

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF INDONESIA H.E. DR. SUKARNO BEFORE
THE CONFERENCE OF HEADS OF STATE OR GOVERNMENT OF NON-
ALIGNED COUNTRIES IN BEOGRAD, 1 SEPTEMBER 1961¹

President Tito,
Fellow Participants in this Conference,

Allow me, first of all, to extend my heartfelt thanks to you, President Tito, and through you to the Government and People of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia for the warm reception extended to us all at this conference.

As you well know, I myself feel perfectly at home in this great country and I am sure that my Fellow Participants will enjoy their stay here because of the friendliness and hospitality of the people.

May I also at this point extend heartfelt thanks to all those who have worked on the preparations for this Conference. The preparatory Conference in Cairo did very important spadework. The work they did in formulating an agenda for our meeting, as well as their suggestions regarding the organisational aspects of the Conference have greatly helped to ensure us success.

Mr. Chairman,

It was only a few short months ago that I, together with my good friends President Tito of Yugoslavia and President Nasser of the United Arab Republic, took the initiative in calling for the convening of a Conference of Non-Aligned Countries. Our initiative was based on the conviction that non-alignment has become a growing force in the world, — a force standing for friendship among nations, for peace, for social justice, — and that the time has now come to gather this force together, to turn it into a co-ordinated accumulated moral force.

¹ Text transcribed by Darwis Khudori from two sources: 1) The Archives of the Non-Aligned Movement in Serbia, and 2) Modelski, George (ed.), *THE NEW EMERGING FORCES: Documents on the Ideology of Indonesian Foreign Policy*, Department of International Relations, Research School of Pacific Studies, the Australian National University Canberra, 1963.

We made this call in the conviction that such a Conference was needed, that it would evoke widespread response. But speaking for myself, — and I am sure that my co-initiators will agree, — the actual response to our call has surpassed our expectations.

We come together here not as members of a bloc, for indeed countries which conduct a policy of non-alignment do not constitute a bloc. We abhor the very idea of blocs. We have come together because we maintain the view that the creation of blocs, especially when based upon power politics and the armaments race, can only lead to war which, in this nuclear era, can only mean the extinction of mankind.

There was no prior consultation and agreement between us before we adopted our respective policies of non-alignment. No. We each arrived at this policy inspired by common ideals, prompted by similar circumstances, spurred on by like experiences. There was no attempt at compromise among us, no attempt to round off disagreements to make our policies identical.

But, not one of us, I think, will deny that we did inspire each other. The experiences of one country in discovering that a policy of non-alignment is the best guarantee for safeguarding our national and international position have undoubtedly helped others to come to a similar conclusion.

Non-alignment is not directed against any one country or against any one bloc or against any particular type of social system. It is our common conviction that a policy of non-alignment is the best way for each of us to make a positive contribution towards the preservation of peace and the relaxation of international tensions.

And let us be quite frank. It is not mere accident that we countries gathered here happen to be the ones who have set ourselves on the path of non-alignment. Every nation, without exception basically desirous of such a policy, knows that it could help world peace by the adoption of such a policy.

But the possibility to conduct a policy of non-alignment depends not upon desire alone. It may be that because of historical background, because of the immediate national interest, because of the geographical position, many countries do not have the opportunity or even the capacity to conduct a policy of non-alignment.

The idea of convening this conference as I have said was born but a few months ago but the idea of non-alignment is not new.

It is an idea that has inspired many nations. For many years I am indeed proud that the Republic of Indonesia was one of its first protagonists; ever since our proclamation of independence in 1945 our foreign policy has been based upon and inspired by the principles of non-alignment. The following words are from the preamble of our constitution drawn up in 1945:

“To set up a government of the State of Indonesia which shall contribute in implementing an order in the world which is based upon independence, abiding peace and social justice.”

My presence here in this conference, which has the full and united backing of the entire Indonesian people, is in fulfilment of those profound words.

Mr. Chairman, we who are participating in this conference come from all parts of the globe; we come from Europe, from Asia, Africa, from Latin America. Our peoples are different in many ways; our cultures differ; our forms of state differ; and so do our political systems. But in an essential way we do not differ and that is in our determination to implement a new order in the world which is based upon independence, abiding peace and social justice; we do not differ in our determination.

To have the freedom to be free, yes, independence, abiding peace – social justice, the freedom to be free — these are noble aims indeed. Independence means putting an end forever to the exploitation of nation by nation, indirect exploitation as well as direct exploitation.

Abiding peace means not the mere absence of war. It means removing the sources of conflict which threaten the world and split it into camps.

Social justice means justice for all nations, not for one nation or one power alone, not for one group of nations or one power bloc alone.

The freedom to be free means the freedom to determine our own national policies, to formulate our own national concept, unhampered and unhindered by pressure or intervention from outside. It is the freedom to conduct our political, economic and social affairs in line with our own national concepts. It is the freedom to co-operate with all nations, to be friends with all nations, the freedom to oppose anything which harms the rightful and just interests of any nation.

These are the principles towards which we are aiming. Inevitably, they will bring us into conflict with the vested interests of the past. Yes, with the vested interests of the past. Our own bitter experience teaches us that the old equilibrium is based upon the domination of a few nations over the vast majority of mankind. And within nations too, the ruling few live their lives of affluence and luxury at the expense of the millions who live in poverty and misery. This old equilibrium is seething with social revolt, the revolt of subjected nations against the domination of other powers, the revolt of the subjected majority against the ruling few.

From this point of view, non-alignment is not neutrality. Let there be no confusion on that score. No, non-alignment is not neutrality. It is not the sanctimonious attitude of the man who holds himself aloof — “a plague on both your houses”. Non-aligned policy is not a policy of seeking a neutral position in case of war; non-aligned policy is not a policy of neutrality without its own colour; being non-aligned does not mean becoming a buffer state between the two giant blocs. Non-alignment is active devotion to the lofty cause of independence, abiding peace, social justice, and freedom to be free. It is the determination to serve this cause, it runs congruent with the social conscience of Man.

And now if non-alignment is to become the co-ordinated accumulated moral force we need, powerful enough to make its impact felt upon the two conflicting blocs, powerful enough to call a halt, to save the world from catastrophe, it must be based upon a common approach to the basic issues confronting our world today. A new approach, that will startle Mankind by its freshness, its frank recognition of objective reality, its resolution to grapple with world problems, its determination to cut the Gordian knots strangulating international relations at the present time.

Yes, to call a halt, before it is too late! For time is running short. Many problems demand immediate solution, and as long as we fail to get to the source of the tension and strife,

we shall be working like amateurs plumbers, plugging up a leak here only to find a bigger one spurting up behind our very backs. And another, and yet another.

We must get to the source of the tension and strife. And to do this, we must first have a common understanding of what that source is. Prevailing world opinion today would have us believe that the real source of international tension and strife is ideological conflict between the big Powers. I think, that is not true. There is a conflict which cuts deeper into the flesh of Man — the conflict between the new, emergent forces for freedom and justice and the old forces of domination, the one pushing its head relentlessly through the crust of the earth which has given it its lifeblood, the other striving desperately to retain all it can, trying to hold back the course of history.

As I said in my Address before the United Nations General Assembly last year, this is the era of emerging nations and the turbulence of nationalism, the building of nations and the breaking of empires.

I do not deny that there is an ideological conflict between the great Powers. To deny that, would indeed be an ostrich-like approach. But this ideological conflict need not lead to tension, it must not lead to tension. It can take place peacefully, provided that it does not extend to an attempt to force one's own ideologies upon other nations. The problem of ideology is for every separate nation to decide, and if there is conflict it is a conflict within a nation. Certainly ideological conflict within nations can bring turbulence, growth, more turbulence, and finally — so long as that nation is left alone to resolve its own conflicts — it will surely lead to a synthesis, a single nation-wide approach inspired by the common desire burning in the hearts of men and women everywhere to win prosperity, to establish social justice and to live in peace. Ideological conflict between nations can and must proceed peacefully, it can and must be waged not on the battlefield but on the construction site, not with nuclear weapon and napalm bombs but with bulldozers and anti-biotic.

We in Indonesia know from experience that we could only arrive at our national progressive ideology, we could only consolidate this ideology through struggle, through turbulence. And is this not also the experience of the United Arab Republic, or Iraq and of many other countries today, or to go further back in history, of the Soviet Union, of the United States of America, of Great Britain? Every nation that sincerely strives to

build a nationhood based on the concept of prosperity and social justice will always have to go through struggle and turbulence. And inevitably, victory will be in the hands of the majority fighting for equality, against oppression, for freedom from the yoke of poverty, misery and exploitation.

Permit me, for a moment, to speak at greater length about our experiences in Indonesia. Yes, we in Indonesia have already passed through the gruelling process of forming our national ideology — and we have now reached our synthesis, i.e. Indonesian socialism. This inner search brought with it conflicts and commotion, an inevitable part of the process. Some people scoffed at us, complaining that we are forever arguing, caught up in endless bickering. To these people I always say: *“Look back for a moment at your own histories. Did you not have years of turbulence and turmoil, your years of finding yourselves and setting yourselves on the right path?”*

Yes, our Indonesian socialism developed through turmoil, and in the course of that turmoil, we have learnt many things. And we believe that the lessons we have learnt will be of interest to other nations. We have learnt that the basic ingredient of any national ideology must be the national inheritance of that nation itself, its heritage from the past, the traditions which bind its people together and set the pattern of their life. In Indonesia, this is *kerakjatan*, *gotong rojong*, *musjawarah* and *mufakat* — the people as the source, collective effort for a common goal, discussion and deliberation, consensus of opinion. To this basic ingredient, add all useful ideas from other countries. In Indonesia, we drew the equality of men from the Jefferson declaration, we drew spiritual socialism from Islam, we drew scientific socialism from Marxism. Put this mixture into the mould of the national identity, and the result is a national ideology which binds the people together and frees all energies for the tremendous tasks of construction.

In this process, we also learnt another lesson, a lesson I believe to be of immense importance. We learnt that when external forces sought to bear pressure on us in our ideological conflict, turmoil and turbulence turned into hostility, violence and war. But when left to our own device, turmoil and turbulence led to synthesis and new advance.

Many of the new, emergent countries are now engaged in a similar process. Left alone, they will reach their synthesis.

So, recognize the world situation of today as a temporary situation, recognize it as a state of relentless movements and progress. Do not be obsessed by the conflict of ideologies. This is a matter which must be left to each nation itself. Recognize that the conflict between the new, emergent forces and the old forces of domination is today coming more and more into prominence. And this is not fortuitous. It is coming more into prominence precisely because the new, emergent forces are thrusting themselves more and more persistently upon the world, while the old forces still strive to preserve the old equilibrium, based upon the exploitation of nation by nation.

It is not fortuitous, either, that the non-aligned countries ally themselves with these new, emergent forces. It is not fortuitous that the flags that colour our meeting-hall today are all flags of nations which stand in the very forefront of these new, emergent forces. They are nations which are or have been engaged in the struggle for national independence. They are nations which are determined to leave behind the inglorious past of colonisation. They are nations fighting for a glorious future, a future of independence, a future of prosperity for all nations, a future of the rule of justice among nations. If we consider for a moment the positive and constructive uses to which science and technology can be put today, this is the only future which can save Mankind from the danger of the silent, seething anger of the oppressed peoples exploding into the face of the world.

The world must recognise this conflict between the old and the new, recognise the existence of this conflict, and — recognise all it means. Socialist states have emerged. Newly independent states have emerged — and with what tremendous speed in the past few years, with what tremendous speed! And side by side with this, science and technology have taken gigantic stride, achieving breathless new successes, while at the same time winning smaller but no less significant victories everyday in the battle of mankind to master the forces of Nature and harness them to meet the rising demands, the rising expectations of people everywhere.

These factors are living realities in the world today, their contours line the political and economic map of the world. But these contours are changing fast, they need continual re-mapping if we are to keep up with reality.

The world must recognise that the new, emergent countries as a co-ordinated accumulated force, are striving for the speedy establishment of a new stable equilibrium.

What do we mean by this new, stable equilibrium? We mean that all nations must become independent. All nations must have the freedom to be free, the freedom to arrange their own national life in accordance with their own wishes, the freedom to be free to build their own national foundation, — politically, economically, culturally. We mean that all nations must be free to arrange their international relations as they see fit, based on the principles of equality, justice and mutual benefit. We mean that no power shall interfere in the struggle of any other nation to find its own national concept, that no power shall attempt to force any other nation to change its ideology. Reflect for a moment: Let us suppose that foreign intervention had played a forceful and dominant role in the American Civil War. Had that been the case, could American have become one of the leading world powers that it is today? Could American have succeeded in establishing a nation state on the basis of which to build a national life for the American people?

In this new stable equilibrium there can and will be no place for conflicting blocs. The very notion of military alliance will become obsolete. Then, truly shall we be able to speak of abiding peace.

The establishment of this new, stable equilibrium can only come about with the active and conscious desire of all humanity. But can we stand idly by, waiting for this conscious desire to evolve on its own, to appear before us like a wondrous miracle, like manna from heaven? It is for the non-aligned countries, as a moral force which can take the lead, to make the establishment of this equilibrium its sacred cause, the cause to which all the energies of our accumulated strength must now be devoted.

This, then Mr. Chairman, is our objective, the target we set before ourselves. But before we can proceed, we must set our sights accurately. Where do we stand now? What are the demands of the present situation?

There is a great variety of social systems in the world. Absolute monarchies, parliamentary monarchies, parliamentary democracies, socialist and communist democracies, dictatorships. Look at the great variety of social systems in Europe alone!

What sharp differences there are between the one and the other. And yet, they co-exist. Yes, they co-exist! They have co-existed for the past decades.

But at the same time, sources of tension disturb the international scene every day. Not a day passed but the columns of our newspapers blare forth news of war dangers here, there. South Africa! Congo! Cuba! Algeria! Angola! Tunisia! Berlin! The people desire to co-exist, and they can co-exist. But, what, then, is it that causes these “trouble spots”, that send sensation-thirsty news correspondents rushing at top speed half-way round the world, hoping to be “in at the kill”?

In every single case, the cause, the root of international tension is imperialism and colonialism and the forcible division of nations. Yes, imperialism and colonialism and the forcible division of nations! History in the past, and the realities of today prove that different social systems can co-exist, but there can be no co-existence between independence, justice on one side and imperialism-colonialism on the other side.

The emergence of nations, their tenacious fight to preserve the independence they have won at so much sacrifice, their resolve to end economic servility, is a process which meets with the resistance of the old forces of domination at every turn. But this resistance is blind, it is a resistance that refuses to recognise reality, refuses to recognise the march of history. The old forces of domination must be made to realise this. Let us be quite frank. These old forces play on the fears of their own people, play on their ignorance of the stark realities of colonialism, play on their suspicions. These Africans, these Asians these Latin Americans are a bunch of communists, the say.

We non-aligned countries of the world, recognising and accepting the reality of the emergent nations, have the bounded duty to win the understanding of the peoples in other countries, to tell them quite frankly that they cannot go on living at the expense of millions of poverty-stricken peoples. Their affluent societies are built upon the sweat and toil and tears of millions who spend their evenings not with their eyes glued upon the television-set but in a darkness pierced by the flame of a single candle, whose days are tormented not by the desire to have a better car than their neighbour but by the desire to give their children on meagre bowl of rice.

We must tell them that the emergence of new nations does not threaten their affluence. Far from it. But it will require adaptations. Their rising living standards must be the result of their own hard work. The emergent nations, freed from the shackles of exploitation, freed to build their own economies, will be extremely profitable trading partners. If allowed to dispose of their own products under reasonable and stable conditions, they will raise endless demands, keeping the factories of the advanced countries buzzing night and day without fear of crisis or unemployment. Ours is a revolution of rising demands. Emergent nations demand not only independence and non-interference. They demand goods, equipment, the wherewithal to build their own industries. Do not fear us as competitors. Welcome us as emancipated partners. Together, we can build an affluent world with a boundless future before it.

These are the realities of today, the realities of the future. Do not, then, try to scare us from our chosen path. *"Beware of new colonialism"*, the old colonial powers used to say. *"If we, the old colonialism, move out, new colonialism from other countries are waiting behind the door to suffocate you in their embrace"*. What a lie! Let us not permit others to use the pretext of seemingly impending imperialism as a defence for existing colonialism and imperialism. This is not so!!

Have no fear, gentlemen. We are not children. We know colonialist when we see one. We shall deal as effectively with new colonialism as we have dealt with and are dealing with the old ones. Do not try to divert our attention from the present cancers rankling our bodies. Rid the world of these festering sores — Algeria, West Irian, Angola, Bizerta — and have no fear. We shall be well steeled in the battle against colonialism in its purest form. We shall be well equipped to deal with any new imperialism that may try to rear its ugly head.

On the other hand, beware of colonialism in a new cloak, the so-called *"Neo-colonialism"*. This is also an item to be dealt with on our agenda, because this is a real danger.

It is common to us all that the old colonial powers, in having to leave their colonial territories, want to preserve as much as possible of their economic — and sometimes also their political and military — interests. This is carried out in various ways: creating strife amongst all layers of the local people; provoking the accession of one part of the old colonial territory from the rest under the pretext of "self-determination"; creating chaos

through military provocation or — and this also common — by fortifying their economic interests at the last moment, using even the most unscrupulous of means.

This is a process which we have seen, and still are seeing, in the newly independent countries. Yes, in Indonesia we have experienced it. Our people have suffered from it — and only after uniting all our national energy did we succeed in pushing back the forces of neo-colonialism, and finally manage to lay down our solid national foundations. According to our experience, the effective answer is national unity, and once more, national unity! This could be achieved through a national, progressive ideology which does not leave much room for the playing off of one section of the community against the other.

This can be dealt with effectively by trying to understand, and trying to implement the revolutionary demand of the people as a whole for a better living standard — or at least by providing them with a solid hope for the future: that their misery, after independence, is a problem which can be solved. This can be dealt with through a firm and wise National leadership.

And what about the forcible division of nations to which I referred just now? These nations forcibly divided stand on the very frontiers of the two blocs. They are nations which have been particularly severely subjected to the pull of opposing ideologies. They have been pulled so hard opposing directions that their states have split in two. Now we have two Germanies, not one; now we have two Koreas, not one; now we have two Vietnams, not one. Even here, we have seen that co-existence is possible, that these artificially divided states can live side by side in peace, and can even peaceably trade with each other. This is a good beginning. It augurs well for re-unification.

But the basic requirement for the re-unification is that the big powers must cease to treat these divided countries as ideological battlegrounds. Leave the nations to settle this matter themselves. As elsewhere, this will be a tumultuous process, a gruelling process, but it will bring the desired synthesis, provided the nations concerned are left alone, again, provided they are left alone.

I have deliberately spoken at some length about the evils and injustices of the past, the achievements of the present as the result of relentless struggle, and the common goals of

the future. I have done this so that we should not forget. Let us never forget the misery of colonial bondage though we are now independent. Let us never forget the misery and degradation of being poor though we ourselves are living better lives. Let us never forget the misery and emptiness of illiteracy though we ourselves now possess skills and erudition. Let us never forget our past miseries, sufferings and frustrations. Were we to do so, our national independence would become an obstacle in the way of the struggle of progressive forces for peace, justice and the brotherhood of mankind.

Mr. Chairman,

A glance at the agenda of this Conference clearly shows that the basic problems besetting the present day world arise from the two radical processes in the history of mankind.

Firstly, the process of liberation of the colonised people, and secondly, the process of emancipation of all nations from poverty and injustice. These two processes go hand in hand, they are inseparable. They are like Siamese twins. Try to separate them from each other and both will die.

I have already spoken at length about the process of liberation. Not a single person in this hall would dispute the fact that colonialism must be eradicated, completely, irrevocably, for our own sakes, and for the sake of the whole world. There is no power on earth that can stem this tide of liberation.

We must demand the immediate cessation of the colonial wars now raging in Angola, Algeria and Tunisia. We must not rest a moment until we have stopped these wars, until we have halted this criminal bloodshed and terror, all perpetrated in order to preserve the old order.

We must demand that a time limit be imposed for the complete removal of all forms of colonial subjugation of one nation by the other. In the case of every single remaining colonial regime, that time limit must not exceed two years, and must, if possible be less than that.

As you know, we in Indonesia still have a colonial problem because one-fifth of the territory of our Republic is still occupied and dominated by the Dutch colonialists. It is the territory of West Irian. West Irian is an indivisible part of the sovereign territory of the Republic of Indonesia, and we demand that the authority of the Republic be established in that region forthwith. During the past few years, we have been

strengthening ourselves in order to face the Dutch in all fields, and we feel quite strong enough to take all measures necessary in order to be able to unfurl our beloved Red and White flag on the soil of West Irian.

As I have said repeatedly, we are prepared to negotiate with the Dutch on the question of West Irian, but only if such negotiations are based on the principle of the transfer of the territory of West Irian to the Republic of Indonesia. We insist that this thorn, cutting deep into our flesh, must be removed at the earliest possible moment, for it is a serious danger, not only to our independence and stability, but also to peace in Asia and the world. We demand that this problem be solved within the shortest possible time.

It was in order to contribute to world peace and to solve the West Irian problem peacefully, that I offered the hand of friendship to the Dutch a few weeks ago. I offered to the Dutch that we shall not anymore talk about whose sovereignty West Irian is, but that the Dutch transfer the government administration over West Irian to us in the shortest possible time. The Indonesian people hope, that in a very short time our Indonesian Red-White flag shall fly bravely in the West Irian sky. May God Almighty give His blessing to our struggle to liberate West Irian on the basis of love for peace and justice, and even more our great love for freedom of our country. The God Almighty spoke in the Holy Qur'an, verse Al-Mumtahimah, that He does not prohibit a friendly attitude towards those who are not hostile to you and who act with justice, *"But Allah prohibits unto you, towards those who are hostile to thee... and who banish thee from thine homeland, and towards them thou are prohibited to have a friendly attitude"*.

Yes, Mr Chairman, let us continue our struggle against colonialism and imperialism relentlessly! If we do this, if we speed up the eradication of colonialism and help to halt the colonial wars now raging, we shall have done something indeed. But deliberately, I use the word "something", fully conscious that, having achieved this, we will not yet have achieved all our aims. In Indonesia, I have repeatedly told the people that independence is only a bridge, though a precious golden bridge, a bridge for nation-building, a bridge for national construction, a bridge for winning better living conditions, a bridge for the establishment of social justice. Yes, and I have stressed that national independence is a bridge for the brotherhood of mankind and for eternal peace in the world.

And in international relations too, independence is a bridge, a bridge for the struggle of nations for emancipation, for the building of nations and states that are able to stand on their own feet, politically, economically and in every other way, a bridge for justice amongst nations. The creation of national regimes without the concomitant process of emancipation will not further stability, prosperity and justice in the world. On the contrary. In the past, and even today, we have had many examples of national regimes which make no effort for emancipation. These regimes are not only a plague to their own peoples, they are a plague to the world because they easily fall prey to foreign intervention, become the playground of rivalries between foreign powers, the battlefield for foreign powers in their struggle for domination. These regimes become the source of international conflict.

There can be no alternative for us. Just as we have persistently waged the struggle for liberation against colonialism and are still doing so today, so must we, just as persistently, struggle for international emancipation. It is only through the simultaneous struggle for liberation and emancipation that we can advance towards the international order of stable and independent states, a lasting international order, one which can withstand the shock of even the most radical or technical advances.

However story it may be, this march towards the new order of world justice is far safer than preserving the old world of silent colonisation and exploitation.

The problem of emancipation lies at the source of many of the international issues which have been put on the agenda of our Conference. The problem of non-intervention and non-interference, the problem of peaceful co-existence, the problem of racial discrimination, yes, and even the problem of the structure of the United Nations; all these are problems which have been thrust onto the scene by the process of emancipation.

As a result of this process, now social and economic forces have emerged in the world. Socialist countries, based on Marxism have emerged. Independent countries big and small in Asia and Africa have emerged. And side by side with other independent countries, they are pressing for national construction and for laying a solid foundation to their nation-building, based on the requirements of our age.

These are living realities, realities which cannot be denied. The world must accept them. Perhaps they do not conform to the norms and standards of the past, but they are here, and they are indispensable part of the emancipation process, indispensable to the march towards a new world-order of peace, justice and prosperity. This emergence of non-conformity with the past is reflected in the conflict of ideologies, in the conflict of economic interests, in the conflict of military interests. The fact that conflicts have emerged must not make us abandon non-conformity. On the contrary. We must abandon the old dogmas — the march of history has proved that they are out of tune with a world society of peace, based on equal liberty, justice and a fair share for all.

What, then, is the way to solve burning present day issues? Where the conflict of the old interest and the emerging forces has become very acute and explosive, we must accept the principle of peaceful co-existence, not only in words but also in deeds. Concrete action must be taken to reduce feelings of hostility by urging the contending parties to initiate talks with the aim of beginning to understand each other. Do not befog the issues by standing stubbornly by previously adopted positions in order to “save face”. The aim must be to find an acceptable solution around the negotiating table so as to save the world from extinction.

Let me issue a warning. Miscalculation of the facts as they stand — bluffing in order to see how far the other side will go, may bring us to the verge of disaster. The alternative to peaceful co-existence between the two blocs is war of unimaginable magnitude.

True, peaceful co-existence does not immediately restore the position to normalcy, it does not remove conflicts. But it does remove acute feelings of hostility, and that alone is a gain.

A glance into history provides us with many examples of tolerance prevailing over bigotry and narrow-mindedness, of new ideas and creeds — at first condemned as heresy — later co-existing with older dogmas. Christianity and Islam today co-exist after centuries of crusade and counter-crusade. Protestantism and Catholicism today co-exist though at first Rome condemned Martin Luther as a heretic and treated him as an outcast.

Let us learn from the experiences of our forefathers. Learn to avoid their mistakes — their centuries of crusading and bigotry. Learn how eventually tolerance prevailed, with different ideologies and creeds living peacefully side by side, each recognising the right of the other to live without in any way compromising on principles.

This is why, Mr Chairman, we in Indonesia firmly believe that the ideological conflict is not, I repeat, not the main problem of our time. It is not a problem which affects the majority of mankind, such as poverty, disease, illiteracy and colonial bondage.

But people may ask, if we adopt the principle of peaceful co-existence, will this mean preserving the status quo forever? My reply is quite definitely: No! How can we expect to perpetuate the division of nations? How can we expect to prevent nations from evolving their national concepts of life, based on their own brands of socialism, Marxism or capitalism? How can we prevent nations from replacing monarchies by republics, or the reverse, if they wish?

No, peaceful co-existence cannot and should not perpetuate the status quo. It must allow every nation to develop as they see fit, unhampered by external pressures or interference.

Applied to Germany and West Berlin, these principles can, I am sure, reduce the acute tensions of today. Formalise or legalise existing conditions; remove all possibility of a spread of hostilities; accept the difference in social outlook; avoid every single act which might provoke greater mistrust and suspicion; withdraw all interference from outside; let the Germans themselves decide their future destiny. Let them initiate talks in a serious endeavour to reach understanding. Let them take initial steps, however small, towards the creation and strengthening of regular forms of contact — trade is an excellent example of this. After all, the Germans are wise enough to know that internal conflict over Germany would obliterate their entire national life, and rearmament will not save them from this fate.

Commonsense must prevail. Yes — and commonsense demands the recognition of the temporary de facto sovereignty of two Germanies as a big reality. Commonsense also demands that West Berlin should not become the playground of big power conflicts, or ideological conflict. The people of West Berlin should be left to themselves to conduct their lives without interference from outside. The people of West Berlin should also have

free access to the other parts of the world, and the people of the world should also have free access to West Berlin. This, I think, can be arranged through the recognition of both Germanies as the de facto position of two states. And if the Soviet Union chooses to conclude a peace-treaty with East Germany, let it be so.

To achieve this, the big powers must come to the negotiating table to end the present crisis, fully conscious of their responsibilities towards the world. The problem of Germany, a nation divided against itself, has too long been a threat to peace in Europe and the world. The non-aligned countries, by proposing principles for its solution such as I have outlined above, can make a major contribution towards preserving world peace at a time when it stands in great danger.

Now something about the United Nations. The rapid march of developments in the past few years — the establishment of new independent states, the role of non-alignment in international affairs, the growing desire for peaceful co-existence, the march of the revolution being waged by three-quarters of mankind — are showing with increasing clarity that the structure of the United Nations need to be overhauled. The United Nations was set up in 1945. Who can deny that the political map of the world has radically altered since then? Who can deny that the composition of the big powers has altered? Who, for example, can deny that the People's Republic of China exercises authority over the mere than 600 million Chinese people?

The United Nations was set up in order to be a stabilising factor in world affairs. It was set up in order to preserve and consolidate peace. It was set up as an instrument through which the advanced nations could render assistance to other nations to help them overcome poverty and economic and technical backwardness. If it is to deal all this, in short, if the United Nations is to play a positive and progressive role in this age of liberation and emancipation, then its structure must reflect the composition of nations that make up our world community of today. Failure to do so is a contradiction of reality, it can only create new dissensions and deepen the existing ones.

The United Nations must not be allowed to become the instrument of any power bloc. We know from experience that the United Nations is not functioning properly today. Voting is all too frequently determined not by the merits of the case but by external pressures and considerations for the interests of one set of nations, one power bloc. It is

our duty to do all we can to make this world organisation a centre of world stability, a means of consolidating relations between nations, an instrument for putting the principles of peaceful co-existence into practice. It is our duty to ensure that the new, emergent forces find adequate recognition there and can exert a rightful influence in the world councils where major world problems are considered.

For these reasons, I strongly urge that the United Nations structure requires re-organisation. This applies to the membership of the Security Council, as well as to the composition of the Secretariat and other United Nations bodies.

Another problem on our agenda is the question of disarmament. No one here in this hall disagrees with the need for disarmament. Indeed people the world over are more and more persistently demanding disarmament. They demand this because history has taught, time and time again, that the armament race leads to war. They demand this because re-armament is one the most effective ways of subjugating other peoples, because re-armament is the road to imperialism. They demand this because disarmament will release tremendous resources for construction and for raising living standards throughout the world.

Apart from the handful of people who stand to gain from the expansion of war industries, no sane person in the world agrees to re-armament. And too, no single person in the world can escape from the devastation of war and its aftermath.

The re-armaments race is the result of fear and mistrust between the big powers. And likewise, the re-armaments race leads to greater fear and mistrust. Therefore we believe that the key to success in disarmament rests in first disarming mistrust, disarming fear, disarming men's suspicions of one another. The non-aligned countries must be given an active role in the task of finding a solution to this complicated problem.

We demand this, because the decision of "peace or war" should not be left to the big powers alone. No, the decision of "peace or war" should not be left mainly to the powers which possess nuclear weapons and missiles. The decision of "peace or war" is a matter which should be in the hands of all people in the world. This only is the surest way to peace.

Mr. Chairman,

I am now coming to the closing remarks of my speech.

For most of us, it was not an easy decision to come to this Conference. Many problems occupy us at home; we are moving from one urgency to the next in order to keep pace with the process of national advancement. But we came because we knew this Conference would be important, that it would take us an important step forward in the noble task of helping to establish and preserve peace based on prosperity, social justice and co-operation amongst all nations.

This Conference is not an isolated event in the emergence of the new social forces. It is one of a series of major events in the process of emergence. The first was the Asian Relations Conference held in Delhi in 1948, a Conference which in one of its resolutions condemned the military attack of the Dutch on the Republic of Indonesia. That Conference was a protest against colonialism in its purest form.

The next major Conference, and one the echoes of which are still reverberating around the world, was the Asian-African Conference held in Bandung, Indonesia, in April 1955. The purpose of that Conference was to cement and consolidate the co-operation between the independent peoples of Asia and Africa in their struggle for a just and prosperous society and the continuation of the struggle of the colonial peoples against imperialism and colonialism in all its manifestations. Then, we have the regional conferences of our African sister nations.

And now we have this present Conference, the basic purpose of which is to draw the non-aligned countries into a co-ordinated accumulated moral force in order to help preserve world peace and bring about a new stable equilibrium based on a world order of social justice and prosperity.

I have already explained that such an order is not possible without the eradication of colonialism and imperialism in the world. So our purpose here is also to contribute relentlessly to the struggle against the remnants of colonialism and imperialism. And so our Conference is not a rival to the Asian-African Conference, but must be complementary to it.

The Conference of Non-Aligned Nations must be a joining brother to the Asian-African solidarity, it must contribute strength to it. Our Conference now, and the Asian-African Conference, are two comrades in arms.

If we want to make dynamic progress in the struggle for liberation-emanicipation and world stability, I hope that this Conference will bear in mind the necessity for a second Asian-African Conference in the near future.

I deem it also necessary to express my hope at the end of this Conference, that the international world would appreciate the compactness and dynamic unity inherent in all decisions of the Beograd Convention. For this purpose I hope that the Conference could accept a Charter of Statements by our Convention in Beograd. This charter will embrace all decisions we will have taken.

The existence of that Charter of Statements certainly will facilitate the forwarding of the decisions of the Convention directly to the forthcoming General Assembly of the United Nations, so that the benefits of the results of this Conference as a complementary body to the Asian-African Conference could immediately be utilised by the members of the United Nations. It is up to the Beograd Conference to determine the composition of the mission who is to present the Charter of Statements to the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1961.

Yes, Mr Chairman, let us bear in mind: our purpose here is to contribute relentlessly to the struggle against the remnants of colonialism and imperialism. To make a collective contribution towards easing international tensions. To co-ordinate our efforts to facilitate the process of emancipation between nations. To build new nationhoods not only, but also to build a new world — to build the world anew.

Yes, our task is to build the world anew — there is no alternative to that. The conviction that this is so must spur us on to even greater efforts, until our struggle has been crowned with success. Through the years our task as independent nations has expanded, and we cannot escape these responsibilities.

We live in a terrifically dynamic time, a time full of dangers. The occasion is piled high with difficulties, but we may not flee from those difficulties, we must rise to the occasion.

But the dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. As our case is now, we must think anew, act anew, shape anew, — re-shape anew!

We must disenthral ourselves. Only when we do so can this Conference of high expectations bear fruit!

May the Almighty bless and guide us all!

Bismillah!