

MEMORANDUM  
(Doorslag)

Van: Plv. MO

Aan: T

Onderwerp: N.N.G.

15 november 1961.

ZEER GEHEIM

DOFZ  
FOAD  
Z  
DBI/DOA  
DIO/PZ  
Z.E. Bot

In overleg met Z belde ik hedenmiddag Drs. J. Meijer in New York.

1. Refererend aan roed 9495 vroeg ik of M akkoord ging met de daarin gevolgde gedachtengang der Amerikanen namelijk om, ondanks de afwijzende houding van Indonesië, toch hun resolutie te lanceren. Tevoren was immers gesteld dat wij in een dergelijk geval verwachtten dat de V.S. onze ontwerp-resolutie zou steunen. Achttē M in het huidige stadium de kansen van het V.S.-ontwerp groter dan die van onze resolutie?
- Meijer antwoordde dat de Minister thans streeft naar een oplossing die ook door zoveel mogelijk "marginale" delegaties gesteund zal worden. Met behoud van zoveel mogelijk essentiële punten van de Nederlandse voorstellen betekent dit dus het eventueel doen van enkele concessies teneinde een resolutie in stemming te doen komen die kan rekenen op een tweederden meerderheid. M acht inderdaad de kansen van het Amerikaanse ontwerp groter dan die van onze resolutie. Het streven van de Minister is er thans op gericht "Washington actief in de boot te krijgen".
2. Degevaardigd bevestigde Meijer dat het niet onmogelijk is dat, in het kader van bovenstaand streven, het woord "selfdetermination" in het Amerikaanse ontwerp wordt vervangen door "free choice". Meijer vestigde er overigens de aandacht op dat te New York thans een stadium is bereikt waarin ook reeds over andere compromisvoorstellen wordt gesproken, inclusief in de voor ons onaanvaardbare zin van instelling van een commissie van goede diensten.
3. Het overleg Luns-Hersee was heel kort. Het speelde zich af tijdens een receptie. Hersee beloofde Menon te zullen inlichten en te zullen opdragen contact met de Nederlandse delegatie op te nemen. Een dergelijk eerste contact vond gisteren plaats. Hierbij bleek dat Menon inderdaad door Hersee was ingelicht. Op mijn vraag of de delegatie meende dat er kans bestond op een onthouding van India, antwoordde Meijer dat bemiddeling meer waarschijnlijk was.
4. De rede van Liberia acht de delegatie bijzonder teleurstellend, namelijk omdat President Tubman Minister Luns steun had toegezegd. De volledige tekst van de Liberiaanse rede wordt ons geseind. Meijer vroeg met spoed een nieuwe démarche te Monrovia te doen ondernemen en suggereerde een telegrafische boodschap van Prof. de Quay aan Pres. Tubman.

- Afgezien -

# MEMORANDUM

(Doorslag)

Van:

Aan:

- 2 -

Onderwerp:

Afgezien van in herinnering brengen van beoebende belofte zou de strekking moeten zijn Liberia te vragen zich althans van stemming te onthouden en zich voorts te onthouden van initiatieven waarvan het Liberia bekend is dat wij die niet kunnen accepteren (goede diensten).

5. Ondanks avondzittingen vordert het debat over dekolonisatie langzaam. Nog 42 sprekers staan ingeschreven voor het Algemeen Debat. Meijer verwacht dat het resolutiestadium niet voor tweede helft volgende week zal worden bereikt.
  6. Meijer onderstreepte nog eens dat de Nederlandse pers te New York regelmatig en uitvoerig wordt ingelicht. Hij verzocht derhalve hier aan de pers niet meer te verklaren dan strikt noodzakelijk, zulks om discrepanties te vermijden.
  7. Het "Aide Mémoire" waar de radio van hedenmorgen van sprak en dat aan alle delegaties zou zijn toegezonden, was niet een nieuw stuk doch slechts een uittreksel uit het memorandum van 4 november (A/4954), welk uittreksel slechts aan een aantal delegaties was verstrekt om hen nog eens de belangrijkste punten kort en duidelijk uiteen te zetten.
  8. Hedenavond (= vannacht Nederlandse tijd) zal Mr. Schurmann, gebruikmakend van het recht van antwoord, spreken ter weerlegging van een aantal punten uit de rede van Soebandrio. De tekst van deze interventie wordt ons geseind.
-

Nummer - 7258

**Bijlage** - 1...

**Rede van Mr. Schurmann in de plenaire Vergadering  
op 15 november 1961**

When the Netherlands Government decided to make the proposals which are contained in our draft resolution (document A/L. 354) it did so for two reasons:

The first one was that, having voted in favour of resolution 1514 in last year's Assembly, we felt in honour bound to comply with its terms in respect of the only remaining Non-Self-Governing Territory under our 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.

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.

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

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

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 was made clear 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.

In his statement His Excellency Mr. Subandrio repeated all the old accusations and utterances of resentments 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.

Although we 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 the distinguished Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia up 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.

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 part of the territory of the Republic of Indonesia, and that we were therefore not entitled to make the proposals we have made.

These arguments are:

- 1/ that, when Dr. Sukarno and Dr. Hatta proclaimed the independence of Indonesia on the 17th of August 1945, they acted not only in the name of all Indonesians, but also in that of the Papuans of West New Guinea and thereby exercised the right of self-determination of the Papuans for the Papuans;
- 2/ that Indonesia, being the successor state to the Netherlands, should include all the territories which had formed part of the former Netherlands East Indies; and
- 3/ that, under the terms of the Charter of Transfer of Sovereignty dated 2 November 1949, 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.

With regard to the background to the Proclamation of Independence of the 17th of 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 deny the authority, namely the book written by Professor Muhammad Yamin, the eminent historian and statesman who is a Cabinet Minister and a prominent member of the Indonesian delegation, entitled: *Naskah persiapan undang-undang dasar 1945*; which means: *The preparing of the draft for the Constitution of 1945*.

In that very interesting book Professor Yamin relates verbatim the discussions 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 a few of the statements that were then made.

On page 203 of Part I of his book Professor Yamin reproduces a statement made by Dr. Hatta on the 11th of July 1945 concerning the extent of the future Indonesia. It reads as follows:

"I base 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 wishes to relinquish Papua, which formerly was under Netherlands rule, to Indonesia, I have no objection to that, but I would not wish to demand it, and if the territory of Papua could be exchanged for North Borneo I would have no objection to that either, but would rather be grateful for it."

.....

"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 that the people of Papua too has the right to become a free nation.*"

On page 212 Professor Yamin gives Dr. Hatta's summing up of his own views, where he quotes Dr. 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 Dr. Hatta had said (pages 201/202):

"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 Island 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?"

And what did Dr. 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 he said:

"I have never taken the view that Indonesia should only consist 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"

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

.....  
 "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."

.....  
 "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. Japan will decide what the territory of Indonesia will be."

I am tempted to quote more from this fascinating book, Mr. President, but the quotations I have made suffice to prove,

that of the two Indonesian leaders who proclaimed Indonesian independence, Dr. Hatta held the view that Papua (he and Dr. Sukarno both used the word Papua which apparently was not considered insulting at that time, as Ambassador Sukardjo says it is now), I repeat, Dr. 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. And Dr. Sukarno said that Indonesia should not consider itself the successor to the Netherlands 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.

How can one reconcile these statements with the assertion that is now made that West New Guinea is a natural part of Indonesia, that its inhabitants are Indonesians, and that Dr. Sukarno and Dr. Hatta proclaimed independence on their behalf? As I have pointed out before: at the time of the Proclamation of Independence Indonesia had been for three years – and still was – occupied by Japan, whereas New Guinea had remained largely under Netherlands administration. There was no communication between the two and it was therefore only natural that Dr. Sukarno said that he did not know what the desires of the Papuans were.

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 its claim).

\* 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”,

and in view of 5 other reasons, among them

“the limited research that has been undertaken and completed with respect to the problems involved in the question of New Guinea”,

“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.”

The decision therefore was that in regard to New Guinea the *status quo* was maintained. 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”.”

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 either, appears from a note to one of the other agreements signed at the Round Table Conference which reads:

"None of the provisions of 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".

In keeping with these agreements the Netherlands negotiated with Indonesia, not for one, but for two years, 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 them. It was only at the end of 1951 that Indonesia suddenly took up a new position: namely that sovereignty *had already been transferred* to them. On that new interpretation of the agreements we offered to ask – and to abide by – the opinion of the International Court of Justice. Indonesia refused to do so and has steadfastly adhered to this refusal.

Meanwhile, however, the General Assembly itself decided the question.

On June 29, 1950, the Permanent Representative of the Netherlands informed the Secretary-General of the United Nations that the Government of the Netherlands would "no longer submit information on Indonesia to the Secretary-General under Article 73e, since sovereignty over Indonesia, *with the exception of Netherlands New Guinea*, had been transferred to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia".

And on December 12, 1950 the General Assembly adopted a resolution, proposed by the delegation of India (number 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 73e on Indonesia *with the exception of West New Guinea*;

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;

Requests the Special Committee on information transmitted under Article 73e 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".

Now, if sovereignty over West New Guinea had already been transferred to Indonesia (or even if Indonesia had only thought that it had been so transferred),



Indonesia would of course have made a violent protest against this recognition of West New Guinea as a Non-Self-Governing Territory under Netherlands administration and to be reported on by the Netherlands.

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".

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.

It was not until the next report was submitted (when Indonesia had meanwhile thought up the idea of interpreting the Charter of Transfer of Sovereignty in another way) that Indonesia protested. Nevertheless, although the Netherlands has submitted reports on West New Guinea now for twelve years, Indonesia has never proposed a resolution 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.

Consequently, as the General Assembly has 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 judgment from the International Court of Justice, which it has refused – and still refuses – to elicit.

When we voted for resolution 1514 (XV) we also approved with our vote the sixth operative paragraph, of that resolution, stating that "any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations". That, Mr. President, 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.

West New Guinea, however, never formed part either of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia or of the present Republic of Indonesia. 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 entitled to decide that it wishes to join Indonesia), but, on the contrary, that the national unity and territorial integrity of West New Guinea should be respected, not only by the Netherlands but also by Indonesia.

This being so, Mr. President, it follows that there can be not the slightest doubt whatever that the Netherlands was legally entitled to make the proposals concerning the Non-Self-Governing Territory of West New Guinea under its administration which it has submitted to the General Assembly.

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 the various resolutions on the subject which our Foreign Minister analyzed in his intervention of November 8.

Our plan is simple and unambiguous.

If adopted, it will mean that:

- a. we will transfer sovereignty over West New Guinea to the people of the territory at the earliest possible moment when the United Nations says we can do so,
- b. the Papuan people will be allowed to exercise its right to determine its own future, by voting either for integration in Indonesia or for any other political status, as soon as a plebiscite can be held by the UN,
- c. 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,
- d. all Dutch military as well as civilian personnel will be withdrawn, unless the UN specifically requests some of them to stay on temporarily,
- e. the Netherlands will continue to pay for the administration on the basis of its present contribution even after our withdrawal,
- f. the initial measure should be the sending of a United Nations fact-finding commission to West New Guinea to report on the situation and the practical feasibility of our plan.

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 we are willing to consider it.

One of the particulars of our plan is that the only immediately effective decision, it requests the Members of the General Assembly to take now, 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 its making will be facilitated by the fact that the Assembly will then have before it an impartial report and consequently will be able to decide with full knowledge of the situation.

Mr. President, we have sincerely done our best. I hope my fellow delegates 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.

-- ..

Nummer 7258

Bijlage 2

**Gedeelte van de rede van Dr. Subandrio  
in de plenaire Vergadering op 9 november 1961**

My intervention this afternoon is directed primarily to the statement we heard yesterday from the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, who introduced in this debate a draft resolution dealing with a part of my country, West Irian.

Yesterday I listened very carefully to the speech of the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, in which he explained his seemingly very generous proposal to decolonize the territory of West Irian, part of the Republic of Indonesia, by relinquishing Netherlands authority there and transferring sovereignty to the people as soon as the United Nations can assume the administrative services which the people themselves are not able to carry out now.

I was particularly attracted by Mr. Luns' declaration that this step of the Netherlands is a rather unique and novel one, never before attempted by any colonial Power.

Well, if one were ignorant of international relations, if one were not too familiar with the struggle against colonialism, if one had never heard about the fierce struggle for independence conducted by the Indonesian people against the colonizers, and if this proposal of Foreign Minister Luns were immediately applicable to the still existing Netherlands colonies, such as Surinam and Curaçao, then I would be the first to congratulate Mr. Luns and express my admiration for his humane and anti-colonial attitude. He would even, I think, deserve the Nobel Peace Prize, like Mr. Luthuli of South Africa.

However, a further examination of the seeming generosity of the Netherlands leads inexorably to a conclusion quite different from that of Mr. Luns.

In the first place – and I wish to emphasize this – Indonesian independence is not the result of a generous Christmas present bestowed upon by the Netherlands. We won our independence in a fierce and cruel war, fought from 1945 to the end of 1949. We sacrificed more than a half-million of our people in the struggle for Indonesian independence. The Netherlands was at that time superior in its physical forces and utilized them with unstinting cruelty. Massacres of the ordinary people became an almost daily occurrence. While we had suffered hardship during the occupation by the Japanese, what they did paled into just a minor harassment in comparison to the Netherlands cruelty.

To give an example, the notorious Captain Westerling managed in a single week to kill forty thousand people in South Celebes – mostly old men, women and children, since the young able to bear arms had fled to the jungles to conduct guerilla warfare against the Netherlands. This episode of our national struggle is still fresh in our minds and the massacre in South Celebes is still commemorated every year as a reminder to the people that our independence was achieved through fighting and heavy sacrifice.

Even after the recognition of our independence by the Netherlands at the end of 1949, the Netherlands still continued with their colonial policies of subversion against the young republic. They instigated the proclamation of the so-called Republic of the South Moluccas in an attempt to divide Indonesia. We crushed this separatist movement within a few days with our military means. The Netherlands then conspired uprisings everywhere and dispatched for this purpose again the

notorious Captain Westerling to Indonesia. Under the leadership of Captain Westerling, a coup was attempted against the central Government, but the coup did not succeed.

After this failure, the Netherlands concentrated on bedeviling the problem of West Irian, going so far as to include this disputed territory in their Constitution as a territory within the Netherlands Kingdom. Whereas originally the temporary maintenance of the Netherlands occupation administration in West Irian was done as a policy of expediency to allay Netherlands domestic reactions to the loss of Indonesia, the Netherlands now began using this territory as a base for increasing Indonesia's difficulties and subverting other territories of Indonesia. This anti-Indonesian attitude of the Netherlands further manifested itself in their steady refusal to enter into bilateral discussions on the substance of the problem of West Irian. When it came to procedural discussions, they went so far as to keep an Indonesian delegation waiting for two months in the Netherlands before they deigned to attend the meeting. Further, just to exhibit his contempt towards the Indonesians, Mr. Luns, during the 1955 Conference in Geneva, suddenly left to spend some weeks of vacation on the Mediterranean.

I only mention these things in order to illustrate the vehemently anti-Indonesian sentiments of the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands. He will exploit to the utmost every opportunity to humiliate Indonesia and the Indonesian people. From 1954 tot 1957, we submitted to the General Assembly of the United Nations very moderate resolutions which merely sought a General Assembly recommendation for peaceful negotiations between Indonesia and the Netherlands on the problem of West Irian. Even this Mr. Luns refused, on the pretext that West Irian is a domestic affair of the Netherlands. Later, in 1959, the Netherlands dispatched the aircraft carrier Karel Doorman to Indonesia with a specific Netherlands explanation that it was designed to suppress certain aspects of the aggressive policy of Indonesia towards the Netherlands. This is our experience with the Netherlands since the Second World War, during this period of decolonization.

After all these experiences, no one in Indonesia and, I hope, no one in this august Assembly, can regard the Netherlands' attitude as one of great generosity towards colonial problems, I think that Mr. Luns himself must feel uneasy about this statement regarding the novelty of the Netherlands disinterested decolonization when confronted with his own actions in the recent past. I shall come back to this subject later.

Secondly, if the Foreign Minister is really so generous and progressive in the advancement of humanity, why does he not apply his proposal in the case of Curaçao and Surinam, which are every minute of the day awaiting release from colonial bondage? Instead, he has seen fit to apply his proposal exclusively to the territory of a sovereign and independent State, or, at least, to a disputed territory.

Thirdly, if the Netherlands are adopting a generous attitude in the struggle against colonialism, why do they not support the peoples of Algeria and Angola who are sacrificing thousands and thousands of their people in the heroic struggle for freedom?

From these examples, it will be seen that nothing is left of the generosity of the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands.

One may now ask why the Netherlands is suddenly coming with its proposal of

so-called decolonization of part of Indonesian territory, reoccupied by force by the Netherlands, even with the additional inducement of a payment of \$ 30 million a year. Some may say that this is a big concession on the part of the Netherlands. Well, again it has nothing to do with concessions.

Present-day realities sooner or later had to force the Netherlands Government to terminate its old colonial policy. However, even in this respect, compared with other colonial Powers the Netherlands is behind schedule, and up till now it still clings to its colonies in Curaçao and Surinam. And what are the realities that compelled the Netherlands Foreign Minister to appear generous? First, it was the pressure of world public opinion for the abolition of colonialism everywhere, in all its forms and manifestations, as expressed by Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Secondly, it was the danger that the Netherlands would be ejected from West Irian by the anti-colonial forces in Indonesia itself. Yes, as was not the case a few years ago, the anti-colonial forces in Indonesia are today physically able to remove Netherlands colonialism from West Irian within a short period.

Indeed, whatever our feelings may be towards the policy carried out by the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, he has given me and many of us a very instructive, though perhaps not very constructive, experience. And that is that the Netherlands colonial policy can be faced and surmounted by the application of our national strength in its entirety – political, economic and military. This policy we call the policy of total confrontation.

Regrettably, we have had to divert a substantial part of our national income for the purchase of armaments, which otherwise could have been used for national reconstruction and the social welfare of the Indonesian people. But it was only through this policy of total confrontation that the Netherlands began to realize that their illegal occupation of West Irian by armed force can also be ejected by the opposing forces of Indonesia itself. This realization, together with the universal pressure for decolonization, has created a favourable climate in the Netherlands public opinion for relinquishing their power in West Irian.

Our policy of total confrontation has been denounced by the Netherlands as a policy of duress. But, in the light of the historical background of Indonesia's struggle for independence, I hope that it has become clear to this august Assembly who has used duress and suppression by virtue of superior military power from 1945 to 1949; who used duress and suppression in the reoccupation of West Irian by armed force; who is employing the tactics of duress, suppression and intimidation in dispatching the aircraft carrier Karel Doorman to Indonesian waters? Need I go on?

We are, in all humility, only arming ourselves – sometimes at the cost of tightening our belts – in order to defend our national integrity from the assaults and subversion of the Netherlands colonial power.

We gave ample proof of our peaceful nature from 1954 tot 1957, when we came to the United Nations for support. But our resolutions, though supported by a substantial majority, could not attain the required two-thirds majority vote. So we were left on our own to meet the duress and subversion of the colonial Power. What are we supposed to do? Submit abjectly to the whims of Netherlands foreign policy? That we could not and we will not do that.

The 90 million people of Indonesia have their national pride and their feelings of

self-respect. It proclaimed its independence on 17 August 1945 and it has defended it in bitter warfare. If the anti-colonial war was stopped at the end of 1949, it was only in the conviction and hope at that time that our further problem with the Netherlands could be solved in a co-operative spirit and peaceful manner. We have always hoped that the Netherlands would accept the relinquishment of its remaining colonial territory in Indonesia as a matter of progress in human relations and not as a setback in its national life.

We certainly never anticipated that this problem of West Irian – the least explored and the least exploited part of Indonesia, inhabited only by 700,000 people – would create such a problem that Indonesia would be faced with the possibility of having to take up arms again to complete its independence.

I know that this Assembly up till now has not always been in a position to prevent a colonial Power from using its superior military strength against colonized or ex-colonized peoples. On the other hand, I sincerely hope that this Assembly will not denounce it as duress if colonized or ex colonized peoples are forced to take up arms against the aggressive and mostly arrogant forces of a colonial Power.

We now have reached a stage in which the Netherlands, for the reasons I have already mentioned, is prepared to relinquish its power in West Irian. If the favourable political climate that has led to this stage is exploited to the utmost, and if both sides have the sincere desire to solve this dispute, then I think a compromise formula can always be found between the two sides. Unfortunately, however, this is not being done. Instead, the Netherlands is making use of the present favourable climate to ignore Indonesia, which has its rightful claims, and thereby worsen the relationship between our two countries.

But even assuming that the Netherlands is not interested in an accommodation with Indonesia – even then their present actions in West Irian are not those which the Foreign Minister, Mr. Luns, sought to convey to this Assembly.

With the appearance in the Netherlands of a favourable climate for relinquishing power in West Irian, there was a sudden increase in the number of West Irian people expelled from their homes. In the recent general debate I had already stated that the rate of refugees is about one hundred a month.

Well, I must stand to be corrected. On my way home to Djakarta this past October, I stopped in Singapore and was met by 1,100 refugees who were being transported by ship from West Irian to Djakarta. Now, at this time, another ship with more than 1,000 people is again on its way to Djakarta. The anti-Indonesian campaign in West Irian, with house-to-house canvassing is increasing daily. It is accompanied by physical suppression of those who dare to raise their voices in favour of joining the Republic. The Netherlands authorities are already hoisting a so-called West Irian national flag and introducing a so-called national anthem in the artificial attempt to create the symbols of an independent West Irian State. They have substituted the Dutch language for the Indonesian language as the *lingua franca* in West Irian.

There are the real facts, in stark contrast to the suave and conciliatory words of the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands that the people of West Irian are free to join Indonesia.

We thought that if the West Irian people are to be given a free choice, then at least the anti-Indonesian campaign in West Irian, the expulsion of thousands of

people who wish to associate themselves with the Republic of Indonesia, would be immediately stopped. Certainly the introduction – or, more correctly, I should say imposition – of a so-called national flag and so-called national anthem for West Irian cannot but be meant to prejudice the outcome of the so-called free choice in the most obvious direction.

Let me stress again that if the Netherlands is interested in an accommodation with Indonesia, if the Netherlands is interested in solving its dispute with Indonesia, I recognize in advance that such an accommodation must be a compromise between the points of view of both sides. I can say in advance that such an accommodation will not be based 100 per cent upon Indonesian terms, nor 100 per cent upon Netherlands terms. I can see no reason why, if both sides approach this problem with sincerity, a formula cannot be found on the questions of self-determination and the authority of the United Nations.

But what happens now? The Foreign Minister of the Netherlands entirely ignored the existence of Indonesia in his first statement in the general debate. He entirely ignored the existence of the Republic of Indonesia in the draft resolution submitted by the Netherlands delegation. We appreciated his politeness yesterday in referring to Indonesia as a nation which may also be interested in the West Irian problem. But in view of the Netherlands actions in West Irian itself, I doubt whether even this slight and belated reference to Indonesia is really sincere, or merely an effort to exhibit a certain amount of reasonableness in this international forum for the purpose of gaining votes.

We thought that the Netherlands Government would have exploited the favourable political climate in the Netherlands to sound out what the reactions may be in Indonesia. If this could not be done directly, certainly any other nation could have been found to make the first soundings. In this respect, the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands found the excuse – and I quote from his statement:

“... because Indonesia has broken off diplomatic relations with my country (the Netherlands) and has even gone so far as to refuse to accept the normal procedure in such cases, which is that a third country should be allowed to represent the Dutch interests in Indonesia”. (A/PV. 1049, p. 13-15)

It is true that we have broken off diplomatic relations with the Netherlands and a few months later, following the Netherlands attempt at intimidation with the intrusion of their aircraft carrier *Karel Doorman* in Indonesian territorial waters, we decided that the time had come to eliminate all remnants of relations with the Netherlands.

Feelings have run so high in Indonesia that it is becoming a national demand that we prepare ourselves for a final show-down with the Netherlands in defense of our national integrity. It seems that the Netherlands will never stop harrasing Indonesia, will never stop subverting Indonesia, will never stop trying to humiliate Indonesia as long as they feel themselves to be militarily superior to Indonesia.

The colonial war from 1945 to 1949 appears not to have been long enough for the Netherlands. The creation of a separatist movement, culminating in the proclamation of the Republic of the South Moluccas, appears also not to have been the final act in its hostility towards Indonesia. Now it is preparing to turn the last act of this



Indonesian-Netherlands drama into an accomplished fact with the separation of West Irian from the rest of Indonesia.

At this stage of the debate I do not intend to discuss in detail the draft resolution submitted by the Netherlands. But, for the sake of clarifying matters for those fellow-representatives who were not present during the sessions from 1954 to 1957, permit me to state a few facts.

First, Indonesia is not claiming any other people's territory. The Indonesian people as a whole would feel ashamed if their anti-colonial struggle were to degenerate into expansionism and result in colonizing other people. The Indonesian people under the leadership of President Sukarno are not only fighting for their own national independence but, in all humility I can state here, they are contributing consistently to the struggle for independence of other peoples in Asia and Africa.

West Irian, called West New Guinea by the Netherlands, was part of the Netherlands East Indies. This is an historical fact. The name "Netherlands East Indies" was in 1949 constitutionally altered by the Netherlands themselves into the name "Indonesia" in the Constitution of the Netherlands Kingdom.

Ample quotations from Netherlands official statements can be adduced to confirm not only the fact that West Irian is part of Indonesia but also that there was, during the conference between Indonesia and the Netherlands leading to the peace settlement, no question of separating the administrative "residency" of West Irian from the Indonesian State. To mention only a few, in its report to the United Nations on Indonesia during 1948 and 1949, the Netherlands Government officially stated:

"Indonesia consists of a series of island groups in the region of the Equator extending from the mainland of Asia to Australia. The principal groups are the Greater Sunda Islands (Java, Madura, Sumatra, Borneo and Celebes with their adjoining smaller islands), the Lesser Sunda Islands (Bali, Lombok, Sumbawa, Flores, Timor, Sumba, Roti and other smaller islands), the Moluccas and New Guinea west of 141 degrees E. longitude."

Further, Dr. H. J. van Mook, the then Lieutenant Governor-General of Indonesia, in a Dutch-sponsored conference in Den Pasar (Bali) in 1946 about the forming of the sub-State "East Indonesia", stated emphatically that "it is decidedly not the intention of the Government (of the Netherlands) to exclude New Guinea from Indonesia".

Thus, there was not the slightest doubt among all parties that the whole of Indonesia – that is to say, West Irian included – would constitute the territory of the new independent State of Indonesia, which is indeed only logical and natural. Confirming this agreement, Dr. van Roijen, the official Netherlands representative in the Security Council, stated in that Council on 22 December 1948 on the question of the independence of Indonesia as follows:

"As I explained at the outset, this dispute is not about the question of whether or not Indonesia will become independent. All parties agree that what used to be the Netherlands East Indies should become an independent

State, as soon as possible." (Security Council Official Records, Third Year, No. 132, 388th meeting, 22 December 1948, p. 11)

This was indeed the agreed basis for the end of the colonial war and the recognition of the birth of a newly independent nation: Indonesia, comprising the whole territory of the former Netherlands East Indies.

Indonesian unity among all peoples, whatever their ethnic group or racial differences, has thus always been recognized, also by the Netherlands Government. In its official report on Indonesia to the United Nations in 1948, the Netherlands Government stated:

"Racially, the indigenous people (of Indonesia) may be divided into Malays in the West and the Papuans in the East. As these races have to a considerable extent intermixed, they are not separated by clearly defined boundaries".

Then in December 1948 Dr. van Roijen, the Netherlands representative in the Security Council, explained further that:

"... the population of Indonesia consists of about seventeen main ethnic and linguistic groups which, in their turn, contain a still greater number of sub-groups... Common existence under the Netherlands Crown has created a sense of Indonesian nationality and the will toward an Indonesian State." (*Ibid.*, pp. 19 and 20)

This of course is only partly true, because before the arrival of the Netherlands there was an even bigger State, the Ciriwidjaja Empire, which crossed from Africa to the east, to what is now West Irian and even to the eastern part of the island, and from Thailand to the Indian Ocean.

All these historical facts are well known to most Members of this Assembly, and yesterday the representative of Saudi Arabia again explained these facts very lucidly and convincingly.

In fact, speaking of ethnological groupings in South East Asia as a whole, there are also the larger groupings of Melanesians in the western and Polynesians in the eastern part. This talk of racial groupings is of course irrelevant to this subject of Indonesia's independence. What counts is that the Indonesian people – both from the eastern and western part, and indeed of every part no matter what racial differences may exist – have for centuries already formed a national entity and an Indonesian nationality, as the Netherlands themselves have confirmed.

After all, I believe that the population of practically every nation State is composed of different racial or ethnic groups, and in fact some very distinct racial groupings are often discernible. There is nothing startling about this; it is the normal state of affairs.

Therefore, it is cheap and vicious for the Netherlands to have tried to use ethnic differences to obtain their political ends against Indonesia. They say that the people in West Irian are of a "negrito" type and thus related to the races in Africa and hence, like them, should have their own independence. This is not only an incorrect but a very misleading, if not insidious, statement indeed. First, the

so-called "negrito" Indonesians are found not only in West Irian but all over the eastern part of Indonesia – called the Moluccas – and even in isolated places in Sumatra and Java. As the Netherlands official statement, which I have already quoted, clearly said:

"As these races (in Indonesia) have to a considerable extent intermixed, they are not separated by clearly defined boundaries."

So I do not think that these arguments of Netherlands propaganda will deceive anyone.

If one wants to make racial arguments, it should be noted that Indonesians are racially very closely related to the people of Malaya and the Philippines. We even speak the same language as do the Malaysians in the Federation. However, I assure you that from the Indonesian side there have never been any territorial claims whatsoever towards Malaya nor towards the Philippines. This is also true in reverse. They are independent and sovereign States in their own, as we are, and we are happy for that. Even in regard to the large island of Borneo – what we call Kalimantan – whose northern part is British territory, and likewise as regards one half of the island of Timor, which is Portuguese, we have no territorial claims at all; because what we consider to be Indonesian and Indonesian territory is nothing else but the entire territory of the former colony: the Netherlands East Indies. Thus we also have no claim as regards the eastern half of the island of New Guinea, which is administered by Australia.

West Irian, as part of the former Netherlands East Indies, is of course Indonesian and Indonesian territory. To call our right in West Irian a territorial claim is indeed a deliberate distortion of fact and of history, designed to confuse the issue and to justify the unjustifiable colonial occupation of that territory by the Netherlands.

The Foreign Minister of the Netherlands has pronounced very loudly the right of self-determination for the people of West Irian. But loud voices do not alter the facts of history. He tried to cover up the fact that people of West Irian have already exercised their right of self-determination – not as an ethnic group as the Netherlands desires, but as part of the Indonesian nation which in 1945 comprised 70 million people.

Mr. Luns also suggested that the West Irianese have never fought or been associated with the fight against Netherlands colonialism in Indonesia. Let us look at the facts. During the Netherlands colonial period, it was in West Irian that the Netherlands established the notorious concentration camp, Boven Digul, to which political leaders in Indonesia were banished. Thousands of freedom fighters lived in banishment and in misery in that concentration camp, and hundreds perished from disease and maltreatment. Thus, West Irian was stained with the blood of many Indonesian freedom fighters. The people in West Irian knew full well what the fight for Indonesian independence meant and they were closely associated with this fight.

Thus, when Indonesia's freedom was proclaimed in 1945, the people in West Irian immediately and actively participated in the defence of the Republic. Local political parties were set up, led by West Irianese themselves, such as the *Partai*

*Kemerdekaan Indonesia Irian* which means Irian Party for Independent Indonesia, led by West Irian leader, Silas Papare. However, when the Netherlands forces re-occupied West Irian, political freedom was suppressed and the leaders of political parties were imprisoned or expelled from the territory.

The people in West Irian never wanted to be separated from Indonesia. When the Netherlands-sponsored conference in Den Pasar, Bali, was to be convened in 1946 under the Chairmanship of Dr. Van Mook, the Lieutenant-Governor at that time, the remaining political leaders in West Irian sent a message to the Netherlands authorities on 12 December 1946 demanding: (a) that West Irian shall not be excluded from the Indonesian Federation and shall remain a part of Indonesia; (b) that a representative group from West Irian be allowed to go and participate in the Den Pasar Conference; (c) that West Irian shall not be re-colonized. This message was signed by the following persons in West Irian: C. M. Kre, M. Indey and N. Jouwe, themselves West Irian people. As a matter of fact, Mr. Indey is now accompanying the Netherlands delegation as adviser in connexion with the debate of the West Irian issue.

May I say here that we are very glad that the Netherlands delegation has brought some people from West Irian to this Assembly, and we hope that since, on our delegation, there are also people from West Irian, these people may be allowed to talk to each other, to sit together and to go out with each other. We hope that the Netherlands delegation will give full freedom to these West Irian people to meet other West Irians here in New York, without a watch dog, without the supervision of a Dutchman. I say this because, unfortunately, when the West Irians met accidentally at a restaurant and they started to have a friendly talk, the Netherlands supervisor or watch dog immediately paid the bill for the meal without even allowing the West Irian people of the Netherlands delegation to finish eating; they are not allowed to make contact with their own West Irian people, although they come from the same villages. For our part, we permit the West Irian people on the Netherlands delegation to talk with the West Irians on our delegation. We would permit the West Irians of the Netherlands delegation to try to convince those on our delegation that they should either become an independent people or become part of the Netherlands. We wish that there would be freedom of movement and freedom of contact between the West Irians on both delegations, especially since they come from the same villages.

I could mention many, many other instances of expressions of opinion in West Irian in favour of remaining with the Republic of Indonesia, in opposition to the already ill-concealed Dutch attempts to maintain their colonial hold indefinitely in West Irian, especially on the eve of the Round Table Conference at The Hague in the second half of 1949. If necessary, I shall reveal all these facts in due course.

Those leaders who, both in the past and recently, have been imprisoned in West Irian, including those who have been banished to the still existing concentration camp, Boven Digul, could also reveal many things that refute Mr. Luns' contention that the people in West Irian have not expressed their will for freedom. This is, in fact, a humiliation to the intelligence and the dignity of our people in West Irian that we do not accept.

It is, however, not surprising to hear such statements from the spokesman of the Netherlands Government. It never accepts the fact that even people whom it

chooses to consider backward and uncivilized can express their will for freedom. My friends from Asia and Africa are, I think, as familiar as we are with such statements from colonial Governments.

For all these reasons, we must reject, without any reservation, the Netherlands draft resolution as it now stands. Instead of seeking a compromise formula, we see that the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands is intent on exploiting to the utmost the favourable climate in his country in order to bring to finality his hostility towards Indonesia by separating, under the guise of a generous benefactor dispensing independence to colonial peoples, the territory of West Irian from the rest of Indonesia.

Suddenly, the Netherlands Foreign Minister declares, in all solemnity, that the Netherlands has a sacred mission to bestow sovereignty on the local people of West Irian and that this should be implemented unequivocally. Who who have recently achieved our independence know very well this myth of a *mission sacrée* of the colonial Powers. The result of this Netherlands *mission sacrée* in Indonesia, during three hundred years of colonial rule in the once prosperous and vast Sriwidjaja and Modjopahit Empire, was that when the Netherlands left Indonesia there were only 500 medical doctors, 200 lawyers and 50 graduate engineers for a population of 70 million.

What a difference now under a national administration. Before the war, there were three quarters of a million primary school children – today there are about 11 million primary school children. We have eleven universities with an enrollment of more than 50,000 students, as compared to the 200 Indonesian university students before the war. Even now, what has the Netherlands done for the people of West Irian? In the past ten years there were no more than three university students, whereas even among the refugees coming to our territory from West Irian there are more than a dozen university students.

This difference in the opportunities for human growth and dignity is the essential and crucial difference between a free national society and a colonial society. It spurs us on all the more in our determination to free the people of West Irian from this injustice, from this human tragedy.

For Indonesia, at least this much is clear: once the Netherlands makes the separation of West Irian an accomplished fact, once it proclaims the independence of this territory, as the Republic of South Moluccas was proclaimed, we shall be compelled to use all the means at our disposal to crush such a proclamation, even if it means war with the Netherlands. The sole responsibility for such a situation will rest entirely upon the shoulders of the Netherlands. Every nation would do the same as Indonesia. The proclamation of independence of a part of its national territory, at the instigation of a foreign Power, will be met with force.

It is this attempt to misuse General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) which is now creating unrest in Asia and Africa. As soon as some dissension arises between groupings of people in those regions, the foreign Powers, and in particular ex-colonial Powers, always try to promote separatist movements. To be frank, it is not difficult to create or promote separatism after more than ten years of armed occupation. It is not a phenomenon restricted to Asian and African countries. We have seen it happen also in Nazi-occupied Europe within the context of a policy of divide and rule. I know the Netherlands very well, and if Indonesia were given

the opportunity to occupy the Netherlands for ten years I can assure this Assembly that it would not be difficult for us to create three independent States out of the present integral territory of the Netherlands, employing the pretext of and misusing Assembly resolution 1514 (XV). Even now there are currents in European countries for secession, for separation from the National entity. As a rule, however, these frictions have not been exploited by outside Powers. It is, in this context, indeed a crime and a shame that the colonial Powers are misusing Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) only with reference to Asian and African nations. These nations are already facing enough difficulties in reconstructing and rebuilding their countries. If, in addition, they are forced to face a policy of separatism pursued by the colonial Powers, then their difficulties are compounded – beyond their capacity, perhaps, to control them.

In Indonesia we are determined to face this challenge – preferably by peaceful means through direct contacts or direct mediation of the United Nations. If this is not possible I hope that this Assembly will not deprive the colonized and ex-colonized countries of their right to use all means at their disposal to complete their freedom. In this context I do not beg for a policy of generosity from the side of the Netherlands, which up till now has never shown generosity towards Indonesia. On the contrary, its policy has been characterized always by a shortsightedness and meanness that cost Indonesia the lives of more than half a million of our people and suffering for the whole Indonesian nation from 1945 to the present. What I do wish to do is to address an appeal to the common sense of the Netherlands, even if it is for the sake of its own national interest. Do not push the feeling of hatred towards Indonesia too far. We have our own national pride. And certainly we have all the means – more than in 1945 – to check any aggressive and provocative policy of the Netherlands.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish also to make an appeal to our fellow representatives at this session, and especially those from the countries of Asia and Africa whose nations, like Indonesia, have just re-emerged as sovereign and independent States. Indonesia is well known as a staunch supporter of the struggles for independence everywhere in the world – sometimes to the detriment of its own immediate national interest. In all humility we can say that we have made our contribution to the struggle to end colonialism. The struggle for independence in Asia has made an impact upon and has supported the anti-colonial forces in Africa. Conversely, the fierce and heroic struggle of the African peoples and African leaders for national independence is a big ally in eliminating colonialism, once and for all, in Asia.

In this common struggle against colonialism we have not been divided in the past, and we shall not be divided in the future. It is only with this feeling and determination of unity that we shall make progress in the tremendous task of reconstruction and the rebuilding and consolidation of our nationhood. Whatever may be the differences in the outlook of our policies in the domestic and international sphere, let us not fall into the trap of the colonial policy of divide and rule. We have still to face, even after the achievement of independence, dangerous attempts at penetration and subversion from outside, in either a political, an economic or a military cloak. This we can overcome only if the colonial policy of divide and rule is checked effectively.

This Assembly, as a whole, has a big responsibility in this problem of West Irian. It is not a problem of decolonization, as envisaged by the Netherlands, but primarily a dispute between two sovereign States, Indonesia and the Netherlands. If this Assembly accepts the Netherlands draft resolution (A/L. 354), which means the legalizing of the use of force by the colonial Power to reoccupy a part of Indonesia, it will consequently also imply the legalization of Indonesia's right to eject the Netherlands by force from West Irian – hence, war between two sovereign States. This is not a threat; neither is it sabre rattling. These are the cold facts and the conclusion to which they may lead.

In fact, the Indonesian people is tired of war. The Indonesian people is still suffering from the aftermath of the colonial war. Nothing is dearer to our hearts than to live and to work in peace. But if it is imposed upon us, if we are left with no alternative but to resume the colonial war to complete our independence, then we shall not shrink from that responsibility.