

# "IGNOMINIES"

## HUMAN RIGHTS APPEAL ON INTERNATIONAL VIOLATIONS IN WEST PAPUA

COMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS  
Sub-Commission On The Promotion And Protection Of Human Rights  
**Working Group On Minorities**  
Seventh Session, 14 - 18 May 2001  
Geneva – Switzerland

Prepared by : J. Ottouw, MPE  
Edited & Presented by : Sem Karoba, BWS

***The West Papuan Community***

Website: <http://www.westpapua.org.uk>

Email: [tribal@westpapua.every1.net](mailto:tribal@westpapua.every1.net)

© 2001

# Thou shalt not kill ...

(EXODUS 20:13)

A people cannot be preserved by authority;  
and no people is willing to be preserved.  
A people lives from within, or dies out.

...No one, whether black or white, has the right to stop  
us from fighting for our freedom.  
One thing must be understood by everyone.  
We are not demanding what is not ours; we are  
demanding what is rightfully ours...  
(Lawrence Dloga<sup>1</sup>)

---

<sup>1</sup> Lawrence Dloga was a former Secretary General for the TPN/OPM – Liberation Army of the Free Papua Movement. He was murdered under a blame that he co-operated with the enemies, even though the rumour was developed by the enemies to kill Dloga. [http://www.geocities.com/wp\\_tpnopm](http://www.geocities.com/wp_tpnopm)

# Introduction

**“...Why do you see the speck that is in your brother’s eye, but do not notice the log that is in your own eyes? ...” (Matthew 7:3)**

Let us all be reminded that West Papua is still a specially RELEVANT case, as yet. In its entity, one cannot open up any matter pertaining to Human Rights Violations in West Papua without looking straight into the direct involvement of nearly all nation leaders of the world, decades ago. Today’s Human Rights Violations in that **“Non-Self Governing Territory”** are dated back to the second half of 1950s, and essentially traced back to international political conspiracy, intentionally developed, and specially aimed at sacrificing the territory for the 1960s Cold War’s geo-political and geo-economical interests by the U.S.A. and its allies.

Nearly each of the world’s nations has its respective share of contribution in the territory’s Indonesianisation and its indigenous people’s minorization - not to mention a wide spectrum of Human Rights Violations that have become an integral part to its people’s daily life, as yet.

The question is: **How long do you have to let the Papuans suffer horrendous consequences of Human Rights Violations essentially created by your predecessors, in the KILLING OF A PAPUAN STATE AND NATION?**

Government Administrations, State Administrators, Political Figures, and Diplomatic Plenipotentiaries may have successively passed - but the problem still lingers on an international basis TO BE SETTLED.

**West Papua,**

April 13, 2001

# I. ANTI-PAPUAISM

Anti-Papuaism is the right term to define phenomenon adopted by U.S. President John F. Kennedy and some of his staffs as well as allies in their political attitude toward Papuans, especially in supporting completion of the Indonesia's annexation claim over the territory. The phenomenon is reflected in various humiliating verbal expressions:

"...New Guinea was not was not a part of the world where great powers should be rationally engaged..." (John F. Kennedy to the Dutch diplomats - The Hague, 1961)

"...Those Papuans of yours are some 700.000 and living in the stone-age ..." (John F. Kennedy to the Dutch Ambassador in Washington, 1961).

"...The preposition that a pro-bloc if not communist Indonesia is an infinitely greater threat to them and to us than Indo possession of a few thousand miles of cannibal land..." (P. Komer, JFK's Senior Staff)

**"Why did these individuals reflect their clear hatred to innocent West Papua?"** is the key question. So far, there are three possible reasons that can provide as reasons for such humiliating and improper expressions by leading political figures and leaders of the civilised world's powers:

- (1) Firstly, perhaps they really did not care about the people of West Papua. What they wanted to get out of the territory was the natural resource. Therefore, any efforts or attitudes that could pro-long the time for waiting before the exploitation processes were seriously opposed by the U.S.A. in various ways;
- (2) Besides, the expressions also explain how they had personal hatred against Papuans. These might most probably caused by the death of Michael Rockefeller, 23 year-old in Asmat Region of West Papua, from which time the world started calling Papuans as cannibals. Theoretically, there is no empirical evidence that can provide arguments that Papuans are cannibals and that The Young Rockefeller was "eaten" by Papuans. Our recent findings show that he was not "eaten" as it was told. We are more than prepared to provide guides and assistance in searching the causes of his death, the true story from the Papuans on the death of dedicated Rockefeller, who should

have become a hero for Papuans' liberation, but who was then stopped by mysterious hands in doing his humanitarian work he started some months before his assassination.

The Cold War Era and the fear of the Communist Influence in Indonesia was the reason that forced the Netherlands to come to a compromise and accepted the recolonisation of West Papua by Indonesia, but this could not cause them to verbally express humiliating expressions as they did during that time.

## II. THE ASSASSINATION OF A STATE AND NATION

**In the light of Resolution 1514 (XV) 14 December 1960, Declaration On The Granting Of Independence To Colonial Countries And Peoples:**

*UNGA,... Mindful of the determination proclaimed by the peoples of the world in the Charter of The United Nations to reaffirm faith in fundamental Human Rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women, and of nations large and small and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom (Para. 01) ...*

*UNGA,.. Aware of the increasing conflicts resulting from the denial or of impediments in the way of the freedom of such (colonized) people, which constitutes a serious threat to world peace, (Para. 04) ...*

*Immediate steps shall be taken, In Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the people of those territories, WITHOUT ANY CONDITIONS OR RESERVATIONS, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, WITHOUT ANY DISTINCTION as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy COMPLETE INDEPENDENCE AND FREEDOM (Para. 13, Article 5) ...*

Unilateral territorial transfer of West Papua from its former Political Status as a Non-Self-Governing Territory to its current provincial status under Indonesia is clearly defined as "KILLING OF A STATE AND NATION" - it has become the root of all current Human Rights Violations in the territory.

### II.1. West Papua: A Non-Self-Governing Territory

***“UNGA, ...Solemnly proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end, colonialism in all its form and manifestation (Para. 11)”***

Based on Article 73 (a) and (b) of the Charter, upon UNGA request, a colonial territorial assessment was carried out in 1946, by eight states (Australia, Belgium, Denmark, The Netherlands, New Zealand, UK, and the USA). Based on the territorial assessment made, 72 (seventy two colonies) throughout the world were formally declared as Non-Self-Governing Territory, including West Papua, which had to be prepared for Decolonization, for which purpose, UNGA Resolution 66 (I) of December 14, 1946, containing a Decolonization List was adopted.

In the Round Table Conference between Indonesia and The Netherlands in 1949, the head of the Indonesian Delegation, former Vice President, Mr. Mohammed Hatta had clearly stated, that **he recognized the rights of the West Papuans as a nation to become independent.** The statement had cut out all argumentations raised around the inclusion of West Papua as an integral part of the Republic. The case was dropped. What was done by Soekarno a couple of decades later was merely based on his expansionism ambitions.

Based on the Netherlands Government Official Gazette J.576 of December 22, 1949, it was decided that West New Guinea, would become autonomous, in the early 1950. The process was established, whereby West New Guinea, separated from the Moluccas Regency to become an autonomous territory, headed by a Governor.

## **II.2. UNGA Resolution 1514 (XV), 14 Dec. 1960 and its related DISSEMINATION of information.**

In its Resolution 1695 (XVI) the General Assembly, recalling the ‘Declaration On The granting Of Independence To Colonial Countries And Peoples’ contained in its resolution 1514 (XV), considered that it was essential that the people of the Non-Self-Governing Territories be widely acquainted with the declaration. The Administering Members were requested to take immediate steps for the widest possible circulation and dissemination of the Declaration, through all appropriate media of mass communication

in all The Non-Self-Governing Territories in the principal local languages as well as the languages of the Administering Members.

**West Papuans were officially INFORMED on the process of their freedom by the United Nations.**

After noting the observations of the Committee on Information, the General Assembly adopted Resolution 1697 (XVI) on 19 December 1961, based on considerations that in the light of the 'declaration' contained in its Resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, IMMEDIATE STEPS SHOULD BE TAKEN TO TRANSFER ALL POWERS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES WITHOUT ANY CONDITIONS OR RESER-VATIONS.

### **II.3. Territorial Transfer**

*...Inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as pretext for delaying independence (Para. 13 Article 3).*

Indonesia's territorial claim on West Papua was merely based on Soekarno's expansionist ambitions - no legal ground.

A special Legalistic Approach designed by the USA to assist the accomplishment of Soekarno's ambitions - based on ideological manipulation in cold-war economics and politics - was instrumental in the territorial transfer process. The mediating role of the US diplomat Bunker had totally dictated the Acting UN Secretary-General (U Thant)'s responsibility to ensure and enforce fair implementation of the 'declaration' in the accomplishment of West Papuan Decolonization process.

### **II.4. Denial & Removal From Decolonization**

ABORTION of West Papua as a Non-Self-Governing Territory in the process to its full independence and its subsequent REMOVAL from the UN Decolonization List was a serious violation against UNGA Resolution 1514 (XV) and other related universally applied principles.

The self-explanatory contents of all UNGA Resolutions, related to the Political Status and the Decolonization Process of West Papua are still applicable.

**Political Status:** No articles in the UNGA Resolution 2504 (XXIV) of 19 November 1969, clearly defines **UN General Assembly's** decisions on:

1. The **REMOVAL** of West Papua from UN Decolonization List,
2. The **ABORTION** of West Papua from its Decolonization Process (Process To Freedom),
3. The **DENIAL** of West Papua from its international status as 'Non-Self-Governing Territory', and

The **UN General Assembly's** recognition on:

4. The '**New National Political Status**' of West Papua as a territory, integral part of Indonesia.



### III. THE MURDERERS OF A STATE AND NATION

*All peoples have the rights to self-determination; by virtue of that rights they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development (Para. 13 Article 2).*

*All armed action or repressive measures of all kinds directed against dependent peoples shall cease in order to enable them to exercise peacefully and freely their rights to complete independence, and the integrity of their national territory should be respected (Para. 13 Article 4).*

*Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations (Para. 13 Article 6).*

Actually, a true international conspiracy had occurred in the transferring process of West Papua to Indonesia.

The following outline reflects the UNITED NATIONS and a number of its Member States that had taken part in the West Papuan Decolonization ABORTION Process, i.e., the murder of West Papua as a non-self-governing territory and people. It contains initial master-minders of the process, as well as the list of State Parties that had legitimised the process:

#### III.1. The United Nations:

Total INCAPABILITY of the (Acting) UN Secretary General, **U Thant**, in enforcing all international laws applicable in the defence of the Inalienable Rights of West Papua as a Non-Self-Governing Territory and Nation in process to full independence under UN Decolonization program is unacceptable and much questionable (whereas, the late UN Secretary-General, **Dag Hammarskjöld** was promoting Self-Determination for West Papua - an approach that didn't favour the Dutch nor favoured the Indonesian claim).

"...It was not in the Dutch interests to fight again with Indonesia because of the Papuans. So they had to solve it with Indonesia and they were very willing to come to an agreement with Indonesia. And they were not the only ones because **the United Nations actually played the WORST ROLE in this whole affair... It was the United Nations that had the official role for looking after the RIGHT WAY that the Act Of Free Choice was going in a democratic way...**" (Dr. Hans Meijer, Dutch Historian, ABC Radio National Asia/Pacific program, first broadcast Tue. Apr. 17, 2001 - Documents show Dutch support for West Papua takeover).

"John Stalford's statements..."

### III.2. The USA:

As one of the key initiators and decision-makers, John F. Kennedy and his Administration represented US's Interests in the process.

"...What moves me is my conviction that in our COMMON INTERESTS, the present opportunities for peaceful settlement in this painful matter must not be lost..." (US President John F. Kennedy in his Secret Letter to the Dutch PM de Quay - 2 April 1962).

"...What we are going to do on West New Guinea was in the INTEREST of the United States..." (US Attorney General, Robert F. Kennedy to Indonesia's President Soekarno, Jakarta - 1962).

With Bunker as mediator in the SECRET NEGOTIATIONS, the talks were an unending retreat by the Dutch from their initial standpoint (Dr. Poulgrain, Biak - September 2000).

Kennedy's continuous pressure on both Indonesia and the Netherlands for the settlement of the conflict through SECRET NEGOTIATIONS. The SECRET NEGOTIATIONS were held without any native Papuan Representatives

At the same time, J.F. Kennedy repeatedly used two interesting and questionable terms: for our common INTERESTS and for JUSTICE. For one thing, common interests reflect the Cold War Era and the Natural Resources in West Papua that could be exploited for the economic interests of the West. However, why did President Kennedy search for JUSTICE? Was there any injustice

between Indonesia and the Netherlands, between the U.S.A. and Indonesian? Or was it between Papuans the Americans?

### **III.3. The Netherlands:**

“ ... The Netherlands position, as we understand it, is that you wish to withdraw from the territory of West New Guinea and that you have NO OBJECTION to this territory eventually passing to the control of Indonesia...” (US President John F. Kennedy's Secret Letter to the Dutch PM de Quay - 2 April 1962).

During the SECRET NEGOTIATIONS in 1962 that led to the (New York) Agreement, Jozef Luns' (Dutch Foreign Minister) instructions to the Dutch Representative, van Roijen were so counter-productive in helping to attain SELF-DETERMINATION for the Papuans (Dr. Greg Poulgrain, Biak - September 2000).

In February 1969, the Dutch Foreign Minister, Jozef Luns, said in the cabinet that he was convinced that the Act Of Free Choice would not be honest because if it was honest the Papuans would vote against Indonesia and he was certain that the poll results would not go against Indonesia but that it would be in favour of Indonesia. And that was actually the outcome. But Luns said this already in February 1969 (more than half a year before the Act Of Free Choice). Wasn't this undemocratic and a FARCE.

Dr. Hans Meijer uncovered the incriminating documents, which show the Dutch government of the day gave tacit approval to undemocratic arrangements for the 1969 Act Of Free Choice, an orchestrated voting process by a small number of pre-appointed (Pro Indonesia) tribal leaders, and placed them at gun-point to decide the fate of the territory.

The Dutch Government has launched an inquiry into information contained in SECRET documents on the transfer of Dutch New Guinea - now known as Papua or West Irian - to Indonesia's recolonisation in the 1960s. The documents include the minutes of Dutch cabinet meetings and confidential correspondence with Indonesian officials. The documents contradict claims by successive Dutch governments and Papuan

people that the Netherlands tried to protect the Papuan people from the Indonesian take-over.

Dr. Meijer acknowledges archives from former Dutch Ambassador to Indonesia in 1960s, Mr. Schiff, for the first time that there are some proofs that the Dutch Government indeed had double roles (two faces) during the West Papua Decolonisation Processes. The Netherlands was in fact pretending to help the Papuans, but actually encouraging Indonesia to recolonise the territory. Take an example; approving the outcome of the undemocratic Act of Free Choice on November 19, 1969 is the strongest fact that supports Dr. Meijer's findings.

### III.4. Indonesia:

" ...Jakarta is not interested in the Papuans but in West Irian as territory..." (Brig. General Ali Moertopo, Indonesian Sr. Officer In Charge for the Act Of Free Choice - 1969)

There are absolutely no **acceptable facts** or **even legal** grounds whatsoever in the International law, that can be used to justify Indonesia's territorial claim on West Papua.

**"U.N. SUPPORTED ACT OF ANNEXATION"**, is the right label to define Indonesia's claim of the Territory.

### III.5. Other 81 Nations:

The following nations are well known in West Papua and - was, is, and will be remembered in the territory's history for generations to come as 'Killers Of A Papuan State And Nation' for their direct participation in the 'take-note' and 'adoption' of UNGA Resolution 2504 (XXIV), 19 November 1969, that has put West Papua in a considerable Human Rights Violations situation:

Afghanistan	Honduras	Pakistan
Algeria	Hungary	Panama
Australia	Iceland	Peru
Austria	India	Philippines
Argentina	Iran	Poland

Belgium	Iraq	Portugal
Bulgaria	Ireland	Romania
Burma	Italy	Rwanda
Byelorussia SSR	Japan	Saudi Arabia
	Jordan	Senegal
	Kuwait	Singapore
Cambodia	Laos	South Africa
Canada	Lebanon	South. Yemen
Ceylon	Liberia	Spain
Chile	Libya	Sudan
China	Luxembourg	Sweden
Cuba	Madagascar	Syria
Cyprus	Malaysia	Thailand
Czechoslovakia	Maldives	Tunisia
	Mali	Turkey
Denmark	Mauritania	Ukrainian SSR
Dominican Rep.	Mexico	USSR
	Mongolia	United Arab
Ethiopia	Morocco	Republic
		United Kingdom
Finland	Nepal	Uruguay
France	New Zealand	Yemen
	Nicaragua	Yugoslavia
Greece	Nigeria	
Guatemala	Norway	
Guinea		

#### IV. INITIAL QUESTIONS TO THE U.N. FOR IMMEDIATE CLARIFICATIONS:

Any clarification by the United Nations and formal announcement or dissemination on the following questions will be of much assistance in the West Papuans efforts to settle all matters pertaining to existing Human Rights Violations both Internationally and nationally:

##### A. TERRITORIAL POLITICAL STATUS IN THE LIGHT OF UNGA RESOLUTION 1514(XV), 14 DECEMBER 1960:

1. When was the International Political Status of West Papua as **'Non-Self-Governing Territory'** officially stripped off by the United Nations and, on what legal base?
2. When was the **'Right To Decolonization'** of West Papua officially aborted by the United Nations and, on what legal base?
3. When was West Papua officially excluded by the United Nations from the Decolonization List and, on what legal base?
4. Malaysia, East Timor and West Papua were in the same 'UN Decolonization Program' and in the same Indonesian Annexation Plan. A Thorough and reasonable explanation has to be provided by the United Nations as to why, discrimination occurred in the implementation of all applicable, related international instruments; whereby, in the case of Malaysia all were completely observed - in the case of East Timor all were finally made up, while in the case of West Papua all related international laws were totally ignored and unobserved?

##### B. REFERENDUM PRACTICES IN THE LIGHT OF THE NEW YORK AGREEMENT - 1962:

1. The official exclusion of **'native'** Papuan Representatives in the negotiation process, Papuan Plenipotentiaries in the

signing of the Agreement and intended SECRET NEGOTIATIONS approach adopted.

2. Deliberate shift of the meanings of questionable terminologies applied by the negotiating parties in the New York Agreement - 1962:

- a. Act Of Self-Determination (why Act Of Free Choice?)
- b. '*Musyawarah*' = deliberation (why 'consultation'?)
- a. 'One man one vote' (why 'representation'?)

### **C. TERRITORIAL AND POLITICAL STATUS OF WEST PAPUA IN THE LIGHT OF UNGA RESOLUTION 2504 (XXIV), 19 NOVEMBER 1969:**

The Resolution does not contain any clear definition pertaining to the political status of West Papua. Clarification is required for the following:

1. Articles containing ABORTION of Decolonization in Process, and REMOVAL of West Papua from the UN Decolonization List.
2. Articles containing international formal recognition of the territory as an integral part of Indonesia with all legal backup references related thereto (On what legal basis, West Papua is recognized internationally as a part of Indonesia?)
3. Article 1 of the Resolution contains appreciation for the completion of all tasks of the UN Secretary-General in the implementation of the New York Agreement. The Agreement itself was a fraud. Involvement of UN in support of such a scandalous decolonisation process could be classified as an IGNOMINY.
4. Appreciations in support of international assistance to Indonesia for the development in Irian Jaya as contained in Article 2 of the Resolution (as it could be defined as formal commencement of international presence in the field Natural Resources exploitation that have become

one of the main triggering aspects of today's Human Rights Violations).

5. **'Take-note'** in the adoption of the resolution clearly reflects total incapability of the UNGA and the absolute weakness of the Resolution itself in terms of applicable International Laws.



U.N. NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL  
COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES. A/RES/1514 (XV) 14 DECEMBER 1960.

---

The General Assembly,

Mindful of the determination proclaimed by the peoples of the world in the Charter Of The United Nations to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women, and of nations large and small and to promoter social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

Conscious of the need for the creation of conditions of stability and well-being and peaceful and friendly relations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of all peoples, and of universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion,

Recognizing the passionate yearning for freedom in all dependent peoples and the decisive role of such peoples in the attainment of their independence,

Aware of the increasing conflicts resulting form the denial or of impediments in the way of the freedom of such peoples, which constitute a serious threat to world peace,

Considering the important role of the United Nations in assisting the movement for independence in Trust and Non-self-Governing Territories,

Recognizing that the people of the world ardently desire the end of colonialism in all its manifestations,

Convinced that the continued existence of colonialism prevent the development of international economic cooperation, impedes the social cultural and economic development of dependent peoples and militates against the United Nations ideal of universal peace,

Affirming that peoples may for their own ends, freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources without prejudice to any obligations arising out of international economic cooperation, based upon the principle of mutual benefit, and international law,

Believing that the process of liberation is irresistible and irreversible and that, in order to avoid serious crises, on end must be put to colonialism and all practices of segregation and discrimination associated therewith,

Welcoming the emergence in recent years of a large number of dependent territories into freedom and independence, and recognizing the increasingly powerful tends towards freedom in such territories which have not yet attained independence,

Convinced that all peoples have an inalienable rights to complete freedom, the exercise of their sovereignty and the integrity of their national territory,

Solemnly proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its form and manifestations,

And to this end,

*Declares* that:

1. The subjection of peoples to alien subjection, domination and exploitation constitutes a 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 cooperation.
2. All peoples have the rights to self-determination; by virtue of that rights they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.
3. Inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should NEVER serve as pretext for delaying independence.
4. All armed action or repressive measures of all kinds directed against dependent peoples shall cease in order to enable them to exercise peacefully and freely their rights to complete independence, and the integrity of their national territory shall be respected.
5. Immediate steps shall be taken in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the people of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom.
6. Any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.
7. All states shall observe faithfully and strictly all provisions of the Charter of the United States, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the present Declaration on the basis of equality, non-interference in the internal affairs of all States, and respect for the sovereign rights of all peoples and their territorial integrity.

**THE U.N. RESOLUTION ON THE OUTCOME OF THE “*Act of Free Choice*” IN  
WEST PAPUA, 1969  
RESOLUTION 2504 (XXIV), 19 NOVEMBER 1969**

The General Assembly,

- (1) take note of the report of the Secretary-General and acknowledge with appreciation the fulfilment by the Secretary-General and his Representative of the tasks entrusted to them under the 1962 Agreement between Indonesia and the Netherlands; and
- (2) express appreciation of any assistance provided through the Asian Development Bank, through institutions of the United Nations or through other means to the Indonesian Government in its efforts to promote the economic and social development of West Irian.

Introducing the draft of resolution, the Foreign Minister of Indonesia said that his Government had carried out its responsibility to hold the act of free choice for the people of West Irian, with the assistance, advice and participation of the Secretary-General's Representative, and that the implementation of the final phase of the Agreement was not only the honouring of an international agreement but also the end of a long struggle for the unity and territorial integrity of Indonesia.

The Indonesian minister stated that it was easy to criticize the implementation of such a complex political exercise, especially when measuring it by so-called international standards that did not necessarily fit to conditions and situations in Asia. West Irian was one of the most undeveloped regions of the world, and the special circumstances prevailing there, as well as the complex political background of the question, should be taken into account. The people of West Irian had firmly expressed their will to remain a part of Indonesia.

The Foreign Minister of the Netherlands stated that the interests of the people of West Irian had been the paramount concern of the Netherlands: his country would continue to translate that concern into concrete action that would reflect the modified circumstances.

The Secretary-General and his Representative had carried out their tasks in a exemplary manner, the Netherlands representative said. However, doubts on the part of the Netherlands with respect to the 1962 Agreement had not been moved in the final phase of its implementation. The report of the Secretary-General's Representative confirmed, to some extent, that those doubts were not unjustified, he added. Nevertheless, the Netherlands recognizes and abides by the outcome of the act of self-determination.

The method and procedures applied in the implementation of the act of free choice were widely commented upon.

Ghana and Sierra Leone were among members that expressed reservation concerning the method followed and considered that the people of West Irian had not exercised their right to self-determination within the meaning of the Indonesian-Netherlands Agreement.

Ghana noted it was a matter of record that Indonesia had rejected the method proposed by the Secretary-General's Representative for the act of free choice. Because of the questionable method used in ascertaining the will of the West Irian people, Ghana could not subscribe to a draft resolution that sought a gloss over what it considered to be essential violations of the 1962 Agreement.

Ghana consequently proposed an amendment to the draft resolution. Bu the amendment, the Assembly would:

- (1) take note of the report of the Secretary-General and acknowledge with appreciation the fulfilment by the Secretary-General and his Representative of the tasks entrusted to them under the 1962 Agreement between Indonesia and the Netherlands;
- (2) decide that the people of West Irian should be given a further opportunity, by the end of 1975, to carry out the act of free choice envisaged in the Agreement, and
- (3) express appreciation of any assistance provided through the Asian Development Bank, through institutions of the United Nations or through other means to the Indonesian Government in its efforts to promote the economic and social development of West Irian.

Togo also expressing misgivings about the method chosen, recalled that the General Assembly, by its resolution (1514) of 14 December 1960 (on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples), had emphasized that a lack of political, economic, and social preparation could never serve as a pretext to delay independence of any country. Togo supported Ghanaian amendment. Dahomey and the Democratic Republic of Congo also expressed support for the Ghanaian amendment.

Speaking in support of the six-power draft resolution, Algeria, Burma, India, Iran, Japan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Saudi Arabia, and Thailand variously stated that the issue before the Assembly was NOT one of self-determination of the national unity, but of the affirmation of the national unity and territorial integrity of the Republic of Indonesia. West Irian was a SPECIAL CASE. India said, and the method used for the act of free choice there could not be considered under any circumstances a precedent for cases of self-determination in territories still under colonial domination.

Moreover, Malaysia pointed out, the Agreement was bilateral; any objection or reservation about its implementation should come from the Netherlands and not from the Assembly, which was only called upon to take not (in witness) of the Secretary-General's report.

Saudi Arabia added that the amendment submitted by Ghana did not seek to amend the draft resolution but rather an agreement between two Member States.

Indonesian stressed that no approval was required either of the Agreement itself or of the Secretary-General's report; Indonesia could not accept the Ghanaian amendment in its present form.

On 19 November, a motion by Ghana to have a paragraph-by-paragraph vote on its amendment was rejected by a vote of 58 to 31, with 24 abstentions.

The Ghanaian amendment as a whole was then put to the vote and was rejected by a roll-call vote of 60 to 15, with 39 abstentions.

At the request of the Democratic Republic of Congo, the phrase "Takes note of report of the Secretary-General" in the first operative paragraph of the six-power draft resolution was voted on separately and was adopted by 80 votes to 6, with 14 abstentions. The first paragraph as a whole was then adopted by 86 votes to 0, with 27 abstentions.

The text as a whole was adopted as Resolution 2504 (XXIV) by a roll-call vote of 84 to 0, with 30 abstentions. (For text of resolution and voting details, see DOCUMENTARY REFERENCE below).

RESOLUTION 2504 (XXIV).

as proposed by six-powers, AL.574, adopted by Assembly on 19 November 1969, meeting 1813, by roll-call vote of 84 to 0, with 40 abstentions as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussia SSR, Colombia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxemburg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, The Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian, SSR, USSR, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Yemen, and Yugoslavia.

Against: -- n o n e ---

(2) Appreciates any assistance provided through the Asian Development Bank, through institutions of the United Nations or through other means to the Government of Indonesia in its efforts to promote economic and social development in West Irian.

-----  
Plenary Meeting - 1813 19 December 1969  
-----