unhappy about this problem. No one, I think, is enjoying this problem in Indonesia, because it affects our whole national life, more perhaps than it may affect the national life of the Netherlands or of Australia. We also wish to get rid of this problem; and we know that, if we wish to get rid of this problem, it is not in order to be victorious over the Netherlands—it is certainly not in order to affront or offend our close neighbour and friend, Australia.

235. We also want what the representative of the Netherlands proposed: to achieve an honourable settlement of this problem. I think I made it clear, my Government made it clear and my President made it clear, that we want to settle this problem on the basis of a normalization of our future friendship and co-operation with the Netherlands. By achieving this, we are fully conscious that it should not be settled on the Indonesian terms and that, on the other hand, it should not be settled on the terms of the Netherlands either.

236. What is bedeviling this problem? It is, in essence, the irreconcilable attitude of the Netherlands towards Indonesian independence. If, perhaps, there were no West Irian problem the Netherlands would still invent something—some obstacle—if only to harass Indonesia, to humiliate Indonesia, to separate Indonesia, because before the secession, before the separation, there was a proclamation of the Republic of South Moluccas inspired by the Netherlands, and the leaders are today still living in the Netherlands.

237. It is against this background that the problem of West Irian must be studied and scrutinized on the basis of the irreconcilable attitude of the Netherlands towards Indonesian independence.

238. I myself will certainly make a statement and also give detailed information to this Assembly on the position—geographical and ethnological—of West Irian. The representative of the Netherlands has quoted some phrases from Professor Yamin's book. I know of the existence of that book, but I would remind him that they were private discussions before the proclamation of independence which were published by Professor Yamin and that after 17 August, a delegation from West Irian came to Djakarta, formally to confirm its adherence to the Republic of Indonesia.

239. However, I would like the representative of the Netherlands to make some corrections in the translation, because I, too, know the sentences he has quoted. There are, perhaps, some which are incorrectly translated which might change the whole mean-

ing, and I think that perhaps Professor Yamin can help him in that translation.

240. Though we may differ and disagree in national or international questions, I think that we may call upon Professor Yamin and put him at the disposal of the Netherlands delegation to make the translation of the phrases just mentioned by the representative of the Netherlands.

241. I must ask the President's indulgence for a few minutes. I want to refer to the statement made by the representative of Australia. Australia and Indonesia are close neighbours. In this present world, we have no differences of principle with Australia. I do not think that Australia has any ambitions for territorial aggrandizement. Nor has Indonesia any expansionist ambition. We do not need that. We have ample territory—exploited and unexploited—the same as Australia. So we have no fear of that country.

242. As far as social systems are concerned, Australia has its own social system and we have ours. We do not want to export our social system, nor does Australia want to export its own. So we have no differences of principle with Australia. Thus, there is fertile ground, a fertile common base on which we can, I think, co-operate. I think that Australia will certainly realize, too, that the security of Indonesia is the security of Australia. That is true in all fields. In the political and economic fields, we can co-operate and give assistance to each other. If there is a difference at the present time, I do not even view it from the point of view of racial differences. It is only because the historical backgrounds are different, which means that for the time being we may have differences in outlook, either domestic or in foreign affairs.

243. In saying this, I would remind the representative of Australia how much he too cherishes West New Guinea, because it is close to Australia. I would remind him that the territory of the Indonesian Republic is closer to Australia. Timor is closer. Timor is just 100 miles from Darwin—even closer, I think, than the closest point of New Guinea to Australia. In addition, I would remind him that he should take into consideration the fact that 90 million Indonesians living as an umbrella north of Australia are perhaps also of importance for Australia. Without underrating its affections or the course of past relations, relations with the Netherlands, not underrating all that, I would remind him that in Indonesia the 90 million people who are living as an umbrella above Australia—to the North of Australia—think they are very important to Australia in all respects.

244. The representative of Australia also referred to the historical background and geographical position of East Irian, on which I am not competent to comment. I would like to make some comments about the population of West Irian, which is closely associated with Indonesia. In that, he is wrong in saying that those peoples have no affiliation or contact with the outside world. The mere fact that immediately after the proclamation of independence, a delegation from West Irian—and I mention the name of Mr. Jouwe and Mr. Papare—presented a letter to our President to confirm in writing its inclusion in the territory of the Republic, is enough to show that they also had political consciousness at that time. More than that, they even asked not to be separated from the Republic of Indonesia, not to be amputated from the Republic of Indonesia. But why, too, is West Irian coming into contact

with the outside world? Because of us, West Irian is the shrine, the symbol of our freedom. Why? Because in West Irian there is the place—the concentration camp of Boven Digul—where Indonesians who are struggling for their independence are incarcerated. Before the war it was the most notorious concentration camp, the largest concentration camp in that region, to which not only Indonesians from Java, but from other territories were exiled. Today Indonesians from West Irian are put into that same concentration camp, which is still in operation.

245. It is for that reason, too, that West Irian is a shrine, a symbol, of the struggle for independence. For that reason, whatever may be the judgement of this Assembly as to the merits or demerits of Indonesian's claims, nobody can deny that West Irian has ties with Indonesia, that West Irian has ties with the Indonesian Proclamation of Independence, and that West Irian is, too, a certain problem in the Netherlands-Indonesian dispute.

246. So, regarding the principle of self-determination, which has been advocated so sincerely and genuinely by the representative of Australia, I would invite him to compete with Indonesia in the implementation of, and devotion to, this principle of self-determination. We have given more than half a million of our lives, of our sons, for this problem—more, perhaps, than Australia lost in two world wars. So we do not need to be educated in this question of self-determination. We fought for it. It is due, I think, to our struggle, together with those of other peoples, that there emerged resolution 1514 (XV). Certainly, without that struggle without the sacrifice of more than half a million Indonesians, this resolution would not have merged in the Assembly. We have made our contribution. So, in this Respect we are in favour of, we are devoted to, this principle of self-determination. To amputate the territory of other nations is only to abuse this principle of self-determination.

247. I would like just one more minute to speak about the use of force. It is true, as has been said this afternoon, that we—President Sukarno and I—promised not to use force in the solution of the West Irian problem.

248. That is true, and I think we will still keep that promise if, of course, the problem of West Irian is still the subject of conflict between the Netherlands and Indonesia. But if the Netherlands were not conspiring and using every effort to make the amputation, to make the secession a fait accompli, then there would be no conflict between the Netherlands and us. And nobody, as has just been explained by the representative of the Netherlands, can deny that West New Guinea is a dispute between the Netherlands and Indonesia. Can this dispute between Indonesia and the Netherlands be removed by granting independence to West Irian? Irrespective of the merits or demerits of the respective pleas, there is still a dispute.

249. As we promised before, if this is still a dispute between the Netherlands and us we will not use force. But as soon as they proclaim their independence there is no alternative for us; we did the same when the Republic of South Moluccas was proclaimed on the conspiracy, inspiration and instigation of the Netherlands. Then also we used force, because they proclaimed independence there.

250. In the case of the separatist movement, also inspired by the Netherlands, we have not yet used

force because we can settle it in a political way. It has not yet been proclaimed, this separatism. So that is our position: we will not use force as long as it is a conflict between the Netherlands and Indonesia. We are asking, even recommending, bilateral negotiations to the United Nations. This is our position and I think it would be that of any other country whose territory or part of whose territory had been occupied by force. We maintain that West Irian has been occupied by force; if we had been strong enough at the time I think we would have ejected the Netherlands then.

251. But all right, the balance of power is such that we have to accept that the Netherlands is occupying by force that part of Indonesia. They tried to do it with other parts, with Ambon, with the Celebes, but we managed to use our own strength then. It was only in West Irian that we were much weaker or generally defenceless. It is for this reason that we did not re-occupy this Territory by force and that for twelve years we asked them for negotiations to settle this problem.

252. I am very much interested that the representative of Australia said that this problem cannot be solved bilaterally. Does he really mean that this problem can be solved unilaterally, without Indonesia? Does he really mean, taking the happiness of the people of West Irian into consideration, that he can solve this problem without the co-operative spirit of Indonesia? I think even the people there would be unhappy.

253. Of course, if the representative of Australia is saying that there are people there asking for independence, total independence, that is true. After ten years of colonial occupation there are some people in the Territory saying: "We want independence; we want to be President; we want to be Vice-President." That is true. But as I said before, that is not typical of Asia or Africa only. We can do the same as European countries, as they did during the German occupation period.

254. But on the other hand, I want to draw the Assembly's attention to the fact that there are numerous leaders now expelled from West Irian to our territory. They were imprisoned, they suffered hardships and everybody knows that in the struggle for freedom the leaders who do not co-operate with the colonial people or the colonial Administration are the real leaders, and they will be chosen as the real leaders. It is a law; we have seen it in Asia and Africa and everywhere. For this reason, this matter also requires most urgent consideration. It is explosive, indeed, because recently in particular the Netherlands has from that Territory expelled more than 2,000 persons—more than 2,000 in only two months—who disagree with the Netherlands policy.

255. The Netherlands is already setting up a flag there; the Netherlands is introducing a national anthem there. Is that the principle of the right of self-determination? Is that in accordance with what the representative of the Netherlands said about having no objection if these people chose to associate themselves with Indonesia? It is for this reason that, in our opinion, this draft resolution [A/L.354] is merely designed to make secession, separatism, a fait accompli. In that case, you cannot expect that Indonesia will just wait for further negotiations with the Netherlands.

The meeting rose at 7.25 p.m.