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C Ir I/Not/1/Verb.

JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Minutes of the 1st formal meeting held on Wednesday 10th May, 1950 at 9 a.m. in Hotel des Indes, Djakarta

Present:
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Member;
Dr. Teng Tjin Leng, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
A. S. Pello, Secretary;
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Member;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;

Union-Secretariat:
Moh. Jahja;
Dr. W. Schols.

1. Opening:
At 9 hours a.m. Dr. Latuharhary, taking the floor, says that he, being the eldest of the Indonesian members who consider themselves to be the hosts, has been requested to convene and preside over the first meeting. He cordially welcomes those present, in particular the Netherlands members of the Committee. Though the Committee has, on account of its commission, not been convened to solve the question New Guinea/Irian, he expresses the hope that the report to be drawn up by the Committee shall contribute to find a solution of this subtle question possible, in particular subtle for the population of New Guinea/Irian, the future fate of which will depend on it.

Prof. van der Kolff addresses a word of thanks to the Indonesian members for the extremely hearty and pleasant reception, given to them from their very first meeting.

2. Drawing up of the Agenda.
Dr. Latuharhary, taking the floor once more, declares himself unable to accept the provisional agenda, as he is of the opinion that the provisional agenda is to be drawn up by the Chairman in cooperation with the Secretary, which has not been the case in respect of the agenda being now presented.

Dr. Schols remarks that a decision is still to be taken about the chairmanship of the Committee. For this reason the secretariat has, as is also customary in other conferences, presented a provisional
agenda, exclusively for the first meeting. As regards further meetings the Committee will have to decide how the agenda is to be drawn up.

Dr. Teng Tjin Leng can appreciate the good intentions of the Union Secretariat, but he considers it desirable to be exact. The Committee itself has to draw up the agenda. He proposes to leave the provisional agenda presented by the Union Secretariat aside.

Prof. van der Kolff also appreciates the intentions of the Union Secretariat. He has no objections if the meeting now draws up its agenda, analogous to this provisional agenda.

3. Election Chairman.

Dr. Teng Tjin Leng maintains his standpoint that questions of procedure have to be decided by the meeting itself. If it can however be taken for granted that the meeting draws up an agenda analogous to the provisional agenda, he would now propose to elect Dr. Latuharhary Chairman of this week, and Prof. van der Kolff Deputy Chairman.

It was decided that in weekly rotation Dr. Latuharhary and Prof. van der Kolff shall be respectively chairman and deputy chairman, Dr. Latuharhary first acting as chairman for the week current until 13th May inclusive.

Dr. Teng Tjin Leng would like to know in what way the secretariat will be arranged.

Dr. Schols elucidates that the Secretary-General, Dr. Pringgodigdo, was of the opinion that for the first week the former would act as secretary, and for the second week Mr. Jahja.

Prof. van der Kolff puts on record that the secretariat will change simultaneously with the chairmanship.


Dr. Latuharhary cannot agree to the definition "discussion of the division of the "work", however vague this term may be. He does consider a discussion of the procedure desirable.

Prof. van der Kolff considers it advisable to mention two points:

1. Concerning the arrangement of the procedure: as regards the point: how the Committee can assume persons.

2. It is of importance that already now consultation be held about the itinerary for New Guinea/Irian, as it is to be expected that its preparation and working-out take a long time. He therefore proposes to discuss the two points in this meeting.

As regards the procedure in respect of assuming persons, he remarks that Mr. J. A. van Beuge, from the section New Guinea of
the Ministry of U. and O.R. has come along with the Netherlands members.

Dr. Latuharhary would like to know whether Mr. van Beuge is to be considered as an expert.

Prof. van der Kolff elucidates that originally Mr. van Beuge was opined to be a liaison-officer with the Ministry UOR and the High Commissioner of the Netherlands in Jacarta and the Government in New Guinea, being at the same time able to cooperate in producing reports and giving information which might be of importance to the Committee. This would save already much time. The Netherlands members were soon convinced that Mr. van Beuge is fully acquainted with all matters concerning New Guinea/Irian, having also been present at all the discussions previously held in this respect. Since the Netherlands members themselves had — in contradiction to the majority of the Indonesian members, previously, nothing to do with the question New Guinea/Irian, the need made itself felt amongst the Netherlands members to have Mr. van Beuge at their disposal, being politically fully acquainted with the matter. The Netherlands members were therefore of the opinion that Mr. van Beuge was to be considered as their adviser, taking the viewpoint that experts are assumed by the Committee as such, but that advisers could be considered as intended either for the Indonesian- or the Netherlands members. The fact that the Netherlands members have not previously contacted the Indonesian members in this respect and had Mr. van Beuge accompanying them straight away, only took place because the former were in such a rush and loss of time had to be prevented.

Prof. Pieters remarks that the Netherlands members considered it necessary to be equipped in such a way that a smooth course of the work is guaranteed.

Dr. Teng Tjin Leng considers it desirable to consider whether it would not be preferable to give Mr. van Beuge the position of an expert, this being more in accordance with the wording of the resolution of setting up this Committee. He therefore proposes to interpret point 4 of this resolution in such a way that both groups of members are entitled to assume experts in accord with the complete Committee.

Prof. Pieters remarks that the term adviser is used in the report preceding the resolution of drawing up the establishment. He presumes that the previous speaker has meant that either group of members would be entitled to assume experts, not as experts of the
complete Committee, but as experts of the group concerned. It would in this case perhaps be preferable to mention advisers, thus expressing that experts are at the disposal of the whole Committee.

*It is decided* that the Netherlands — as well as the Indonesian members — can assume advisers in accord with the complete Committee to assist them in their work.

Concerning the costs the Union Secretariat will be further consulted.

*Dr. Teng Tjin Leng* considers the possibility of assuming advisers of great importance in order to make the work as efficient as possible. The impression should however be prevented that the Committee consists of more than 6 members and that the advisers should speak without having been asked to do so by the members.

*Prof. Pieters* entirely agrees to this and proposes that advisers are only allowed to speak after one of the members has requested the Chairman’s authorization to this end.

*Prof. van der Kolff* considers it advisable to take the same decision in respect of experts.

The *Chairman* finds that it is thus decided and also that the Committee has no objections to Mr. van Beuge being admitted as adviser of the Netherlands group.

A short pause is made in order to enable Mr. van Beuge to join the meeting.

The *Chairman* reopens the meeting at 10.30 hours and welcomes Mr. van Beuge.

He now puts up for discussions the itinerary New Guinea/Irian. He recalls the memory that the Committee only has another 50 days before concluding its work on 1st July and he asks Prof. van der Kolff whether the latter can make a definitive proposal in this respect.

*Prof. van der Kolff* says that he considered it necessary to put this question up for discussion now, because difficulties are to be expected in connection with housing and transport. The Governor of New Guinea would appreciate receiving the program in due time, in order to be able to find a solution for this question. According to the speaker’s personal opinion circa 3 weeks can be reserved for the itinerary New Guinea/Irian and it is therefore advisable to employ this period of time as efficiently as possible.
After some discussion Prof. van Dijk says that he has already considered a rough idea. According to his provisional scheme they could leave for New Guinea on Monday 15th May. After their arrival in Hollandia probably on Tuesday 16th May they might stay there for three days in order to have discussions with the organs of Central Administration, possibly for a flight across the Biliem valley. After that they might also stay in other places for three or four days, bearing in mind, without at once deciding on the definitive sequence, that the following places will be visited; Merauke, with a possible visit to Frederik-Hendrik island and the kampong-complex at the islands-river Biak, with a visit to Serui and the Wissel Lakes; Manokwari, a visit to the territories of colonisation and the Anggi Lakes, Sorong, possibly Radja Ampat.

This would require a total sojourn in New Guinea/Irian from 17th May until their return in Jacarta on 5th June. After that they could stay for another week in Jacarta, and return to the Netherlands about the middle of June, following which another fortnight will be available for the drawing up of the final report.

Dr. Latuharhary remarks that the Netherlands members therefore propose to have the final report drawn up in the Netherlands.

As proposed by Prof. van der Kolff it is decided that the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman shall consider together the itinerary for New Guinea/Irian first, possibly in consultation with the Garuda Indonesian Airways in view of chartering aeroplanes.

5. Publication to the Press. It is decided that the publication to the press shall be drawn up by the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman in mutual accord on behalf of the whole Committee.

In respect of the reports of the meetings it is decided that of formal meetings minutes will be made, short reports of informal gatherings.

At 11.15 hours the Chairman adjourns the meeting in order to discuss the itinerary New Guinea/Irian.

The Chairman reopens the meeting at 18.30 hours and informs the meeting that the Indonesian members have drawn up a scheme which is somewhat different from the one discussed in the morning. This was inevitable since it proved to be necessary that the member Dr. Teng Tjing Leng first returns to his residence Macassar to look after his affairs.

After ample considerations this scheme is adopted in a somewhat altered form, the discussions with the Garuda Indonesian Airways having been taken into account. The scheme is then as follows:

17/5 Jacarta—Balikpapan
18/5 Balikpapan—Menado—Biak
19/5 Biak
20/5 Biak—Hollandia
21/5 Hollandia, possibly Baliem Valley
22/5 Hollandia, possibly Baliem Valley
23/5 Hollandia—Serui
24/5 Serui
25/5 Serui—Wissel Lakes
26/5 Wissel Lakes—Merauke
27/5 Merauke
28/5 Merauke—Sorong
29/5 Sorong, possibly Radja Ampat group
30/5 Sorong—Manokwari
31/5 Manokwari—Biak
1/6 Reserve—c.q. day of rest
2/6 Biak—Balikpapan
3/6 Balikpapan—Jacarta.

It is decided that the Governor of New Guinea shall be telegraphically informed of this scheme with the request to make the carrying-out of it, as much as this will be feasible, possible.

It is further decided that the Union Secretariat shall arrange with the Garuda Indonesian Airways the chartering of a Dakota Canadair aeroplane and will already now take steps for a provisional booking of the return flight to the Netherlands by K.L.M.

After having invited the members to convene on Thursday 11th May in the meeting hall of the Ministry of the Interior for informal discussions, the Chairman closes the meeting at 19.15 hours.

Countersigned on 12th May 1950.

Chairman,  
Dr. J. Latuharhary.  

Drawn up by,  
Dr. W. Schols.
JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Minutes of the 2nd formal meeting held on Friday 12th May 1950,
at 9 a.m. in the assemblyroom of the Ministry of
Internal Affairs at Djakarta

Present:
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Chairman;
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Vice-Chairman;
Dr. Teng Tjin Leng, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
A. S. Pello, Secretary;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
J. A. van Beuge, Adviser;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;

Union-Secretariat:
Moh. Jahja;
Dr. W. Schols, Committee-Secretary;
Miss S. J. M. Kerstens.

The Chairman opens the meeting at 9.15 hours and puts up for
discussion:

1. The formalisation of the minutes of the first formal meeting
   on Wednesday 10th May.
   After a few alterations and emendations these minutes are adopted.

   Prof. van der Kolff remarks that he has said that Mr. van Beuge
   „has been present at all the previous discussions on this subject”.
   (Point 4 of the minutes). This is not quite correct. Mr. van Beuge
   has had an active share in the preparation of the previous discus-
   sions in this respect, but he has not attended all the discussions.

2. Formalisation of the report of the first informal meeting on
   Thursday 11th May 1950.
   The draft of the report is adopted after a few alterations and sup-
   plementations.
   A discussion ensues about the sentence on page 3: „In this con-
   nection the speaker further remarks that is is not considered desir-
   able to speak about: the sounding of the disposition of the popu-
   lation, but rather: the sounding of the opinion of prominent persons,
   whose opinion is valued by the Committee”. 
It is decided to put on record that this sentence renders the standpoint of the Netherlands members but that the Indonesian members reserve the right to come back on this point.

3. Formalisation of the report of the second informal meeting on Thursday 11th May 1950.
   The draft is adopted after a few changes have been made.

4. Circulation minutes and reports.
   It is decided that the adopted reports of the first and the second informal meetings shall be attached as appendixes to the minutes of the second formal meeting.

   It is further decided that the Committee will further consider the question as to which instances and persons will receive the minutes and reports, in particular, whether these documents will also be forwarded to the U.N.C.I.

Prof. van Dijk remarks that he is surprised that no previous circulation has been made of an agenda, approved by the Chairman, in particular, as he does not think it correct that the Union Secretariat unexpectedly brings up questions of procedure, in respect of which there has been no opportunity to hold previous consultations.

It is decided that the Secretariat shall draw up a draft Standing Orders to be approved by the Committee.

5. Attending the meetings and gatherings of the Committee by representatives of the two Governments, who can be expected to take part in the ultimate consultation between the two Governments.

Prof. van der Kolff says that the Netherlands members have considered this point and he elucidates their standpoint as follows:

The Netherland members remark that the Committee has been set up for the preparation of the negotiations between the Republic of the United States of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands, which have to lead to the determination of the political status of New Guinea, on which they have to report to the two Governments, which shall there after have definitive negotiations take place.

They are therefore of the opinion that the tacit presence of persons, being part of the respective Governments, or official representatives of the latter, would not be in accordance with the aim for which the Committee has been set up, viz. a preparation on behalf of the negotiations the two Governments shall hold, because by these Government officials, c.q. official representatives tacitly attending the meetings of the Committee, the latter would be to a certain extent responsible for the report, they might feel themselves committed and in any case could be kept co-responsible for it by third parties.
They also remark that the independence of the Committee which is, at least on the Netherlands side, viewed as a non-political committee, is in this way endangered, on the other its independence of opinion being impaired.

The Chairman says that the Indonesian members will be pleased to consider this point, since they have taken cognisance of the standpoint of the Netherlands members and proposes to give their reply in the next meeting on Monday 15th May.

6. Definitive drawing up of the final report.

Prof. van der Kolff elucidates that the Netherlands members are conscious of the difficulties the Indonesian members expect they will have to face.

Assuming that there is complete agreement between he Indonesian and Netherlands members in respect of the fact that the report of the Committee will be drafted in the Netherlands, the latter are of the opinion that it will be possible to find a modus to meet the desire of the Indonesian members to consult own advisers in Indonesia before the signing of the report.

The Chairman has been pleased to take cognisance of the standpoint of the Netherlands members and expresses his confidence that it will prove possible to find conjointly a solution.

Prof. van der Kolff.

May we take it for granted that if the Netherlands members should have to return to Indonesia their sojourn here would be of a very short duration?

The Chairman answers in the affirmative.

7. Closure.

The Chairman closes the meeting with a word of thanks at 11.20 hours.

Countersigned on 15th May 1950.

Chairman,
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff.

Drawn up by,
Dr. W. Schols.
JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Summary of the 1st informal meeting on Tuesday 11th May 1950, at 11.00 a.m. in the assemblyroom of the Ministry of Internal Affairs at Djakarta

Present:
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Chairman;
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Vice-Chairman;
Dr. Teng Tjin Leng, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
A. S. Pello, Secretary;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
J. A. van Beuge, Adviser;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;

Union-Secretariat:
Moh. Jahja;
Dr. W. Schols, Committee-Secretary;
Miss S. J. M. Kerstens.

The Chairman opens the meeting at well past 11 hours.
The Secretary reads the draft telegram about the itinerary to be sent to the Governor of New Guinea.

1. With reference to the total number of persons expected to make the trip, the Chairman says that the Indonesian members consider it desirable to add two experts to the Committee, viz. Messrs Papare and Latumahina. Both are conversant with the sentiments alive in wide strata of the population and they are considered to be experts in the political field.

After the meeting has been adjourned at the request of the Netherlands members in order to enable them to consider this proposal, Prof. van der Kolff elucidates after the reopening the viewpoint of the Netherlands members. They anxiously wonder whether an appointment as is being proposed does not infringe the aim of H. E. Dr. van Maarseveen, who took the initiative for the setting up of a Mixed Committee New Guinea/Irian, H.E.'s intention having been a non-political Study Committee. The experts proposed by the Indonesian members are to be considered to be positively politically orientated. Further, it is not clear to the Netherlands members of the Committee in what connection in this case there can be question of expertness. It is customary to speak of expertness in case of a generally acknowledged capability in respect of a trader or science. The Netherlands
members are of the opinion that the question whether the persons mentioned can be considered to be experts, is positively to be answered in the negative. They can therefore not accept the gentlemen’s appointment as experts of the Committee. In case however the Indonesian members would nevertheless value having these persons as advisers, consequently exclusively for the Indonesian group, objections could also be raised against this standpoint. In the first place because the difficulties of housing and transport make it necessary to restrict the number of people as much as possible.

Further, in these persons two advisers would be assumed who are also political persons, whose arrival in New Guinea could possibly give rise to political demonstrations and counter-demonstrations, it being unknown whether the Government could prevent this. The work of the Committee would in this way be rendered impossible; though the Netherlands members do not want to withhold their agreement from the assumption of those advisers considered necessary by the Indonesian members, they are inclined to stress these objections opposite the Indonesian members, expressing at the same time their confidence that the Indonesian members will not object against the Netherlands members assuming after their arrival in New Guinea another adviser, as long as the parity is not impaired, which parity the Netherlands members presume to be also accepted by the Indonesian members.

*Dr. Teng Tjin Leng* considers Prof. van der Kolff’s appeal to the words of H.E. Minister van Maarseveen not quite correct. The words quoted were only meant as a remark, not further gone into, without meaning that this could not have happened. It has therefore not been the intention to set up a purely scientific Committee. In this respect the problem New Guinea is of a far too political nature.

The Indonesian members understand the standpoint of the Netherlands. The Indonesian members however consider the two gentlemen they have mentioned decided experts in the political field. Speaker is however prepared to consider whether the Indonesian members can agree that they are assumed as advisers and asks an adjournment of the meeting in order to reconsider the matter.

*Prof. van der Kolff* says that the words quoted as having been spoken by H. E. Minister van Maarseveen were indeed only a suggestion, which was however very seriously meant, as also appears from the appointment of the Netherlands members, who are all of them non-political.

After the meeting has been adjourned *Dr. Latuharhary* says after its being reopened that the Indonesian members are prepared to assume Messrs Papare and Latumahina as advisers. The Indonesian members also declared themselves in principle prepared to allow the Netherlands members to assume advisers on a basis of parity if need occurs.
They also express their confidence that the presence of Messrs Papare and Latumahina will give no cause for demonstrations.

2. The Chairman now puts up for discussion the question how the work in New Guinea/Irian will have to be done.

Mr. Makaliwy proposes that in New Guinea/Irian shall be heard: leaders of parties, Government officials and other important persons, whose opinion is valued by the Committee.

Prof. van der Kolff sees two possibilities: either the Committee in pleno can hear various persons, or the members individually can approach them. In the first case, when the Committee has acted as such, the results obtained are put on record as being fact findings of the Committee, which does not influence the possibility that the conclusions to be drawn later from these facts can be different. The information to be obtained by the members individually can however only be taken as personal notes, which may serve to strengthen or form their own opinion but cannot state an accomplished fact for the Committee.

When Mr. Makaliwy mentions the hearings of leaders of parties the speaker would rather have it formulated as the hearing of prominent persons, prominent, not on account of their being representatives of certain parties, but on account of their individual merits. Further, the speaker mentions the desirability to solicit in advance the cooperation of the Government in New Guinea/Irian to the effect that locally information be collected as to who would like to be heard during the sojourn of the Committee, after which the Committee can make a choice from the information collected.

In this connection the speaker also says that it is not considered desirable to speak about: the sounding of the disposition of the population, but more correct: the sounding of the opinion of prominent persons, whose opinion the Committee values.

Dr. Latuharhary considers the various ways in which prominent persons can be heard, a. the hearing by the Committee in pleno, b. the collecting of information by the members individually. He would appreciate if the hearing of persons shall take place without the local civil government being present or military authorities.

Prof. van der Kolff agrees to this desirability and considers it out of the question as they are not members of the Committee.

The Chairman tenders his thanks to those present and closes the meeting at 12.30 hours.

Countersigned 15-5-50.

Chairman,
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff.  

Drawn up by,
Dr. W. Schols.
JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Summary of the 2nd informal meeting on Tuesday 11th May 1950, at 5.00 p.m. in the assemblyroom of the Ministry of Internal Affairs at Djakarta

Present:
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Chairman;
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Vice-Chairman;
Dr. Teng Tjin Leng, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
A. S. Pello, Secretary;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
J. A. van Beuge, Adviser;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;
Union-Secretariat:
Moh. Jahja;
Dr. W. Schols, Committee-Secretary;
Miss S. J. M. Kerstens.

The Chairman opens the meeting at 17.45 hours and says that owing to a technical stagnation the report of the morning-meeting can not yet be circulated. The formalisation will therefore be postponed till Friday morning.

Prof. Pieters would appreciate if measures could be taken to prevent a reoccurrence of such a stagnation.

The Chairman takes it that all the members now have the draft minute of the first formal meeting. These too will be discussed on Friday morning c.q. accepted.

As regards the question of the date to be fixed for the departure of the Committee to the Netherlands, he says that the Indonesian members agree in principle that the departure can be fixed between 12th and 15th June.

But this item ought to be fixed definitively after their return from New Guinea/Irian. Meanwhile the Union-Secretariat can have seats booked at the K.L.M. for 15 passengers circa the 10th up to the 15th June. The Indonesian members consider it of importance to state that the drawing up of the final report in the Netherlands may confront them with great difficulties. In connection with the fact that it will be very difficult to withdraw officials from the service in Indonesia,
the Indonesian members will not have sufficient advisers at their disposal. Nevertheless the Indonesian members consider a sojourn in the Netherlands of importance, as they would be pleased to come into contact with the leaders of political parties in the Netherlands in order to take cognisance of their standpoint. It would however be appreciated if it could be decided to have definitive drawing up of the report take place in Indonesia.

Prof. van der Kolff cannot express the standpoint of the Netherlands members in this respect straight away. This proposal makes a change in the plans, with which objections of a financial, physical and personal character are connected, time also being a factor. The Netherlands members would like to consider this point. The Speaker would however like to know whether a definitive drawing up in Indonesia means that practically the report would be finished in the Netherlands, apart from the fact the Indonesian members would for instance like to test in some instances further technical data with the advisers in Indonesia.

Dr. Latuiharhary answers in the affirmative and asks to be given the opportunity of giving the decision on this point, if possible, on Friday.

Prof. Pieters remarks that it is considered desirable that a decision be taken as soon as possible about a provisional scheme or a provisional structure of the final report. This will facilitate and guarantee in due time the collecting of material.

The Chairman proposes that the members shall consider this item, after which this point can be discussed on Monday afternoon, 15th May, which proposition is adopted.

In this connection Prof. van der Kolff says by way of information of the Netherlands members that he has been informed before the meeting that the members Messrs Papare and Teng Tjin Leng will leave on Friday afternoon in connection with urgent work, owing to which it will not be possible to meet before Monday afternoon.

Dr. Teng Tjin Leng asks whether there are objections to the meetings being attended by representatives of the two Governments, who can be expected to take part in the final discussions between the two Governments. He has hereby in mind H. E. the Menteri Negara Dr. Suparmo and the acting High Commissioner Dr. Gieben.

Prof. Pieters would like to give further consideration to this point and come back on it Friday morning.

Countersigned 15-5-50.

Chairman,
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff.

Drawn up by,
Dr. W. Schols.
C Ir I/Not/3/G.T.
Appendix: 1 itinerary

JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Minutes of the 3rd formal meeting held on Monday 15th May 1950, at 18.00 p.m. in the assemblyroom of the Ministry of Internal Affairs at Djakarta

Present:

Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Chairman;
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Vice-Chairman;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
J. A. van Beuge, Adviser;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;
Mr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
S. Papare, Adviser;
A. S. Pello, Secretary;

Union-Secretariat:

Mr. W. Schols;
Moh. Jahja, Committee-Secretary;
Miss S. J. M. Kerstens.

1. Opening.

The Chairman opens the meeting at 18 hours and welcomes those present. He addresses in particular Mr. Papare who attends for the first time the meeting in his capacity of adviser. He then expresses the hope that also under his chairmanship the meetings will have the same smooth course and be held in the same pleasant atmosphere as was the case when his predecessor was in the Chair.

2. Adoption of the minutes of the 2nd formal meeting on 12th May 1950. The Chairman puts with reference to the last line of point 6 the following question:

Can it be taken for granted that, if the Netherlands members would have to return to Indonesia, their sojourn here would be of a very short duration?

Dr. Latuharhary answers in the affirmative.

It is decided after a few alterations have been made and after the minutes have been supplemented as mentioned before, to adopt the minutes of the 2nd Formal meeting.
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The *Chairman* says that it would be clearer if it would be clearly mentioned on the reports of the informal discussions, attached as appendixes to the adopted minutes, of which minutes they are an appendix.

*It is decided* to agree to this suggestion.

3. Closure.

As there are no further items under discussion, the Chairman closes the meeting at 18.15 hours.

Countersigned 19-5-50.

*Chairman,*

Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff.

*Drawn up by,*

Moh. Jahja.
Travelling-scheme

20/5 Biak—Hollandia (if possible a fligat over the Hidden Valley-Baliem)
21/5 Hollandia (if possible to the Hidden Valley when not possible on 20/5)
22/5 Hollandia—Biak
23/5 Biak
24/5 Biak—Merauke
25/5 Merauke—Wigul (vice versa)
26/5 Merauke—Biak
27/5 Biak
28/5 Biak—Wisselmeren (Lake Anggusi)
29/5 Wisselmeren—Serui—Biak
30/5 Biak—Manokwari (vice versa)
31/5 Biak—Sorong (vice versa)
1/6 Biak—Fak Fak (vice versa)
2/6 Home journey via Morotai—Balikpapan
3/6 Balikpapan—Djakarta.
JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Minutes of the 4th formal meeting held on Friday 18th May 1950, at 17.30 p.m. in the lodgings of the K.L.M. at Biak

Present:
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Chairman;
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Vice-Chairman;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
J. A. van Beuge, Adviser;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;
Dr. Muh. Yamin, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
S. Papare, Adviser;
A. S. Pello, Secretary;
Union-Secretariat:
Dr. W. Schols;
Moh. Jahja, Comittee-Secretary;

1. Opening.
The Chairman opens the meeting at 17.30 hours and welcomes those present, in particular Dr. Muh. Yamin, who has taken his place as a member of the Indonesian Group of the Mixed Committee New Guinea/irian after his return from his visit to Moskou as a member of the R.I.S. Delegation.
The Chairman hopes that the meetings of the Committee will have the same course as in the atmosphere when Dr. Teng Tjing Leng acted as deputy of Dr. Muh. Yamin. The Chairman further regrets to state that Dr. Teng Tjing Leng, who was going to act as adviser of the Indonesian Group, has been prevented from making the visit of orientation to New Guinea/irian owing to political disturbances in Macassar.

2. Adoption of the minutes of the 3rd formal meeting.
It is decided after a few alterations and supplementations have been made to adopt the minutes of the 3rd formal meeting.

3. Fixation of the itinerary.
It is decided to fix the itinerary as embodied in appendix 1 of the minutes of the 3rd formal meeting.

Closure.
As there are no further items under consideration, the Chairman closes the meeting at 17.55 hours.

Countersigned 23-5-50.

Chairman,
Dr. J. Latuharhary.

Drawn up by,
Moh. Jahja.
Joint Committee New Guinea/Irian

Minutes of the 5th formal meeting held on Tuesday 23 May 1950, in the lodgings of the K.L.M. at Biak

Present:
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Chairman;
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Vice-Chairman;
Dr. Muh. Yamin, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
A. S. Pello, Secretary;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;
S. Papare, Adviser;
N. Jouwe, Adviser;
J. A. van Beuge, Adviser;

Union-Secretariat:
Moh. Jahja;
Dr. W. Schols, Committee-Secretary.

1. Opening.

The Chairman opens the meeting at 8.30 hours and puts up for discussion.

2. Documents received:

a. The Chairman says that in Hollandia there are two persons, viz. N. Wali and H. Jouku, who presented themselves at the Secretariat in order to protest against the fact their names had been put under resolutions, presented by P. Wettebossy, Chairman of the P.I.D.R.I.S. An official report had been drawn up by the two secretaries, a copy of which was presented to the members.

It is decided to attach this official report to the resolution concerned.
b. *The Chairman* further says that the deputations in Hollandia have also presented documents under sealed envelope, which later proved not to have been addressed to the Committee, but to:

1. The Head of the Netherlands Union at The Hague,
2. The President of the Netherlands Parliament,
3. The President of the Indonesian Parliament,
4. The Chairman of the Netherlands Delegation of the Neth. Indon. Union,
5. The Chairman of the Indonesian Delegation of the Neth. Indon. Union,
6. The High Commissioner R.I.S. at the Hague,
7. The High Commissioner Netherlands at Jacarta.

He proposes to have these documents forwarded to their addresses.

*Prof. van der Kolff* wonders whether these documents have to be forwarded since an incorrectness proves to have taken place in the resolutions presented to the Committee, in the first place, or, if this be decided, whether this should not be done, stating at the same time the fact, mentioned in the official report.

*The Chairman* does no know the contents of the documents to be forwarded.

*Prof. van Dijk* says, that in any case in respect of the resolution addressed to the Committee an incorrectness has taken place. This could justify the surmise that the same fact has taken place also in respect of the documents to be forwarded. He proposes to have a copy of the official report presented simultaneously with their possibly being forwarded.

*Prof Pieters* shares this opinion. Already in Hollandia he pointed out that these documents should have been returned to the deputations. Since this was not done, the documents can only be forwarded when simultaneous information be given to the addressees about possible irregularities in the signing.

After some discussion between the Netherlands and Indonesian members *it is decided* that these documents not addressed to the Committee shall be forwarded together with a copy of the official report.

c. With reference to the letter received from the Director, Head of the Service of the Civil Service and Justice in New Guinea, concerning remarks made by Mr. Pello, *the Chairman* states that he
has already orally offered his apologies to the Resident van Eeckhoud and that he will repeat it in writing.

The Committee can agree to the draft letter.

3. Adoption Minutes 4th formal meeting on 19th May 1950
4. Adoption report 3rd formal meeting on 15th May 1950
5. Adoption report 4th informal meeting on 19st May 1950
6. Adoption report 5th informal meeting on 21st May 1950

The documents mentioned under 3—6 incl. are adopted with a few alterations and supplementations.

7. As there are no further items under consideration, the Chairman closes the meeting at 22.10 hours.

Countersigned 6-6-50.

Chairman,
Dr. J. Latuharhary,

Drawn up by,
Dr. W. Schols.
JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Summary record of the third informal assembly held in the conference room of the Ministry of foreign affairs at Jacarta on Monday May 15, 1950 at 18.15 hours

Present:
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Chairman;
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Vice-Chairman;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
J. A. van Beuge, Adviser;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
S. Papare, Adviser;
A. S. Pello, Secretary;

Union-Secretariat:
Moh. Jahja, Committee-Secretary;
Dr. W. Schols;
Miss S. J. M. Kerstens.

1. Opening.

At 18.15 hours the Chairman opens the meeting and immediately proceeds to deal with the items on the agenda.

The Chairman feels that the items 2 and 3 of the agenda are closely interrelated. He expresses the standpoint of the Netherlands members that this committee should be essentially looked upon as a study committee, which establishes its report independently of the two Governments and, therefore, is not subject to Government influence, as far as this is possible. Inversely, the committee should be careful not to influence the Governments prematurely. The Netherlands members are therefore of opinion that the Committee should not send these documents officially to the Governments concerned. It stands to reason that there is no objection to furnishing the minutes, besides to the members and secretaries, also to the advisers and experts, in so far as they have attended the discussions.

The Chairman is of opinion that the term most confidential should only be placed on records of informal assemblies and that the term „confidential” should be used on Minutes of formal meetings, just because the nature of informal discussions, where opinions are more
readily expressed frankly, entails this. Dr. Latuharhary asks whether it is intended that only the records of the informal assemblies should not be submitted to the Governments concerned.

The Chairman declares that his idea was to adopt the official standpoint that neither the records of the informal assemblies nor the minutes of the formal meetings of the Committee should be forwarded to the Governments concerned. Dr. Latuharhary agrees to the standpoint taken by the Netherlands group, viz., that the Committee should proceed independently as far as this is possible, but is of opinion, that this independence cannot be maintained to the full extent. The Committee was formed following a dispute that has arisen between the two Union partners and, consequently, maintains close relations with the Governments concerned. If need be, he can agree, to the records of the informal assemblies not being submitted, but he considers submitting the minutes necessary to keep the Government informed.

When making the request to admit a representative of the Government concerned to the meetings and assemblies of the Committee, the Indonesian group had no political secondary motive.

In the history of the formation of the Committee it was agreed, inter alia, that, if necessary, the Governments concerned can give unable to do if they are not kept informed about the work of the Committee by having themselves represented at the meetings, or by ordering the minutes of the formal meetings to be submitted to them. The same would have to apply with regard to the UNCI. The speaker wonders whether the latter should not also receive the minutes, or whether forwarding the final report would suffice. As to the classification, he states that both the records of the informal assemblies and the minutes of the formal meetings should be qualified as confidential documents.

The Chairman feels that it is actually possible to obtain instructions from the Governments concerned without forwarding the minutes, firstly when the Governments take the initiative to that end during the work of the Committee, and secondly when, in the event of a more important difference of opinion, the groups in question ask their Governments to give them further instructions. All the same, it was definitely intended that in Indonesia the Netherlands group of the Committee should work without further instructions.

As far as the forwarding of the minutes and records to the UNCI is concerned, the Chairman is of opinion, that this cannot be deduced from articles 5 and 6 of the resolution instituting the Committee, nor from the Minutes of the meetings of the Union Conference of New
Guinea/Irian. On the contrary, there is no direct relation between the Joint New Guinea/Irian Committee and the UNCI, since paragraph 6, unlike paragraph 5, of the resolution instituting the Committee makes it clear that forwarding the Committees report to the UNCI is a matter for the Governments and not for the Committee to arrange.

*Dr. Latuharhary* falls in with the Chairman's views with respect to sending or not sending documents to the UNCI, and further believes that forwarding reports to the UNCI is not the task of the Committee, but of the Governments. Nevertheless, he adheres to his standpoint that from a practical point of view it is no doubt necessary to keep the Governments in question constantly informed about the committees activities, in order to prevent those Governments from suddenly being faced with problems. This might be done by forwarding the minutes.

The *Chairman* remarks that the Netherlands members continue to see in this a procedure not in conformity with their commission. After some discussion the Chairman suspends the meeting to enable the Netherlands members to deliberate further on this point.

The *Chairman* reopens the meeting at 18.50 hours, on behalf of the Netherlands group, advances that the Netherlands Group is prepared to agree to the minutes being forwarded to the Governments if the Indonesian Group is ready to abandon their wish that a Government representative be present at the meeting. This latter point would mean to the Netherlands members too far-reaching an infringement of the principle.

*Dr. Latuharhary* says that in that case he withdraws his request to admit a Government representative to the meetings.

4. *Discussion of the Netherlands point of view on the definite adoption of the final report.* It is decided to study this point in greater detail.

5. *Discussion on the provisional set-up of the final report.*

The *Chairman* explains that in his opinion the final report may be imagined to consist of materials from two places of origin. On the one hand, as material will be used what can be borrowed from existing literature, books, reports and other documents. On the other, material will have to be taken from the members' own observations in Irian. As the latter is a point of actuality, the Chairman wants to discuss this part of the set-up first.

On the part of the Netherlands group a number of questions have been drawn up, which are preceded by a consideration giving the standpoints of both parties. The Note summarizing this is now being
typed and will be presented to the Indonesian members tomorrow morning between 9 and 10 hours. For the discussion of this note another meeting will be required.

*It is decided* to discuss this item of the agenda at the next informal assembly on Thursday May 16, at 18.00 hours.


*It is decided* to scrutinize this point, too, at the informal assembly previously referred to.

Adopted 23/5.

*The Chairman,*

Dr. J. Latuharhary.  

*Minutes drawn up by*

Moh. Jahja.
JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Summary record of the fourth informal meeting held in the K.L.M. Guest House in Biak, on Friday 19th May, 1950

Present:
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Chairman;
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Vice-Chairman;
Dr. Muh. Yamin, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
A. S. Pello, Secretary;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;
S. Papare, Adviser;
J. A. van Beuge, Adviser;

Union-Secretariat:
Moh. Jahja, Committee-Secretary;
Dr. W. Schols;

1. Opening.
At 15.55 the Chairman opens the meeting.

2. Discussion of documents received.

The Chairman says that during the visit the Committee members paid to the Governor of New Guinea on 18th May, 1950, they handed him a file containing some Indonesian magazines and pictures. To make already at the outset a few observations on these pictures:

The Netherlands members, although most pained by this form of propaganda, think it better not to go into this matter at this moment. They reserve the right, however, to revert to it in the course of the further discussions, if required.

Dr. Latuharhary wonders if it is the task of the Committee to concern itself with propaganda outside the Committee.

The Chairman would like to regard this matter in such a way that everything reaching the Committee in the form of complaints should be received and read, but that no further consideration should be given to it.
Dr. Muh. Yamin has not yet perused the documents concerned. He knows the name of the magazine, which is not published by the R.I.S. Purely to gratify his curiosity he would like to learn how the Governor received these documents. He agrees to their being filed with the Secretariat.

On the proposal of the Chairman, who is unable to answer Dr. Yamin's question as to the origin of these documents, it is decided that any other similar documents the members might have received or will receive should be registered at the Secretariat, where they should be held at the disposal of the members.

The same procedure is adopted with regard to the petitions which were received the day before and on which nobody has asked permission to speak.

3. Discussion of the provisional set-up of the report.

Mode of laying down the data.

The Chairman proposes to combine the discussion of the two points. He further says that in the previous assembly he already advanced the opinion of the Netherlands members, viz. that they intend to build up the final report from two kinds of sources: firstly, the data known from existing literature, notes, reports and other printed matters and papers, and secondly, the orientation data which the Committee will collect during its trip to New Guinea. These data will serve rather to fill gaps in the former data.

The former data, available from literature, etc., can be left out of account for the time being. They can be obtained in a comparatively easy way. The Netherlands members have thought fit, however, to send the Indonesian members in a Note their proposals relating to the collection of data during the trip to New Guinea.

Therefore the speaker would be pleased to hear whether the Indonesian members have defined or formulated their views on the procedure to be adopted or on the questions to be asked now that they have taken cognizance of the Note referred to.

Dr. Latuharhary says that he will be pleased to give a verbal exposé of the standpoint of the Indonesian members.

The set-up of the report to be submitted to the two Governments constitutes the most important problem of the Committee. It is of primary importance that unanimity should exist on the exception of the task.

After studying the Netherlands Note, the Indonesian members believe to see that it is divided into 3 parts: first, the standpoint of the Indonesian Delegation (at the R.T.C.), second the standpoint of the Netherlands Delegation (at the R.T.C.), third, a plan of the Netherlands Government to promote the national education of the
population. On the basis of the latter a questionnaire has been drawn up.

The Indonesian members fear that the Note is too onesided. They are under the impression that the object of the questions included is to strengthen the Netherlands standpoint at the R.T.C.

The Indonesian members start from the results obtained at the R.T.C. and from those of the first ministerial conference. In art. 2 of the Charter of the Transfer of Sovereignty it was provided, with regard to New Guinea, that the final status should be established within one year through negotiations. The question is of vital importance, as appears from the inclusion of the New Guinea problem in the agenda of the first Union Conference.

The Indonesian members visualize a set-up of the report in 4 chapters, the contents being divided as follows:

1. Summing up of pronouncements of the Netherlands and Netherlands-Indies Governments on the Netherlands Indies exclusive of Irian, as they are found in the Netherlands constitutions of 1848, 1922, 1948, the Government Regulation of 1854 and the Netherlands Indies Constitution of 1925, in which New Guinea/Irian occurred as a part of Indonesia.

   This chapter also includes the treaties which Tidore.

2. The pronouncements of the Netherlands Government and the Allies at the conference of San Fransisco and of the South Pacific Conference; further, those of the Netherlands Indies Government at Malino, Den Pasar and Pangkalpinang.

3. The decisive pronouncements made at the R.T.C. and at the first ministerial Conference, supplemented by those of the Netherlands Government in the Netherlands Parliament; further, official pronouncements of the Government of the R.I.S., the R.I., the N.I.T., both in State papers and documents and in the Parliaments.

4. The consequences of the possible transfer of New Guinea to the R.I.S. with regard to administration, Roman Catholic and Protestant mission, Islam, traffic and trade, customs, economy, education, etc.

The Chairman feels that this set-up is worth studying and expresses the opinion that the Netherlands members will be compelled to ask some time to deliberate on the matter, as the Indonesian members did with regard to the Netherlands Note.

He therefore requests the Indonesian members to lay down this set-up in writing to enable the Netherlands members to study it „à tête reposée”.

In many respects this set-up is different from the Netherlands set-up. The speaker states as his personal opinion that in the last
extremity it must be feasible to have the final report split up into two parts, viz.

a) the report of the Indonesian members commented by the Netherlands members.

b) the report of the Netherlands members, commented by the Indonesian members.

On this point, too, the speaker would like to think matters over.

Prof. Pieters voices his appreciation of the fact that the Netherlands members have been able to note the set-up as the Indonesian members visualize it. It concerns here a set-up of the whole report, however, but parties had not yet got so far. The Netherlands Note dealt with the additional data to be collected during the trip to New Guinea.

The points alluded to by Dr. Latuharhary, however, in the Netherlands train of thoughts would have to be included in the 1st part of the report, the existing literature and data.

As the Netherlands Note merely intended to serve as a guide for the collection of data during the orientation trip to New Guinea, in it only the social and economical aspects were dealt with. It was expressly recalled that the juridical and political aspects had been left out of account.

For this reason the set-up proposed by the Indonesian members cannot be a hindrance to the discussion of the Netherlands Note.

Dr. Latuharhary observes that the Indonesian members were under the impression that by the data of the first catagory as referred to by the Chairman were meant scientific data from literature on ethno-

logy, "adat" law, etc.

Be things as they may, the Indonesian members feel that the questions are intended to strenghthen the Netherlands standpoint at the R.T.C.

The Chairman is of opinion that the Indonesian members are entirely free to propose other questions in addition. If they have the impression that the question are one-sided, he will be pleased to receive suggestions for a change or modification of those questions.

Dr. Latuharhary says that the three main questions have created this impression. If these main questions are left out of account, the others can be considered.

Thus, to main question I: if New Guinea/Irian were transferred to the Republik of the U.S.I., would this result in the termination or the continuation of colonial conditions? The Indonesian members could immediately reply that continuation would not occur, for the R.I.S. does not intend to incorporate colonial conditions in its con-

stitutional law.
Prof. Pieters is of opinion that this question cannot, actually, be taken to have been worded in such a way that answering it means strengthening the Netherlands point of view. The question admits of two replies.

Dr. Latumarhary declares that to the Indonesian members the question is no longer a question.

The Chairman feels that the speaker will have to prove this by arguments, as to the Netherlands members it still is a question. The Netherlands Group starts from the idea that the information to be obtained in New Guinea will send to contribute towards answering this question.

The Indonesian members, too, could use the data to be collected to strengthen their standpoint, as an objectively given answer holds two possibilities.

Prof. van Dijk is able to realize that the Indonesian members consider some questions one-sided. Thus, question II, for example, might be looked upon as somewhat tinted, but it is also the task of the Netherlands members to collect data which can strengthen the Netherlands standpoint. Each group of members must try to obtain in the best and most objective way possible the arguments most suitable to strengthen its standpoint.

Dr. Muh. Yamin believes that the existence of some misunderstanding is quite accountable. Dr. Latumarhary has explained how the Indonesian members had visualized the set-up of the final report. He has not expressed himself, however, on the Committee's task during the orientation trip.

Further, the misunderstanding is due to the fact that the two Governments have omitted to give instructions. This does give the Committee members a free hand, but on the other hand they are restricted by other factors, e.g. time, the common conceptions at the R.T.C. and the Union Conference.

With the Indonesian members objections have arisen not to the questions, but to the guiding principle behind them. This principle will constitute the subject of the forthcoming negotiations between the Governments.

The speaker suggests that the secondary questions be considered separately from the guiding principle embodied in the 3 main questions.

The Chairman would like to hear if, consequently, the Indonesian members do not object to the individual questions being asked at a later date it will then be possible to discuss the standpoint of the Netherlands members, viz. that the secondary questions and the main
questions should be interrelated, which is denied by the Indonesian members.

Subject to a few observations to be dealt with presently, Dr. Muh. Yamin has no objection to the secondary questions being asked. Answering the 3 main questions would furnish conclusions, which he thinks undesirable. The guiding principle behind these questions does not tally with the main points of the R.T.C. and the Union Conference: not with the R.T.C. in that sufficient data were not yet available, and not with the Union Conference in that transfer would take place within a specified time.

Prof. Pieters is of opinion that members are free to draw conclusions from the data.

Dr. Muh. Yamin contests this. When he discussed this point with His Excellency Minister van Maarseveen, the latter, too, declared that it would be a report without conclusions.

Prof. Pieters can agree to Dr. Yamin’s standpoint as far as conclusions with regard to the future political status are concerned. On other points such conclusions are allowed, however. The speaker fails to realize that the Committee should be intended for the collection of data without critical considerations of such data to be laid down in conclusions. For a mere collection of data no committee is required.

Prof. van Dijk observes that the Committee is indeed a preparatory committee. Therefore, should the Committee not conceive the preparatory work in such a way that it collects, groups and sifts the data and draw conclusions from them, this would result in the two Governments presently being overwhelmed with a chaotic floor of data. Consequently, the intention must be that the Committee also draws conclusions from the data, from a scientific point of view.

Dr. Muh. Yamin believes that the standpoint of the parties are not so widely apart.

Both groups agree that political conclusions must not be drawn. The Committee is not a political one, but not a purely scientific one either. There are no instructions, however. It is not his intention to deny the members the competence to draw conclusions of a non-political nature, but the three main questions are political in character. If they are to be answered, the Indonesian members can reply forthwith to question 1: yes, to question 2: no, and to question 3: an economic whole.

Prof. Pieters could imagine that a political answer to these questions would ensue if the members were to reply to them "à bout
portant”. However, if the Committee first collects material and draws conclusions after quiet consideration, this will not be a political answer.

As an example the speaker recalls that both Governments have declared that the interest of the autochthonous population should predominate. The Committee has to form an opinion on this matter, and the conclusion of the Indonesian members and those of the Netherlands members may be differed. It is then left to the Governments’ discretion to come to a solution of this matter in the political field.

On the proposal of the Chairman the meeting is adjourned to enable the members to deliberate further on this point.

After the meeting has been re-opened, the Chairman suggests that the Indonesian members give a concisely formulated written exposé of their objections to the three main questions and bring this to the notice of the Netherlands members.

From the discussion he believes to have gathered that no objection is raised to the secondary questions.

Dr. Latuharhary promises that the Indonesian members will lay down in writing their objections to putting the problem in the three main questions.

As to the secondary questions, the Indonesian members would be pleased to know exactly what is meant by the so-called „cargo-cults”.

At the Chairman’s request Dr. van Baal gives a short explanation on that question.

Dr. Latuharhary says that the Indonesian members object to the questions of group I under 3, namely to the whole group of these questions. The objections are that according to the standpoint adopted by the Indonesian members the population of Irian belongs to that of Indonesia and that there is no dividing line between the population in Irian and that in the other parts of Indonesia.

Prof. Pieters is of opinion that this standpoint need not be a hindrance to the questions being asked.

Dr. Latuharhary states that the Indonesian members maintain the objections because they hold this principle.

The Chairman fails to see that answering these questions would imply taking sides politically.

Dr. Latuharhary declares that not only the feelings of the Irian population are involved, but in this case those of the Indonesian members.
Prof. van Dijk establishes that, consequently, the questions are objected to because asking those questions would have open the possibility that there is a dividing line between Irians and Indonesians. If objection is raised on the ground that these populations might not be considered as one, this implies that any argumentation not starting from unity must be objected to. The Committee's task is, however, to collect data, and answering these questions is necessary in order that the standpoints may be defined.

If the Indonesian members feel that any questions could not be asked because they are at variance with the established opinion of the Indonesian members, the speaker has to declare he is unable to fulfil his task.

The Chairman then adjourns the meeting to enable the members to deliberate further on this point.

After the meeting has been re-opened, Dr Latuharhary states that the Indonesian members regret to be unable to withdraw their objections.

Dr. Muh. Yamin explains that the appreciates the questions and admits that the answers may be of importance. These questions do not bear on the pith of the problem. At the R.T.C. the main point was not whether particular groups of the population do or do not belong to the Indonesian people. Thus, it is immaterial that Irians, Mentaweians and Niassians are no Indonesians in the anthropological sense of the term. It was the process of forming a nation that was all-important. To form this nation, some groups were even admitted that, ethnologically, can on no account be considered to belong to the Indonesians, such as the Eurasians.

Therefore, the Indonesian members cannot admit these questions. The speaker further refers to the regulations with regard to the assignment of citizens adopted at the R.T.C., which provide that on the nationality of the inhabitants of New Guinea nothing has been decided in case sovereignty over this territory should not be transferred to the Republic of the U.S.I.

The Chairman establishes that there has been no rapprochement of the standpoints of the Groups of members.

He therefore requests the Indonesian members to give a concise expose in writing of their standpoint also with regard to this question and to bring this to the notice of the Netherlands members, in order that the latter may deliberate on the matter.

It will be necessary that this is done at very short notice, in connection with the plan for the trip.
**Dr. Latuharhary** and **Dr. Yamin** promise that they will send the written exposé of their standpoint to the Netherlands Group that very evening.

**Prof. van Dijk** advances as his personal opinion that the difficulties which have arisen also relate to a difference in views on the Committee’s task. He asks whether it would be possible to have the opinion of the Indonesian members on this point, laid down in a summary.

**Dr. Yamin** promises this. In that case, however, he will be pleased also to have the Netherlands Group’s opinion on the matter after the Indonesian standpoint has been noted.

He sees the omission of giving instructions as one of the causes of the difficulties, but expresses his hope that the Committee may solve this difficulty within its own body without the necessity of asking instructions.


At the proposal of **Dr. Latuharhary** after article 12 a new article is inserted, reading as follows:

**Article 13**

1. All official documents issued by the Committee shall be made out in the Netherlands and Indonesian languages.

2. Both texts shall have equal force.

The number of article 13 is changed into 14.

After a few more amendments have been introduced, the Rules of Procedure are adopted.

5. Mode of laying down data.

It is decided to cancel this item, as for the time being it is irrelevant, no agreement having yet been reached on item 3.

6. Proposal to attract an adviser by the Netherlands Group, if possible.

The **Chairman** recalls that at the time the Netherlands members reserved the right to attract an adviser in New Guinea/Irian. They are now requesting permission to attract Mr. Nicolaas Jouwe of Hollandia as such.

**Dr. Latuharhary** declares that the Indonesian members have no objection to this.

The **Chairman** establishes that, consequently, Mr. Nicolaas Jouwe has been admitted as adviser to the Netherlands Group.
Closure.

Before proceeding to the closure, the Chairman calls on Dr. Latuharhary to speak a few words. The latter declares that during the conversation he had with the Resident and the Head of the M.L.D. on the plan of the trip, he has learnt with satisfaction that the Chairman has asked to prevent demonstrations from whatever side. He reminded the Chairman of the demonstration that took place on the Committee's arrival at Biak, by which the Indonesian members had been more or less painfully affected.

The Chairman says that the Netherlands members, too had been pained by it.

There being nothing further to discuss, the Chairman closes the meeting at 21.30.

Adopted 23/5-'50.

The Chairman,
Dr. J. Latuharhary. 

Minutes drawn up by,
Dr. W. Schols.
Prior to setting out for New Guinea the Netherlands members think it desirable to render accounts with regard to the question as to how this trip can be made conducive to the aims of the Committee to prepare the negotiations between the two Governments by collecting data and drawing up a report. They feel that this trip can be particularly useful for a further orientation in respect of the social and economic aspects of the pending questions, which will make it possible to obtain a broader insight into the real interests and situation of the population and into the wishes vanished by it, at any rate in so far as such wishes can be actually sounded. The members are of the opinion that by filling the gaps existing in this knowledge of local conditions a better understanding may be obtained of the grounds on which the arguments brought up by both parties are based, at any rate in so far as such arguments do not come within the scope of the interpretation of pronouncements and agreements — i.e. generally concerning the periodical side — or within that of historic considerations based on sources of history, for which a study with reference to data to be obtained from libraries would be more appropriate.

The problems involved here can best be summarized with reference to the agreements advanced to substantiate the Indonesian line of reasoning, viz. that the population of New Guinea/Irian should not only be considered to form part of the Indonesian people on the strength of juridical agreements left out of account here, but that it actually constitutes an integral part of that people, as well as with reference to those which the Netherlands party has adduced in support of its standpoint that the population of this island is in a special position, which makes it impossible to regard it as an integral part of the Indonesian people and compels the Netherlands Government to fulfil special obligations on its behalf. As the discussions have developed particularly around this special position alleged by the Netherlands Group, the best plan may be to begin with that point.

Now the Netherlands Group has advanced that New Guinea/Irian does not belong to Indonesia in ethnological, linguistic, geological, zoological and botanical respect, that anthropologically, too, there are fundamental differences with the Indonesian people so that on that account unity cannot be spoken of, while the development of the population is still so far behind that, in contradistinction to that of Indonesia, or rather Indonesia proper, the population of this territory must be considered to belong to those peoples which have not yet reached the full measure of self-government to which article 73 of the United Nations Charter refers, and this for two reasons:
firstly because some 80% of the population of this area has not yet been brought under administration and therefore is neither in a position nor capable to exercise its right of self-determination, and secondly because the remaining, 20% of the population has, on the whole, not yet reached such a stage of development that it would be possible to give it at this juncture already such a share in the independent administration of its affairs that this could be qualified as full self-government.

In support of this standpoint the Netherlands Group further states that when signing the United Nations Charter the Netherlands Government undertook all the obligations specified in article 73 of that Charter, so that this Government is morally not justified in shirking this responsibility unilaterally, and still less should promote that by the integral transfer of New Guinea/Irian to Indonesia under the authority of the United States of Indonesia a situation would be created that would withdraw this territory, which the Netherlands, also in virtue of the agreements to institute the South Pacific Commission, countersigned by the Netherlands, considers to be an area as referred to in article 73 of the Charter, from the supervision to which that article relates.

In addition, the Netherlands Group agrees that this territory, which is considered to be of little value for the present economy of Indonesia, is most important to the Netherlands, as it offers possibilities for settlers, in the first place for such Dutchmen in Indonesia as do not wish to relinquish Netherlands nationality and wish to build up a new existence there, and in the second place for those Dutchmen from the Netherlands itself who, forced by the over population of their own country, must look for possibilities of living elsewhere. Moreover, particular Netherlands circles consider this territory to be of as great importance for the expansion of their own industries of tropical agriculture and mining which, in view of the restrictions attended with operating outside the Kingdom of the Netherlands — reference is made here to foreign exchange restrictions and transfer difficulties — are looking for new possibilities, compelled as they are to do so particularly also in connection with the recent sacrifices made by the Netherlands. The Netherlands Group is of opinion that the development of such industries may constitute a material contribution towards international economy by opening and building up a new area supplying products of which there is a shortage. It is this Group’s conviction that such opening up creates important possibilities for the fulfilment of the obligation to bring the population of this territory into contact with international economy and intercourse, to enable it to take its own independent place in that economy and intercourse when some time has elapsed. It is
agreed that just by participating in international economy a position in international intercourse is secured and consolidated.

Against all this, the Indonesian Group alleged that it objects to considering the population of New Guinea/Irian as a non-self-governing people, as in doing so it would actually cooperate towards the subsistence of colonial conditions and even legalize them, whilst, for the rest, it considers the people of New Guinea/Irian as an integral part of the Indonesian people, whose lot it has shared under the common Netherlands domination. In New Guinea — continues the argumentation — it is rather a process of formation of a nation that is developing, expressing that the Irian people feels it constitutes part of the Indonesian people. Therefore, in this connection reference is made to the presence of better educated Irians, who are already capable of showing political sense. There is even a political party — state the Indonesians — numbering 3000 members, which explicitly demands incorporation into Indonesia, from which circumstance it should be deduced that this political sense has already developed further than the Netherlands Group has asserted and that there are definitely feelings of solidarity with the Indonesian people among the population of Irian.

For this reason the Indonesian Group advances that sounding the feelings of the population is of importance for the investigation by the Committee, because, apart from the value to be attached to such feelings, they might give indications as to the direction on which national consciousness is evolving with the Irians.

In addition, it is stated that New Guinea/Irian is economically important to Indonesia. It may be true that exports from this area are still insignificant at the present moment, the fact remains that in future when the island will be developed, — here the Indonesians have in mind transmigration to relieve over-population in Java —, these exports may become extremely important, particularly for the port of Macassar, which has been earmarked to become the emporium of the whole of Eastern Indonesia.

Besides to that economic unity between this area and Indonesia, reference has also been made to the historic attachment, consideration being given not only to a particular passage from the „Negarakrtagama“, which is assumed to relate to parts of New Guinea/Irian, but is particular to the attachment to Tidore, which is said to live on in certain parts. Of no less importance is, in the Indonesian Group's opinion, the share which Indonesian have had in opening up the island under the direction of the Netherlands.

For completeness' sake, the Netherlands members feel, in conclusion that they should mention the pronouncement to the effect that Irian culture and community run parallel to Indonesian. They believe to have noticed, however, that the pronouncement must not be qualified
as an Indonesian standpoint, as the conspicuous differences between
the autochthonous and the Indonesian civilization become too great
even by the Indonesians to justify such a far-reaching pronouncement.
They feel they would do an injustice to the Indonesian standpoint
by incorporating this idea into it, unless, naturally, the Indonesian
members of the Committee should maintain the contrary.

In the foregoing an attempt has been made to review in an unbiased
way the standpoints of the two parties concerning the interests and
the situation of the population of New Guinea/Irian. Any arguments
bearing on the juridical side of the problem or on other aspects for
which an investigation on the spot is of little or no value, have been
expressly set aside here, in so far as they should not be mentioned
in passing for clearness’ sake. It stands to reason that the Netherlands
members will be pleased to endorse any corrections that the Indone-
sian members may want to make with respect to their own standpoint.
With this proviso, the Netherlands members would therefore like to
formulate in greater detail what points they intended to include in the
Committee’s investigations.

Before doing so, however, they feel they would do well to give a
still further detailed exposé of the Netherlands ideas on the interests
of the population concerned, whereby they will find an opportunity of
painting out the dangers threatening this population as a result of the
incorporation of this area into international intercourse.

On the part of the Netherlands it is wished that loyal exertion be
given to the programme embodied in the United Nations Charter, in
particular in article 73 and 74, as well as to that laid down in the
agreement relating to the creation of the South Pacific Commission.

This requires a policy of native education, the autochthonous popu-
lation being given an opportunity to receive education on the broadest
possible scale and to qualify in this way for another, higher standard
of life than had been the case hitherto. The Netherlands Government
realizes that education alone is not sufficient. Experience acquired
elsewhere in Oceania has shown that the population receiving educa-
tion alone is exposed to serious cultural disorientation and uproot-
ing, which may lead to a decrease in the population failing new
births. Among the causes of such a cultural disorientation attended
with what Rivers defined as mental depression, there is particularly
the total disturbance of the world picture and the subsequent incapaci-
ty to build up new ideals. It is believed, therefore, that it is specifi-
cally a popular interest when education is tended with filling the
religious needs of the population by the propagation of religious
ideas which fit better into the modern world then the faith professed
by their fathers, which does not give them adequate backing in their
new situation. At the same time it is necessary to build up a new
society, which enables them to form new ideals and to realize them,
a society that creates conditions under which existence has again real sense and offers prospects. It will only be in this way that the evil consequences can be avoided which the opening up of the rest of Oceania, consequences which have not left Western New Guinea/Irian entirely unaffected either, though it is gratifying to establish that there — with the conception of the area of Southern New Guinea, where a pathological autochthonous cultural development had created particularly unfavourable conditions — developments have never been so fatal as in various areas of Polynesia and Melanesia.

Therefore, the Netherlands Group advances the necessity of taking up the Papuan (Irian) into all functions of an administrative and economic character. First, many of the lower secondary posts should become available to him. He should be able to profit by his schooling. Moreover, if there is to be real progress, he should have an opportunity of leaving his village and get into touch with other Papuas of a different tribe and language, the experience acquired therewith on the mandated territory of Eastern New Guinea is of outstanding importance for the acculturation of the population.

Now, against this background the following questions arise:

I. In the event of integral transfer of New Guinea/Irian to the Republic of the United states of Indonesia, would this result in the termination of continuation of colonial conditions?

II. Would such a transfer not jeopardize the work of Roman Catholic and Protestant Missions, at present the great native educators, as in a predominantly Islamic State it may be difficult to continue subsidizing these corporations on the present footing? What would be the consequence of an interruption of the activities of these missions?

III. How far does the interest of New Guinea/Irian reach in case of the continuation of the former economic relation with Indonesia?

Of these questions the first will no doubt cut deepest. This question involves a whole complex of problems which comprises practically all important points of difference. Among the questions arising the following suggest themselves first.

Re I. 1. How fast has the population of New Guinea/Irian proceeded on the way towards self-government?

To investigate this matter, the Netherlands members suggest that in the places visited by it, the Commitee should give consideration to the following questions:

a) How many people live in the districts concerned, and what part of this population has been brought under administration?

b) What should be meant by this bringing under administration? Can a regular contact be spoken of? Are taxes paid? How much,
and in what way? Can the heads appointed read and write? If so, what approximate percentage?

c) What is the position with regard to education in the district concerned? How many schools are there? Are they attended by all children of the village (the neighbourhood)? What progress it made? What remains of the education after say 10 years have elapsed?

d) How many people have had more than their years' popular schooling? What sort of education is that? Are there any people who have had advanced elementary education, secondary education or university training or a similar education? What employment have such people found? What is the position as regards vocational training and the employment available to those who have received such training?

e) What is the economic situation of the population? Do they take part in any branch of trade of industry related to international intercourse, or is their economic occupation exclusively directed towards meeting their own domestic needs? Do they participate in the trade with other people and if so, in what way? Do they also buy and sell on „pasars“ (markets) simultaneously with Indonesian dealers?

f) What share is reserved to the autochthonous population in the lower secondary posts such as that of general clerk, clerk administrative assistant, teacher, policeman, „tukang“ (skilled labour), motor driver, etc. Are they paid the same wages for such jobs as Indonesian employers performing the same duties, and

g) What is the reputation of the autochthonous administrative officers, teachers and policeman as leaders of their own village heads? Have the latter sufficient authority over persons of different extraction?

2. How far has the population of New Guinea/Irian produced on the way towards mutual attachment and the realization that they form one people? To allow the Committee to orientate itself about this problem, the Netherlands members feel that consideration should be given to the following questions:

a) Do those who hold various lower secondary posts belong to all the different tribes and groups brought under administration, who, in this respect, have taken a considerable lead?

b) If this is indeed the case, is there a marked feeling of solidarity between their better educated groups, and if so, what facts substantiate this?

c) Is there a distinct feeling of solidarity between these groups and the less advanced ones, os is there a relationship of superiority,
which opens possibilities for a kind of domination if a third party
not personally interested and of higher authority should not supervise
this?

\textit{d) Is it noticeable that the division between the various tribes is
becoming less marked than it was formerly? If so, is this also revealed
by the occurrence of mixed marriages? In the affirmative, are these
marriages between men and women of different tribes or marriages
between men of different tribes and women of one tribe only? In the
negative, what data are available to substantiate this?}

\textit{e) Are there political tendencies or parties, aiming at the form-
ation of a Papuan (Irian) people? If so, what are these parties, who
are the leaders, what is their programme and how many members
have they?
Do they meet regularly and if so, what is the extent of interest of
their members? What is dealt with in such meetings? Do these parties
comprise essentially members of one tribe or do they comprise
members of various or a great many tribes?}

\textit{f) Where is political interest encountered mainly and around what
questions is such interest centred?}

\textit{g) To what extent is political interest mixed with cargo-cults and
other kindred movements, which may be considered to be reactions
to cultural disorientation and incapacity to secure a position in the
world newly opened up which also affords emotional satisfaction?
If these movements are to be regarded as forerunners of the de-
velopment of political sense, can they than be conceived as a proof that
such political sense is approaching the stage of maturity or an indica-
tion that this stage has not nearly been reached? Why? What is done
to steer these movements into good channels?}

\textit{h) What is the level of general education of the most prominent
political leaders, and may they be attributed, on the strength of this
education, besides an independent judgement, also an insight into
the general consequences of the developments advocated by them? In
how far do they feel dependent upon and influenced by suggestions
made to them on the part of the Netherlands or the Indonesians?}

3. How far has the population of New Guinea/Irian proceeded on
the way towards attachment to and solidarity with the Indonesian
people? For this question to be answered, too, it is thought desirable
to dwell on various aspects, which might be summarized in the
following questions:

\textit{a) Do the Indonesians living in New Guinea/Irian form a group
or class of their own, or are they assimilated by the autochthonous
population? In this connection it might be asked if and to what extent
mixed marriages occur. Is there any preference in Indonesian and
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autochthonous circles for marriages within their own group or for marriages with the other group? Are marriages between Indonesian men and autochthonous women mostly contracted legally? Do marriages between Indonesian women and autochthonous men also occur? Are they contracted legally? What standpoint does the Indonesian community adopt with regard to both kinds of marriages and what is the standpoint of the autochthonous community in this respect? What are the social consequences of these marriages?

b) Do the Indonesians in New Guinea/Irian live in „kampongs“ (villages)) of their own or do they live in the villages of the autochthonous population? In the latter case, do they live in a special quarter? Are there any special professions that entail this living within the autochthonous kampong?

c) Are the Indonesians better off than the autochthonous population or is there no difference in this regard? What posts do they hold? Do they form a more or less superior group and if so, from what does this appear?

d) Do the autochthonous population look upon them as strangers, more or less in the same way as they consider the Europeans, or as members of another tribe? In the latter case, what difference does this make? By what means do they qualify the Indonesian immigrant?

e) Is there any local evidence of solidarity with a particular attachment to Tidore? If so, what? How far did the real sphere of influence of Tidore extend? How was this influence noticed, within that sphere?

f) In what way does the autochthonous population give expression to its feelings of solidarity with the Indonesian population? Are there any political parties aiming at unity with Indonesia in the political sense and if so, what parties are they? Now for the other questions referred to under I 2. Is there any association of these political trends with cargo-cults and in the affirmative, what is this association?

g) If the autochthonous population looks upon the Indonesians as strangers, what are the consequences of this attitude with respect to the question as to whether incorporation into Indonesia is desirable, if at any rate the population is interested in this problem? Where and to what extent is there in this regard a particular "feeling" and how is this revealed? What value may be attached to this?

h) What points of friction are there between the autochthonous population and the Indonesian and Netherlands immigrants? By what particulars not yet mentioned before does the relationship between the Indonesian group and the autochthonous population differ from that between the Netherlands group and that population?
i) Is there any difference in the relationship between a village head and a "guru" (teacher) or policeman, if the latter are Indonesian and if they are autochthonous? If so, how does this difference appear?

Re II. Here the following questions arise:

1. How many of the population brought under administration are Christians (to be split into Roman Catholics and Protestants) and how many people of either category are autochthonous and how many Indonesians?

2. What part has the Protestant or Roman Catholic Mission in schooling? What do they do in respect of popular education besides teaching? What sums are involved in all this? Can they be replaced by others in this work? Motives to be stated.

3. Is the attitude assumed by these corporations one of superiority or may they be considered capable of leading the population to the required independence by this attitude? Motives to be stated.

4. What is done in this field on the part of the Islamites, and have they taken steps to undertake similar action in the interest of the population? Have they sufficient equipment at their disposal? Are there any people available who have sufficient insight into the problems of native education according to modern standards to whom this work can be entrusted?

Re III. Here essentially the following questions suggest themselves.

1. What are the export products from the area concerned and where do they go? What products are imported and where do they come from or would they come from formally?

2. Was orientation of New Guinea towards Macassar advantageous to this territory or is it felt that exportation to foreign parts from New Guinea direct (e.g. to Port Darwin, Thursday Island, Manilla, Hongkong and Kobe) would result in much better prices being made on account of the lower freight?

3. Are there any other grounds on which orientation towards Indonesian ports would be particularly advantageous? What is the position of Indonesia as a supplier of the principle import products: a) before the war; b) after the war (respectively from 1946 and after 1950?)

The Netherlands members realize that these questions do not yet cover the whole of the field to which the commission relates. They feel, however, that this list may be of use for orientation with regard to the pending problems during the trip to New Guinea/Irian, but naturally, they can imagine quite well that the Indonesian members will require others to be added to the list or wish to alter the formalities of the questions on certain points.
Rules of procedure for the joint committee New Guinea/Irian

Article I

1. The Chairmanship of the Committee shall be held in weekly rotation by an Indonesian and a Netherlands member, elected for that purpose by and from the groups concerned.

2. The Vice-chairmanship of the Committee shall be held in weekly rotation by the Netherlands, respectively the Indonesian member referred to in paragraph I.

3. The Secretariat of the Committee shall be conducted by the Netherlands and the Indonesian secretary placed at the Committee’s disposal for that purpose by the Union Secretariat.

Article II

1. In concert with the Vice-Chairmanship, the Chairman shall convene the members for formal meetings of informal gatherings.

2. The agenda for the meetings and assemblies to be sent to the members in good time shall be drawn up by the Chairman in concert with the Vice-Chairman.

Article III

The meetings and assemblies shall be private and secret.

Article IV

The meetings and assemblies shall be attended by the Indonesian and Netherlands members, by the Secretaris to these groups of members, by the Committee experts concerned and by the committee secretaries.

Article V

If the Committee deems it necessary to call in the assistance of experts, the latter shall be selected after mutual agreement between the member groups has been reached.

Article VI

Both the Indonesian and the Netherlands member groups shall be authorized to request the Committee to attract advisers, should they require them.

For a request to that effect to be granted, agreement, between the groups shall be necessary the parity principal being duly taken into account for the composition of both groups.
Article VII

1. The Chairman shall bring up the items of the agenda for discussion.
2. He shall give the members permission to speak in the order in which such permission is asked.
3. At the request of one of the members the Chairman may call on experts, advisers and secretaries to speak at the meetings and assemblies.

Article VIII

As regards questions of procedure not provided for by the present Regulations a decision shall be taken after mutual agreement between the member groups.

Article IX

1. Proposals concerning the suspension or adjournment of the meeting or assembly shall be decided upon in priority to any other proposals.
2. If no agreement on this matter is reached, the Chairman shall decide.

Article X

1. The Secretary shall see to minutes being drawn up of formal meetings and summary records of informal gatherings.
2. The minutes as well as the summary records shall be sent in draft to the members, secretaries and advisers concerned as soon as possible after the meeting or assembly and be adopted in the next formal meeting, if possible.

Article XI

Publication of communications in regard to matters relating to the Committee shall be made exclusively by the Chairman in concert with the Vice-Chairman.

Article XII

The final report shall be adopted by the plenary committee. If there is no unanimity with respect to particular subjects, the individual views advanced shall be laid down in the report separately.

Article XIII

1. All official documents issued by the Committee New Guinea/Irian shall be made out in the Netherlands and Indonesian languages.
2. Both texts shall have equal force.

Article XIV

All cases not provided for in the present Rules shall be decided by the Committee.
JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Summary of the fifth informal meeting on Sunday 21st May 1950 in the Government Guesthouse at Hollandia

Present are:

Dr. J. Latuharhary, Chairman;
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Vice-Chairman;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Dr. Muh. Yamin, Member;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;
Dr. Muh. Yuman, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
A. S. Pello, Secretary;
J. A. van Beuge, Adviser;
N. Jouwe, Adviser;
S. Papare, Adviser;

Union-Secretariat:

Moh. Jahja;

Dr. W. Schols, Comittee-Secretary.

1. The Chairman opens the meeting at 4.55 p.m. and addresses a word of welcome to Mr. N. Jouwe, who for the first time attends the meetings as adviser to the Netherlands group. He expresses the hope that not only the Netherlands group but if necessary also the committee may make use of Mr. Jouwe's advices.

Before proceeding to the consideration of the agendapoints, the Chairman announces that a request has been received to receive a deputation wishing to submit some documents to the Committee.

This deputation is then shown in.

The Chairman informs the deputation that the Committee has decided to receive them, requesting their leader to make known the desires of the deputation.

Mr. Marcus Kasiepo expresses the disappointment of the deputation that so much has already been written on the question New Guinea, which documents are considered humiliating by the inhabitants of New Guinea/Irian. Shortening his argument, he states that the deputat-
ong is of the opinion that New Guinea/Irian is not a part of Indonesia. He then begs permission to submit a resolution.

The *Chairman*, receiving the resolution, thanks Mr. Kasiepo for his words, and promises that the Joint Committee will take cognizance thereof and, if necessary, will invite the deputation to give further information.

After the deputation has left, the *Chairman* says that still an other deputation has requested to be received.

At the *Chairman’s* invitation, *Mr. Wetebossy* then addresses the Committee on behalf of the second deputation and expresses the hope that the Committee may yield good results for the people, and that both Governments may find the strength to find a joint solution. He further thanks the local administration which has given him the opportunity to meet the Committee.

The *Chairman* thanks *Mr. Wetebossy* and promises him, that the Committee will take cognizance of the documents for the Committee handed by him, and, if necessary, will ask the deputation for further information.

The *Chairman* proposes that the letters submitted be regarded as data for the Committee.

*Prof. Pieters* remarks that at the fourth informal meeting at Biak it has been decided with regard to such documents, that these shall be deposited with the secretariat and shall remain there for perusal by the members. He proposes that similar action be taken now.

The *Chairman* is of the opinion that the letters which in Biak came up for discussion, were addressed to a group of members and not to the Committee as such.

*Prof. Pieters* says that these letters in Biak were submitted to a group of members, but were addressed to the Committee, as appears from the contents. He maintains his proposal.

*Dr. Muh. Yamin* is of the opinion that there is a difference, if not in the nature of the documents, then in the nature of the way they were submitted.

*Prof. Pieters* thinks that this does not make any difference. If these documents are not being treated in accordance with the decision taken in Biak, then Speaker will not be able to take any decision before having taken cognizance of the contents of these documents. After some discussion the *Chairman* concludes that the meeting can agree with this point of view. The documents will first be circulated to the members before any decision is taken.
2. Discussion of the provisional framework of the report.

The Chairman presumes that the Netherlands members have received the notes of the Indonesian members and asks what their reply to these is.

Prof. van der Kolff says that the Netherlands members have studied the notes. It had been promised that the Netherlands group would give their opinion on them in writing. This has not yet been proved possible. The drafting of the Netherlands standpoint has not yet been completed, in any case not yet in a definitive wording. He therefore begs permission to submit the Netherlands reply to the Committee in rough draft, with the proviso, that wordings might be altered of not substantial a nature. Practical considerations are the reason why this standpoint is now already being submitted orally. The work of the Committee in Hollandia is not to be allowed to be held up. The timescheme does not permit this. If for instance the Indonesian members would request to consider the Netherlands standpoint, and it would presently prove that the standpoints are far apart, possibly further instructions from the Governments would have to be awaited before further progress could be made. Speaker must advise against this, in order not to deprive the journey taken of its sense. Speaker therefore proposes that it be agreed that for the present both the Indonesian and the Netherlands members may question prominent personalities in the full Committee, this being in the interest of the progress of the work. To this questioning the proviso would have to be connected that the standpoint may be further decided upon afterwards. Therefore to-morrow both groups were to be permitted to put their questions each in their own way, in the meeting of the Committee.

Speaker then requests permission for Dr. van Baal to read the draft-reply.

Dr. van Baal the reads then draft-reply (viz. the note to be attached).

The Chairman says that he may therefore conclude that it is the intention in order to prevent the work being held up, that the members are free to question the prominent personalities to be heard, all of them reserving their right to come back on the question at issue.

Prof. van Dijk further explains that this therefore applies to the hearing of prominent personalities on Monday, 22nd May. Thereafter, he hopes that soon a definitive decision may be reached.
After the meeting has been adjourned for some time in order to enable the Indonesian members to consider the points raised, the Chairman after reopening the meeting says that the Indonesian members do not object against the proposed questioning. The proviso is put however that it be agreed that the Chairman may intervene in case he considers any question too suggestively put.

*It is thus decided.*

The Chairman therefore concludes that point 2 will again be put up for discussion at a next meeting.

3. Manner in which data are to be recorded.

At the Chairman’s request Prof. van der Kolff expresses as his opinion that the manner of recording the data which constitute the Committee’s factual documentation, is to be considered very important. It must be prevented that afterwards difficulties arise owing to denial of the correctness of the data collected. The best method would be to write down accurately all questions put and replies given and to consider this record in the Committee. In practice this will be difficult to carry through. It is therefore considered a practical solution, that the data collected are recorded by the four secretaries jointly. Are they unanimous, then their record constitutes the factual documentation of the Committee. In case no unanimity is reached, the report will be discussed in the committee. It is to be expected that no further difficulties will then arise.

A second point is, that in hearing prominent personnalities, the available time be divided, for instance first 10 minutes for questions to be put on the Netherlands side, subsequently a same period for questions on the Indonesian side. In the third place the questions are to be put objectively. If the person to be heard is nervous, he may easily give to suggestive questions the desired reply. It is therefore important that is has already been decided that the Chairman has the right to intervene. Speaker would add to this the right of all members to request the Chairman’s intervention, if they consider such necessary. Fourthly many questions and answers will be in the Indonesian language. Because the Netherlands members are not all of them so well acquainted with this language that they can feel the finer shades immediately, he requests permission that on behalf of the Netherlands members the questions be put by Dr. van Baal.

*Prof. Pieters* would still like to say that the factual documentation of the Committee has been mentioned. This shall therefore contain facts. It should however be kept in mind that all members reserve their right to value these themselves. He further draws the attention to the fact factual documentation also can be obtained in other ways.
The *Chairman* finds that the manner of recording data as suggested by Prof. van der Kolff is considered by all to be a practically correct method.

*Prof. Pieters* remarks that it is desirable to consider once more in what way in practice prominent personalities are to be heard. In order not to disturb the balance, the Indonesian and the Netherlands groups may in turn be given the opportunity to have a prominent personality heard.

*Prof. van Dijk* adds the suggestion that each group prepares in advance a list of persons desired in sequence of importance. The Committee may then determine a certain time for each hearing, for instance first for number 1 of the Indonesian list, then the same for number 1 of the Netherlands list, next for number 2 of the Indonesian list, etcetera.

*It is thus decided.*

As Dr. Yamin and Prof. van Dijk would like still to visit some institutions in Kota Baru, it is further decided that on Monday, 23rd May, at 8.30 a.m. the hearing of prominent personalities will be started. These hearings will take place in a room arranged as pleasantly and peacefully as possible, in order to make the persons to be heard feel as comfortable as possible.

4. Closing.

Before closing the meeting the *Chairman* announces that during the meeting a letter has been received from Resident van Eeckhoud, which letter is read by him and deals with some remarks of Mr. Pello. Although he did not yet have the opportunity to question Mr. Pello on this subject, he offers in advance his apologies to the Netherlands members, that this letter apparently was necessary. He will investigate this matter and answer the letter officially.

*Prof. van der Kolff* considers it not desirable to anticipate the hearing of Mr. Pello by the Chairman. He would appreciate to receive further information in this respect.

The *Chairman* promises such information and closes the meeting at 6.20 p.m., thanking those present.

Approved 23/5-1950.

Dr. J. Latuharhary — Chairman

*Drafted by*

Dr. W. Schols
Note from the Indonesian Group

The Indonesian group raises objections of principle to asking questions on the attachment and the solidarity between the population of Irian and the Indonesian people outside Irian. Moreover, the Indonesian group does not realize the urgency of answering the questions asked, because in its opinion, they do not touch upon the main point as is it formulated in the draft Charter of the Transfer of Sovereignty, art. 2.

The questions asked can be given consideration by the Committee, provided that it realizes that the replies received to these questions cannot influence the establishment of the political status of Irian. As a matter of fact, in the R.T.C. agreement it has been provided that the nationality of the inhabitants of Irian will depend on the transfer of sovereignty over that island. Consequently, the assumption of Indonesian nationality by the Irian population does not depend on the answers to anthropological or ethnological questions, but does exclusively on the sovereignty transfer, which has appeared clearly from the circumstances that in accordance with the deed of assignment of citizens the R.I.S. also grants Indonesian nationality to people not belonging anthropologically and ethnologically to the Indonesians in the proper sense of the word. The Indonesian group will not object to the questions referred to, however, if they are couched?) in other terms, taking also in account the above remarks and observations, since the assumption of Indonesian nationality is a question of the formation of an Indonesian nation.

Biak, May 20, 1950.
Note of the Indonesian Group

View of the task of the Joint Committee Irian

The Indonesian Group views the task of the Joint Committee Irian as follows:

1. To investigate the problems and factors, connected with the question Irian, necessary for determining the transfer of the sovereignty to the R.I.S. within a year after the date of transfer of sovereignty, by means of negotiations.

2. To compose a report, to be submitted to the Governments of both partners not later than 1st July 1950, containing factual data and material for the definitive fixation of the transfer of sovereignty at the 2nd Union-Conference of ministers or at a special meeting to be held in this respect between the Union-partners in this year (1950).

The Indonesian Group recognizes that the report is not of a purely scientific nature.

The report neither needs to provide political conclusions which belong to the competency of the Union-conference. The group visualizes a provisionally to be drawn-up report with the following contents:

Chapter I

Statements made by the Netherlands and Netherlands-Indies Governments concerning the Netherlands-Indies, including Irian (Constitutions of 1848, 1922, 1948), the Government Regulation of 1854 and the Indies Constitution of 1925.

All international treaties concerning the Netherlands Indies and the treaties of counties and Tidore-treaties with Irian. This chapter may be preceded by a historical dissertation on Irian.

Chapter II

a. Statements made by the Netherlands Government and the Allies at the San Francisco-Conference, South Pacific Commission, as far as existing.

b. Statements made by the Netherlands Indies Government at the conferences of Malino, Den Pasar and Pangkalpinang.

Chapter III

a. Decisive declarations of the R.T.C. and 1st Union-Conference supplemented by declarations made by the Netherlands Government to the Netherlands Parliament.
b. Official declarations of the Governments of the Republik Indonesia, Republik Indonesia Serikat, Negara Indonesia Timur, made both in the published state-documents and in the Parliaments.

Chapter IV

Relation between the possible transfer of sovereignty and the following problems concerning:

a. Administration

b. Mission, Islam

c. Traffic and Commerce; customs

d. Economics, finances

e. Education

etcetera.

In conclusion the Indonesian Group advances the following objections against the very confidential note on the views of the task of the Joint Committee and the resulting framework of the report to be drawn up by the Joint Committee.

The 3 questions I, II and III, put by the Netherlands Group, do not, in the opinion of the Indonesian Group, touch the crucial problem of the transfer of sovereignty over Irian as referred to previously.

They rather suggest a strengthening of the unilaterally worded standpoint of the Netherlands Government at the R.T.C.

Also they may disturb the eventual solution of the problem.

Therefore, in order to facilitate the work of the Committee, the 3 questions must be kept completely separate from the list of questions.

Biak, 20th May 1950.
JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

On this day, Monday, 22nd May 1950, appeared before us, Dr. W. Schols and Mh. Jahja, acting as secretaries of the Joint Committee New Guinea/Irian, of their own accord the following persons:

1. Mattheus Wali, kepala negeri at Ivor Paprongko (Ondo Afi)
2. Hendrik Joukoe, wakil karanu at Ivar Besar,

who made the following statement:

„Under the resolution, which was handed yesterday to the Committee by the P.I.D.R.I.S. by the mouth of P. Wetebossy, our names would appear as testifying to the contents. We heard this from a friend, named Samuel Djom. We protest against this. We have neither put our signature or thumbprint under this document. We state also that M. Wali, who is supposed to have put his signature, can not write and that H. Joku, who is supposed to have put his thumbprint, on the contrary can write”.

The above statement was made to us in the Indonesian Language, which was recorded by us in this official report (one copy only) and then read and explained in the Indonesian language, after which the statement was signed by H. Joku and by us, M. Wali according to his own statement not being able to write, the materials for making thumbprints not being available.

Hollandia, 22nd May 1950.

sgd H. Joku.

sgd Dr. W. Schols
Moh. Jahja
No. C Ir I/Not/6

JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Minutes of the sixth formal meeting on Tuesday, 6th June 1950, in
the Ministry of home affairs at Djakarta

Present are:
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Chairman;
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Vice-Chairman;
Dr. Muh. Yamin, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
A. S. Pello, Secretary;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;
J. A. van Beuge, Adviser;

Union-Secretariat:
Moh. Jahja;
Dr. W. Schols, Comittee-Secretary.

1. At 10.10 a.m. the Chairman opens the meeting and proceeds
to point 2 of the agenda.

2. Adoption of the minutes of the fifth formal meeting.
These are confirmed.
In pursuance hereof the Chairman says that it has appeared later
that the persons N. Wali and H. Jouku, mentioned in the official
report drawn up by the secretaries, were not known and neither
had been made known previously to the secretaries. In view hereof
doctrine could arise as to the objective value of the official report
concerned. It was therefore decided by the two Chairmen to call
for the cooperation of the Governor of New Guine, to have the
persons referred to heard in a more formal manner on their state-
ments by the administration in New Guinea. Speaker suggests the
desirability that the Committee permits the Indonesian members to
ask Mr. Wetebossy in writing, how this matter of signatures, which
are now being denied, stands.

It is decided that there is no objection against this.

3. Question of members individually giving information to the
press.

At the Chairman’s request Prof. van der Kolff introduces this
point. Speaker says that he has requested to have this point put on
the agenda, since it has appeared to the members that Dr. Yamin has given an interview to the press. In this respect the Speaker would like to draw the attention to two points.

In the first place it has been stipulated in article II of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee that: "Information concerning the Committee is exclusively published by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman in mutual agreement". This article is still in force and it is therefore desirable that the stipulation thereof is adhered to. On account hereof a joint communiqué has therefore been drawn up and issued to the press.

Apart from this, the Chairman has discussed with Prof. van Dijk and with the speaker, that the Indonesian members would like to have some freedom to give information to the press, as it was to be expected that the press would urgently require information. Prof. van Dijk had replied that he could understand this, because a similar reception by the Press was to be expected at the arrival of the Committee-members in the Netherlands. In this connection Prof. van Dijk had also said that when giving information to the press, the field of the Committee should particularly not be gone into. No objection was raised against general information. Although it is not known precisely which examples were referred to by Prof. van Dijk in this respect, it may be put in this way that no objection existed against general information about the duration and the nature of the journey, about the general appearance of the country, etc.

The following day Speaker had felt some disquietude about the possibility of a misunderstanding and he had then — in a private talk with the Chairman — pointed at the possibility of entanglements arising from members being too free in their statements to the press. He had therefore also stipulated that for instance a question about the feeling of the population could not be discussed. Speaker remembers that the Chairman had then nodded his assent.

The interview given by Dr Yamin is in glaring contradiction to the agreement; not only to the positive stipulation of article II of the Rules of Procedure, but also to the further oral discussions on this subject. The Netherlands members feel therefore compelled to most strongly protest against this violation of the article II referred to.

Speaker would like to add to this the following. It is not usual in international committees that, as long as the committee has not yet completed its task, their members agitate for individual views. That has also happened and in the opinion of the speaker such is not done. Finally Speaker must remark that the interview, at least as it has been rendered in the press, lacks objective value. On several points it is incorrect.
On account of this interview, the Netherlands members at first have had in mind to give on their part information to the press. After due consideration the Netherlands members have however thought fit first to raise this question in the Committee. For, it is not impossible that the interview has not quite correctly been quoted in the press. Speaker would like to ask Dr. Yamin whether this is the case. It is further considered not impossible that what has been published in the press, neither has the approval of the Indonesian members. If this indeed be the case, the protest of the Netherlands members is strengthened by the approbation of these members. In this case a joint communiqué could be issued, the contents of which are visualized by the Netherlands members as follows:

"The Joint Committee New Guinea/Irian announces that the information concerning New Guinea/Irian, as rendered by Antara and in the papers Merdeka and Pedoman, does not conform to the opinion of the Committee as such. As it has been agreed that information to the press about concerns of the Committee shall only be given in mutual agreement between chairman and vice-chairman, the Committee regrets this untimely publication of statements of one of its members.

This is regretted the more because the statements made are, in the opinion of the full Committee, to be considered incorrect on several points and also facts have become known to the Committee which point to a completely different view from that which was quoted by the Press as having been expressed by Dr. Yamin. The Committee can, however, not anticipate its final report by going further into these differences."

Speaker proposes on behalf of the Netherlands members to issue this communiqué to the press as emanating from the full Committee. He would however first like to hear from Dr. Yamin whether he agrees with the report of the interview as produced by the press.

*Dr. Yamin* commences his reply in the Indonesian language.

*Prof. van der Kolff* begs permission to interrupt. As for the first time during the discussions in the Committee the Indonesian language is being used, he requests, in order to exclude misunderstandings, the use of an interpreter.

The *Chairman* asks Dr. Yamin whether he objects against speaking in Dutch.

*Dr. Yamin* remarks that Prof. van der Kolk has asked for an interpreter.
Prof. van der Kolff thereupon amends his request and asks Dr. Yamin if he would use the Netherlands language.

Dr. Yamin appeals to Article 13 of the Rules of Procedure. He objects against speaking in Dutch.

The Chairman says that he himself will act as interpreter as well as possible.

Dr. Yamin declares that he has permitted this interview to the Antara press-agency and the papers referred to. The contents of the interview are based on impressions which the Speaker has obtained for himself during the orientation-journey, and also on his political conviction and views. For this reason Speaker does not understand that Prof. van der Kolff is of the opinion that Article II of the Rules of Procedure has been violated.

For, this article II only refers to „information concerning the Committee“. The statements made by Speaker in the interview do not in the least refer to information concerning the Committee, but concern his own impressions and views. He is therefore disappointed that he is required not to advance his own impressions and to give up his political conviction. Because Prof. van der Kolff has raised a protest against this interview, Speaker on his part would use this opportunity to make protest against the Netherlands Administration. For, it had been agreed that no demonstrations were to take place.

There have however been many demonstrations during the journey through New Guinea/Irian. When the Committee arrived in Biak, there was a group which demonstrated against the R.I.S. Also in Biak two letters were offered to Mr. Papare, which fact is also felt to have been a demonstration. In Hollandia there were many posters containing mockery and insult of the R.I.S. In Sorong and Doom the same found. This was also the case in other places, but Speaker will refrain from naming all these. Again Speaker draws attention to the fact that, as was also recorded in the minutes, is was agreed that no demonstrations were to be allowed.

Speaker further desires to protest against the Aneta-report from Hollandia. He has not yet read this report himself, but it is supposed to contain a protest against the visit of the Indonesian members of the Committee. This Aneta-report has not come from the Indonesian members, but has been handed to the Aneta-correspondent in Hollandia and the Government of the R.I.S. has been insulted therein.

Speaker further wishes to protest against the military guarding in Doom and Sorong. Perhaps also the other Indonesian members feel the same way. It has undoubtedly been the intention of the Administration in New Guinea/Irian to protect the Indonesian members, but in practice it caused a prevention of every contact with the
population, the more so because the protection was so severe that Speaker even was followed in the bathroom and the toilets.

Further, without protesting against it, he wishes to remark that the list of prominent personalities to be heard in Deom, had been drawn up by the Local Administration and not by the Committee. On account of the foregoing Speaker cannot agree to the proposed issuance of the joint communique.

In conclusion Speaker wishes to mention that his protests and objections do not detract from his appreciation for the Governor and the Administration of New Guinea/Irian, Speaker himself will always keep pleasant memories of the good cooperation with the Netherlands members.

Prof. van der Kolff in the first place thanks Dr. Yamin for his acknowledgement of the pleasant cooperation during the orientation-journey in New Guinea/Irian, which acknowledgement is mutual.

Dr. Yamin’s argument contains some points to which Speaker, expressing the feeling of the Netherlands group, can hardly agree. For instance, Dr. Yamin’s interpretation of article 11 can not be shared. It is desirable that clearly be kept separate the protest against demonstrations, etcetera during the journey to New Guinea/Irian, and the subject under discussion. Speaker will not discuss the demonstrations as this would detract him from his subject.

As regards the interpretation of article 11, the interview indeed contains matters which concern the Committee, because these matters are in direct relation with the Committee’s investigation and the Committee has not yet pronounced any decision thereon. Speaker wants to show this by quoting the following passage from the paper Merdeka of June 5th, 1950:

„Tentang kesan2 nya Yamin mengatakan, bahwa kundjungan ka Irian itu adalah sangat meninggalkan dan memberi kepuasan pada niat Indonesia dan parlemenja supa melakukan penindjana ke Irian-Kesimpulannya, kata Yamin dapat diringkaskan delam tiga pemandangan jakni pertama, likwidasi persengketaan Irian kirana dapat di laksanakan dengan memakai bahan2 jang didapat jang menurut kejakinan-kejakinan menguatkan claim nasional Indonesia terhadap Irian Barat untuk memasakan daerah itu kedalam territory Indonesia dan melepaskan rahjat Irian dari pendjajahan Belanda dengan memberikan nasionaliteit Indonesia kapada rakjat diwala- lajah itu”.

According to Mr. Yamin therefore the „national claim” on the territory Irian has been strengthened. This may be Mr. Yamin’s personal conviction, but Speaker challenges his right to issue statements on this subject to the press.
Speaker further wants to draw the attention to the passage at the end of the interview, reading as follows:

„Pada achirnja Yamin meniatakan, bahwa sanget mengagumkan sekali hampir di segala lapangan proklamasi kemerdekaan sanget populer di Irian. Nama proklamatorens Sukarno-Hatta tertjantum dengan baik dipengarakan kemerdekaan, serta Irian Barat hendak bersatu dengan Indonesia adalah umum diwalajah itu, sehingga kewajiban Indonesia-lah untuk menerima suara dari rakyat Irian itu”.

In particular the part that the proclamation is popular and that the names of the proclamators are well-known, is an example of the attempts to render the feeling amongst the population. Dr. Yamin in the first place was not at liberty to do so as member of the Committee. In the second place this report is untrue. The Committee has heard too many sounds of a quite different tone.

Speaker therefore now desires to put the question whether Dr. Yamin’s opinion that no joint communiqué should be issued, is also being shared by the other Indonesian members.

The Chairman acknowledges that it was agreed not to publish individually anything regarding matters concerning the Committee. These words “concerning the Committee” may however be interpreted in two senses, either liberal or narrow. It is very difficult to draw a line. Speaker has informed Dr. Yamin that it had been agreed to refrain from information on matters, which had been discussed in the Committee or concerning which a decision had been taken. Speaker has not yet been able to peruse thoroughly the article concerned and so has not yet a definite opinion. He is however of the opinion that if the words concerned are liberally interpreted, the interview does not violate article 11 of the Rules of Procedure. Dr. Yamin has expressed his personal opinion, but he has not with one word mentioned matters which had been discussed in the Committee or were still being discussed.

The attitude opposite the press at such interviews is always difficult. Speaker therefore has requested the clemency of the Committee, in order that information to the press be allowed. This is the first Committee of its kind and it has been more or less taken by surprise by the press. The fact that Dr. Yamin has expressed his personal opinion, is in Speakers’ idea not so serious a matter a joint communiqué is necessary.

Prof. van der Kolff is of the opinion that as soon as concessions are made it becomes very difficult to draw a line. But how liberal the limits are drawn, they have been overstepped here in any case. If this were not the case, article 11 would not have any use.
Speaker recalls the first formal meeting. The minutes thereof mention: It is decided that information to the press is to be drawn up exclusively by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman in mutual agreement on behalf of the whole Committee.

Apart still from essential objects, there is being created here a dangerous precedent. Dr. Yamin will be able to continue giving unilateral presentations of affairs. If this is left without any contradiction, the public will in the long run be suggested that this presentation of affairs more or less expresses the opinion of the Committee. In that case the Netherlands Group would feel compelled to issue information also on its part. If the members or groups of members oppose each other violently in the press, what will in the long run remain of the pleasant mutual cooperation? This will definitely become endangered. It will then be impossible to execute the common task. If the Committee can not decide on a joint communique now and a ban on individual members giving information in future, then the Netherlands will feel obliged to issue a communique of its own.

The Chairman considers the Netherlands Group too pessimistic. Mr. Yamin purely expressed his personal opinion and did not intend to attack the Netherlands members. Speaker does not believe it desirable to tie the members hands and feet with regard to such statements to the press. However, the agreement not to say anything regarding affairs which have been discussed in the Committee or are still being discussed there, is to be strictly adhered to.

Prof. van Dijk remarks that Dr. Yamin has said that, if he were tied to what Speaker calls a normal interpretation of article 13, he would have to give up his political freedom. Speaker can not see that. The Netherlands members have strictly adhered to a severe interpretation of article 11, frequently very much against their strong feelings. They have most strictly refrained from every expression which could contain propaganda for the Netherlands standpoint. The Netherlands members too have been approached by the press, but the Netherlands members have refused these approaches, because it was considered improper to anticipate the work of the Committee and because it was considered improper to agitate for a particular standpoint. They even have refrained from giving neutral information. They will also maintain this attitude when they arrive in the Netherlands.

However, by acting thus the Netherlands members do not give up their political standpoint. They will advance this in the report of the Committee.

Dr. Yamin has said that he has only expressed his own impressions of the journey and his own political standpoint. In that case he can neither raise objections against the proposed communique. For, it is clear that the public will understand from the interview that this more
of less records the standpoint of the Committee. Questions to this effect were even put to the speaker.

Because it is clear that the Netherlands members can not accept this affair for the reasons referred to herefore, and may be compelled to initiate a debate in the press, he must ask Mr. Yamin explicitly to agree to an announcement that the interview only expresses Mr. Yamin's own standpoint.

At the Chairman's proposal the meeting is adjourned at 11 a.m., in order to enable the Indonesian members to consider.

At 11.25 a.m. the Chairman reopens the meeting and calls upon Dr. Yamin to speak, who says that he has heard the arguments of Messrs van der Kolff and van Dijk. To Prof. van der Kolff he would like to reply the following: Prof. van der Kolff has read some passages from the interview and is of the opinion that some points are incorrect. Speaker realizes that Prof. van der Kolff has an opinion of his own, but he persists in his own opinion, because everything which was included in the interview expresses personal impressions and personal conviction. To Prof. van Dijk Speaker would like to give the following answer: There are two points at issue, first the interpretation to be given of article 11 and in the second place the draft-communique. The Chairman himself has already said that article 11 permits two kinds of interpretation, viz. liberal and narrow. Speaker does not agree that the interview is contrary to article 11, either to its letter or to its spirit. Nevertheless Speaker appreciates Prof. van Dijk’s standpoint. He only requests the attention for the words "proper" and "improper" with regard to the interview. The boundary between these two conceptions is dependent on personal views.

Prof. van Dijk has asked what objections exist against the draft-communique. Speaker does not agree with this draft. He can agree with the first part, the latter part however he must regard as a condemnation of his statements to the press. Speaker does not object against the communique as such, but against certain passages therein. In general Speaker has much appreciated the words spoken by Messrs van der Kolff and van Dijk.

The Chairman announces that the Indonesian members have considered the matter and, as Dr. Yamin has already said: they are prepared to issue a communique, if this contains only that the opinion of Mr. Yamin as expressed in the interview, is his personal opinion and conviction. It should not be included that certain points from the interview are considered incorrect.

He therefore proposes that the following communique be issued:

"The Joint Committee New Guinea/Irian announces that the information concerning New Guinea/Irian, as contained in Antara and
in the papers Merdeka and Pedoman, represent the personal opinion of Mr. Yamin and not the opinion of the Committee as such”.

*Prof. van der Kolff* reciprocates the personal feelings of appreciation expressed by Dr. Yamin in regard of Prof. van Dijk and himself. He considers this a task the more pleasant because, although their opinion is a different one, they have the greatest appreciation for the personal relationships.

This however does not detract from the matter under discussion. There are three points which have struck the Netherlands members disagreeably. First there is the violation of article 11 of the Rules of Procedure. Mr. Yamin calls for a more liberal interpretation of this article. Speaker wants to recall that in that article are condensed the previous discussions on the subject, as mentioned in the minutes of the first formal meeting. The Netherlands members can therefore not see that Dr. Yamin’s interpretation does justice to the wording. Secondly: As has already been remarked, it is unusual to give information to the press as long as the task of study which constitutes the work of the committee, has not been completed! Mr. Yamin has not disproved this objection. Mr. Yamin too will see that these statements are not beneficial for the good mutual spirit, a mutual spirit which must be good in order to make it possible to complete the common task. This needs not to certain a denial of political convictions, but every one must keep these to himself until the common task has been completed. In the third place: the Netherlands members must persist in their objections against certain incorrectnesses. Though Dr. Yamin has said that the interview expresses his own impressions, the material collected also supports different opinions. The statement, for instance, that in Irian it is the general opinion that accession to Indonesia is desirable, is positively unacceptable. The Netherlands members would however like to further consult each other, for which reason Speaker requests the Chairman to adjourn the meeting.

After the meeting had been adjourned at 11.40 a.m., the *Chairman* reopens the meeting at 11.55 a.m.

*Prof. van der Kolff* announces that the Netherlands members are prepared to accept the draft read by the Chairman as the joint communiqué to be issued by the Committee. The Netherlands members wish however to add two conditions to this. They can not acquiesce in the unilateral presentation of affairs as rendered in the interview and therefore reserve the right to issue information to the press in this respect on their part. The second condition is that what has happened should not be repeated. They trust that the Indonesian members will adhere to the agreement that information is only to
be given by the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman in mutual agreement.

The Chairman says that the Indonesian members can agree to this.

Prof. van Dijk requests permission to speak for a personal matter. Dr. Yamin apparently is of the opinion that the words "proper" and "improper" affected Mr. Yamin personally. Speaker would like to say that this is not the case and that the words referred to the Netherlands standpoint in this respect.

4. Nothing being left for discussion the Chairman closes the meeting at 12.10 p.m.

Countersigned 26-6-50.

Chairman,  
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff.  

Drawn up by,  
Dr. W. Schols.
No. C Ir I/Not/7

JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Minutes of the 7th formal meeting on Monday, 26th June 1950, in
the Ministry for Union-Affairs and Overseas Dominions
at The Hague, no. 1 Plein

Present are:
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Chairman;
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Vice-Chairman;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
Dr. Muh. Yamin, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;
Dr. Teng Tjin Leng, Secretary;
J. A. van Beuge, Adviser;
S. Papare, Adviser;
Union-Secretariat:
Moh. Jahja;
Dr. W. Schols, Committee-Secretary.

1. At 4.10 p.m. the Chairman opens the meeting with a word of
welcome to the Indonesian members of the Joint Committee New
Guinea/Irian and expresses the hope that also in the Netherlands the
work may proceed in the same spirit of good relations as was the
case when the Committee was in Indonesia.

The Chairman then proceeds to point

2. Organisation of the Joint Committee New Guinea/Irian. He
calls upon the Vice-Chairman, Dr. J. Latuharhary, to speak.

Dr. J. Latuharhary thanks the Chairman for his words of welcome
and announces that within the Indonesian Group a change has taken
place, as a consequence of which Dr. Teng Tjin Leng now takes the
place of A. S.Pello as Secretary of the Indonesian Group.

The Chairman expresses his satisfaction in having here Dr. Teng
Tjin Leng, who is no longer unknown to the Netherlands Group,
because during the absence of Dr. Muh. Yamin he acted as deputy-
member of the Indonesian Group in this Committee. The Chairman
then recalls that at the time in New Guinea/Irian, he expressed to the
Vice-Chairman, Dr. J. Latuharhary, as his opinion, that he did not
consider it necessary to concern all advisers in the discussions to be
held in the Netherlands.
In case however the Indonesian Government might decide to send Mr. Papare, also Mr. N. Jouwe would come to Holland as adviser to the Netherlands Group, Dr. Latuharhary then desired first to submit this question to the Indonesian Government at Djakarta.

After the Netherlands Group had been informed of the decision of the R.I.S.-Government to add Mr. Papare nevertheless as Adviser to the Indonesian Group during the discussions in the Netherlands, the Netherlands Group has proceeded to have Mr. N. Jouwe called to this country as Adviser to the Netherlands Group. Thanks to the cooperation of the Governor of New Guinea/Irian, Mr. Jouwe may already on Tuesday night be expected to arrive by Constellation in the Netherlands.

3. Confirmation minutes of the 6th formal meeting.

*It is decided* to confirm the minutes of the 6th formal meeting after some slight alterations have been made.

4. Adoption summary of the 6th informal meeting.

Dr. J. Latuharhary regrets that owing to illness he has not had the opportunity in Djakarta to submit the supplementary note to the 2nd Indonesian note, as was promised by him at the preceding informal discussions. He will present this supplementary note to the Netherlands Group of the Committee at the first next meeting of the Committee.

*It is then decided*, after making a few additions, to adopt the summary of the 6th informal meeting and to attach to this summary the note of the Netherlands Group dated 22nd May 1950.

5. Remarks on the Indonesian side as to the recording of the hearings in New Guinea/Irian.

The *Chairman* calls upon Dr. J. Latuharhary to speak.

*Dr. J. Latuharhary* says that the agendapoint does not correctly render the intention of the Indonesian Group. The Indonesian Group only intends to have at a following meeting all hearings of the Joint Committee in New Guinea/Irian formalized.

The *Chairman* is of the opinion that it is not necessary for the Joint Committee to formalize the hearings, if the agreement reached in the 5th informal meeting of the Committee in New Guinea/Irian (vide document C Ir 1/Versl./5, page 4) is recalled. For the rest he personally could agree with the standpoint of the Indonesian members, if the formalisation of the hearings is not intended to cause alterations in the contents of the reports of the hearings, but is purely a formality, in order to sanction the work of the four secretaries.
Dr. Muh. Yamin considers the hearings held not the work of the secretaries, but of the Joint Committee. The documents drawn up in mutual agreement between the four secretaries, are to be regarded as minutes.

Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters remarks that at the hearings an other procedure has been adopted by the Joint Committee itself. For this reason the case is different here from the confirmation of the minutes. He has however no objection, if the formalisation as proposed by the Indonesian Group is only intended to confirm that the documents concerning the hearing, have been received from the secretaries, that concerning the contents of these documents there is unanimity between the four secretaries and that therefore these documents are part of the data of the committee.

Dr. Muh. Yamin remarks that it is not sufficient only to confirm that the documents have been received from the secretaries. Though it has been the intention to have the wording of the hearings drawn up by the four secretaries, the formalisation or legalisation has been reserved for the Joint Committee.

Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters refers to the summary concerned of the 5th informal meeting, according to the Committee in advance has acquiesced in the result of the work of the four secretaries, with the proviso, that there should be no difference of opinion between them. From this summary it is clear that it has been excluded explicitly that the hearings still would have to be submitted to the Joint Committee in case the four secretaries had achieved unanimity; therefore the Joint Committee has delegated its power in this respect to the four secretaries. Only in case of difference of opinion between the four secretaries on any particular point of the hearings, this point would be submitted to the Joint Committee for decision.

Prof. Dr. van Dijk seconds the standpoint of the Chairman and of Prof. Pieters, that the contents of the hearings are to be left unaltered and that the documents must be accepted as documents of the Committee. He would however like to hear, whether on the Indonesian side there are objections against the reports of the hearings, in short, whether this question has any practical side.

Dr. J. Latuharhary insists that the formalisation is a matter for the Committee. He is not a priori of the opinion that the hearings are wrongly recorded, but he can on the other hand view the possibility that concerning some particular part a wrong presentation is rendered, therefore that the contents are incorrect. And in this case the Joint Committee is not allowed to accept the contents.
The Netherlands members maintain the standpoint that the Joint Committee, having once accepted this special procedure with regard to the hearings, is no more entitled to alter the contents. For this special procedure has been adopted by the Committee itself in mutual agreement, in order to be rid of all the bother and to prevent needless debates. The Joint Committee has put its faith in the four secretaries.

Prof. Dr. van Dijk proposes that jointly a formula be found acceptable to all, for the legalisation of the documents of the hearings.

Dr. J. Latuharhary proposes to hold over this point of the agenda till the next meeting of the Joint Committee.

It is thus decided.

6. Discussion of the further work of the Committee.

The Chairman explains that this point of the agenda points to the drawing-up of the final report of the Joint Committee, since both groups have given their views regarding the frame-work of that report in an exchange of notes. He visualizes that a particular chapter may be considered important by the Netherlands group but not so by the Indonesian Group. In this case this chapter could be drawn up by the Netherlands group, which however leaves full freedom to the Indonesian group to examine it and to give its own opinion on the subject concerned. The reverse may also be the case, the Netherlands group being entitled to examine the draft and to make possible remarks. Also, there may be chapters which both groups consider important. In this case however the part concerned will have to express the opinions of both groups. He considers it advisable that already now both groups hand each other those pieces of work which are ready, in order that both can consider them.

The Chairman would like to know from the Vice-Chairman, whether the Indonesian members have already considered this matter.

Dr. J. Latuharhary says that the Indonesian group already occupies itself with this matter, but he is of the opinion that both groups still have to consider the manner of cooperation in this respect.

The Chairman recalls that July 1st is the target-date and he therefore proposes to hold the next meeting already on Wednesday, June 28th.

Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters would like to know, whether the Indonesian Group has already made some progress in drawing-up a contribution to the final report, because it has been agreed at the last meeting in
Djakarta that each group were to start work immediately according to its own conception.

Dr. J. Latuharhary says that the Indonesian Group has already completed some parts, but he would like to deal with these at the discussions on Wednesday.

It is decided to hold the next meeting on Wednesday afternoon, June 28th, 1950, at 2 p.m., in the Ministry for Union-Affairs and Overseas Dominions.

7. Nothing being left for discussion, the Chairman closes the meeting at 5.30 p.m.

Confirmed 30-6-50.

Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff — Chairman

Drawn up by

Dr. W. Schols.
No. C Ir I/Versl/6
1 App.: 2nd Ind. Note concerning frame-work of the report no. ......
2 C Ir I/AM/P/3 Note Neth. group dated 22nd May 1950

JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Summary of the 6th informal meeting held on Tuesday 6th June 1950 in the Ministry of Internal Affairs at Djakarta

Present are:
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Chairman;
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Vice-Chairman;
Dr. Muh. Yamin, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
A. S. Pello, Secretary;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;
J. A. van Beuge, Adviser;

Union-Secretariat:
Moh. Jahja;
Dr. W. Schols, Comittee-Secretary.

1. At 5.35 p.m. the Chairman opens the meeting and proceeds to point

2. Discussion Netherlands Note dated 22nd—28th May.

The Chairman says that the Indonesian group has drawn up and submitted a second Indonesian Note in reply to this second Netherlands Note. In order to elucidate this second Indonesian note he would like to say the following. The Indonesian members regret that the Netherlands members have from point I of the first Indonesian note formed the opinion that the Indonesian members start from the assumption that within a year after the transfer of sovereignty also the sovereignty over New Guinea/Irian is to be transferred. For the Indonesian members too, the transfer of sovereignty as regards New Guinea/Irian, is still at issue. As regards the objections against the questions proposed on the Netherlands side: in the opinion of the Indonesian group the population of Irian is Indonesian and therefore the Indonesian members object against everything which might cause a division. The Indonesian members do not object
against the Netherlands group putting these questions, but they would do so in case this should be done by the Committee.

Finally still an explanation that this second Indonesian note has rather started from the first Union-conference, which is considered a better back-ground for the work of the Committee. However, article 2 of the Charter of the transfer of sovereignty is not lost from view.

Prof. van der Kolff thanks for the note and the orally given elucidation both of which have clarified the situation, because it is now clear that within the Committee the starting-point is that the transfer of sovereignty in regard of New Guinea/Irian is still at issue, the Netherlands members being left free to collect the material for strengthening the own standpoint and to oppose the other standpoint.

Nevertheless he considers it desirable once more to put the question, whether therefore the Indonesian members can agree that the Netherlands members are entitled to collect the material as referred to in the previous paragraph.

The Chairman agrees to this.

Prof. Pieters considers the oral elucidation a very important addition to the note. Although this supplementation will be recorded in the minutes, Speaker still considers it desirable and would appreciate, if the Indonesian members would submit a supplementary note in this respect.

The Chairman says that he has not previously had the opportunity to do this. He promises that this note will be submitted the same evening or, if not, in the morning.

3. Discussion of the procedure regarding the drawing-up of the final report.

The Chairman says to have heard that the Netherlands members had already a draft in mind and he requests that this be submitted.

Prof. van der Kolff says, that there is no question of a definitive and completed draft. The Netherlands members have in mind that each group according to its own idea — from the notes exchanged known to each other — proceed to draw up a provisional contribution to the final report. The Indonesian group can do such in Indonesia, the Netherlands group in the Netherlands. After that it can be considered jointly in what way the final report is to be constituted from these contributions.

The Chairman considers this the correct proceeding. One difficulty will arise from the fact that the Indonesian members will draw up
their contributions to this final report in the Indonesian language, because they can then better express themselves and achieve better wordings.

Prof. van der Kolff understands this difficulty. Translation of all documents in both languages will prove necessary in any case.

It is decided to pay every attention to a speedy and correct translation of all documents.

It is further decided, that the Indonesian members after the commencement of the fast will go to the Netherlands on 18th June next. After provisional determination of the final report in the Netherlands, the Indonesian members first will return for a short while to Indonesia for a last consultation with advisers and experts. How these things will be effectuated, will be looked into in the Netherlands.

4. Nothing to be discussed any more, the Chairman closes the meeting at 5.55 p.m.

Confirmed 26-6-50

Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff

Drawn up by

Dr. W. Schols
Second Indonesian Note on the set-up of the report

Task of the Committee

The Indonesian Group is of opinion that it will hardly be possible to borrow the definition of the Committee’s task in details from the pro of Article 2 of the Charter of the transfer of sovereignty, since that article is to be considered to lay down the joint argumentation for the suspension of the decision on the status of Irian, which problem is to be solved through friendly negotiations within a year from the transfer of sovereignty.

The task of the Committee had rather be viewed in the light of the train of thought and of the discussions at the first Union Conference, since it was then that the Committee was formed.

As a matter of fact, at this conference the Indonesian Delegation pressed the urgency for the residency of New Guinea, to be added to the U.S.I. at the earliest possible moment.

The Netherlands Delegation, answering this statement, through His Excellency Minister van Maarseveen expressly advanced the following points:

1. that when seeking a solution for this problem, parties have not only to face political factors and to take into account the interests of the population of Irian, but that this question cannot be detached from international factors;

2. that the two parties should do everything to prevent the Netherlands proverb „two dogs fight a bone, and a third runs away with it” from being applicated to them;

3. that the Netherlands will not transfer Irian to any other country but Indonesia and that status of Irian must be laid down amicable before the end of this year.

Minister van Maarseveen then suggested that a joint committee be created to study this problem in greater detail, this committee having to report on its findings to the next Union Conference.

The Indonesian Delegation fell in with this proposal, after having recalled two clauses reading as follows:

a) the condition on which Irian will remain under the Government of the Netherlands until, at the end of this year, the political status of Irian is established through negotiations;

b) the obligation of the Netherlands never to transfer the sovereignty over Irian to another country but the R.I.S. and not to alter the status without further consultation with the Union partner.
It appears from the foregoing that the Irian problem is no longer a problem in regard to which the first thing to do is to investigate all the factors that may be of importance to answer the question as to whether the sovereignty over Irian should rest with the Netherlands or should be transferred to the R.I.S., i.e. to prove first whether Irian belongs to Indonesia from an ethnological, botanical, zoological, anthropological, etc, viewpoint, but that parties have felt they should deal with this question „between themselves”, the Netherlands having expressly promised to transfer the sovereignty over Irian to the R.I.S. only.

Considering the matter from this angle, not only will a broad and comprehensive set-up of the report to be issued not be necessary, but such a report could even exercise a confusing influence. Therefore the Indonesian Group is still of opinion that the set-up of the report to be issued should essentially comprise the constitutional and political factors relating to Irian, as well as the interests of the Irian populations as incorporated in a provisional and schematic form (so that they are susceptible of addition and improvement) in the first Note.

Djakarta, 6th June, 1950.
Note from the Netherlands Group of the Joint Committee
New Guinea/Irian

The Netherlands Group has noted with interest the views of the Indonesian members with regard to the Committee's task as laid down in their note of 20th May, last. Before going into this matter at greater length, it wishes first to formulate briefly its own views on that task, as follows:

It considers that the Committee's task comprises:

1. investigating all the factors that may be of importance to answer the question as to whether sovereignty over New Guinea/Irian should continue to rest with the Netherlands or should be transferred the R.I.S. The main question in this respect is whether a change in the administration of New Guinea/Irian is in the interest of the population in connection with the requirements such administration has to meet according to current standards,

2. submitting a report to the two Governments, containing either the joint or the individual conclusions of the parties with regard to the question under consideration, together with the facts on which those conclusions are based.

With this summary as a background, the Netherlands members would now like to deal with the note of the Indonesian Group in greater detail. They believe they have to establish in this connection that the Indonesian members restrict the definition of the task of the Joint Committee by starting in a one-sided way from a standpoint unacceptable to the Netherlands members. As a matter of fact, neither Article 2 of the Charter of the Transfer of Sovereignty nor the resolution instituting the Joint Committee New Guinea/Irian support the conception set forth in the Note of the Indonesian Group, viz. that the question New Guinea/Irian would already have been decided to such an extent, that in any case within a year from the date of the transfer of sovereignty over Indonesia also the sovereignty over New Guinea/Irian would have to be transferred to the R.I.S. In that train of thought the Joint Committee would merely be a Committee for the preparation of the transfer of sovereignty and the forthcoming negotiations between the two Governments would have to be confined to the manner in which and the conditions on which this would take place.

The Netherlands members believe that against this they can, on good grounds, contend that the transfer of sovereignty over New Guinea/Irian itself is in dispute. The Netherlands Government has
never abandoned its standpoint in this matter, nor has the R.I.S. its own.

Under a, article 2 of the Charter of the Transfer of Sovereignty provides, in point of fact, that the standpoint of parties with respect to New Guinea/Irian remain in dispute and, finally, that the problem of the political tasks of New Guinea/Irian will be tackled further by means of negotiations.

The restrictive interpretation given by the Indonesian Group in its Note of 20th May, last, on the conception of the task of the Joint Committee New Guinea/Irian is apparently taken from the Indonesian standpoint and does not do justice to what has been agreed at the R.T.C. and at the First Ministerial Conference of the Netherlands-Indonesian Union.

The Netherlands members, however base themselves on Article 2 of the Charter of the Transfer of Sovereignty and the resolution instituting the Joint Committee. Actually, both documents clearly show that parties agree:

a) that it has not been found possible to effect a rapprochement between the standpoints of parties with regard to New Guinea/Irian, so that they remain in dispute;

b) that the question of the political status of New Guinea/Irian will be settled through negotiations;

c) that for the solution of the New Guinea/Irian problem important factors must be taken into account and that it has only been possible to make a limited previous investigation with respect to the problems relating to them.

d) that, consequently, it is desirable to have the negotiations which are to lead to the establishment of the political status of New Guinea/Irian, prepared by a committee to be set up for the purpose.

It follows from the connection between the items a—d that both parties have felt the need for a Joint Committee to bridge the gaps referred to under c, in order to enable the Governments of the R.I.S. and of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to conduct the negotiations on the future status of New Guinea/Irian in a well founded manner.

The latter, as well as the search for a political solution, is therefore left to the two Governments and does not belong to the Joint Committee's task. For the rest, the Netherlands members consider the task of the Committee to be a comprehensive one, involving everything that bears on and is of importance for the settlement of the dispute concerned.

In the train of thought of the Netherlands Group, the set-up of the report to be issued will be broader than that apparently visualized by the Indonesian Group.
In that set-up, the Netherlands members also base themselves on the consideration that the two Governments will presently submit the report to the respective Parliaments (this will at any rate be done in the Netherlands) and that it will be brought to the notice of the U.N.C.I., which, in turn, may refer it to the United Nations.

Under the circumstances they feel that it will not be possible for the report to be confined to the New Guinea/Irian question in itself, but that this report should also be of an informative character. Therefore, attention should be paid to the milieu and the background of the problem.

The following scheme might be adopted for the set-up of the report:

A. *Natural milieu* (geography — geology — flora and fauna).

B. *Population* (anthropological — cultural — religious).

C. *Attachment of New Guinea/Irian to neighbouring countries and peoples* (historical — cultural — economic).

D. *Participation of New Guinea in international intercourse* (contribution of New Guinea to world economy, influence of this contribution on the population, acculturation).

E. *Political status* (historical and other claims, desirable future status).

The Netherlands Group is fully alive to the fact that the set-up is only a schematic and will possibly require additions and/or correction. It further feels that the division of the contents of the report as advocated by the Indonesian members can for the greater part be fitted into this scheme, when the question may be further considered as to whether particular stata had not better be attached to the report as annexes.

Finally, the Netherlands Group thinks fit to point out the following with regard to the Note of the Indonesian group. It cannot agree that the report would not require to be furnished with political conclusions, as this would be a matter for which the Union Conference is competent. Actually, in so far as science can play some part in the consideration of advantages or disadvantages implicit in a political status defined concretely, political conclusions in the sense of the political status to be deemed most desirable are certainly necessary, according to the Netherlands conception. In this way, indeed, one and the same object can serve for a political and a scientific consideration. The Netherlands Group assumes that this standpoint links up very well with an observation made by the Indonesian Group, Dr. Teng Tjin Leng having said at the first informal assembly that it cannot have been intended to appoint a purely
scientific Committee, as the New Guinea/Irian question is too much of a constitutional and political character to justify this.

All the same, it remains the task of the Committee to approach the political New Guinea/Irian question only from a scientific point of view. The discussion of this object from a political angle is left to the two Governments. This implies that a particular status should be selected from the various possibilities which arise, on the strength of considerations of practical statesmanship.

Now a discussion may be proceeded to of the Indonesian Note concerning the procedure of the Committee during its stay in New Guinea/Irian, as proposed by the Netherlands Group. The Netherlands group has advanced inter alia the following points:

1. The population of New Guinea is in a special position, which does not yet make it possible to grant this population full self-government, a circumstance which imposes a special obligation upon the Netherlands towards that population.

2. Unity between the population of New Guinea/Irian and the Indonesian people cannot be spoken of.

3. The population of New Guinea/Irian, which, owing to the war, was abruptly involved in international intercourse, will inevitably have to adapt itself and therefore has to depend on expert leadership. For this purpose opening up of New Guinea/Irian is necessary. The Netherlands is best qualified to effect this. In this connection the possibilities which New Guinea offers to settlers may be of importance.

The Netherlands members consider their group fully justified in marshalling arguments in support of an objective investigation (which, in that sense, may be qualified as scientific). The Indonesian Group has the same right for the support of its own standpoint; the Netherlands members assume that the Group will bring up in the same spirit aiming at objectivity material tending to confirm the Indonesian conceptions. Further, the Netherlands members feel that each group has the right to marshal agreements (also on the basis of an objective and, in that sense, scientific investigation) contesting the standpoint of the other group.

The Netherlands members regret that they are unable to trace this standpoint in the Notes of the Indonesian Group. When following point for point the Indonesian note on the working-programme for the New Guinea trip as suggested by the Netherlands group — it being once more expressly established that this deals only particular sectors of the Committee’s activities —, at the very outset they are struck by the fact in this Note reference is made to objections on principle to part of the questions proposed by the
Netherlands Group, but that an exposé of those objections is omitted. At any rate, the Netherlands members cannot assume that the second paragraph should be intended as a description of those objections on principle.

With regard to the questions deemed necessary by the Netherlands members and their right to formulate them, it may in the first place be remarked that they do go to the root of the problem. The Indonesian members are quite justified on their part, in suggesting another question as the main question — actually there are also questions to which the Netherlands Group gives a most important position — which have been left out of account in its note as irrelevant in that Note —, but the Netherlands members wish to have their right to place the questions advanced by them here at least on one line with those to be formulated by the Indonesian Group, maintained without any restriction.

They feel they have to establish that this right is not considered in the Note of the Indonesian members. Not only do these members object to a whole group of questions which have to serve to collect data to come to the most objective foundations possible of the Netherlands standpoint, but the Indonesian members even go so far that they are willing to admit the other questions only if the Netherlands members are prepared to acknowledge that the answers obtained cannot effect the establishment of the political status of Irian! Acceptance of such a restriction would not only mean that their asking those questions would have no value for the work of the Committee, but even that the Netherlands members would abandon this standpoint without any argumentation.

The Netherlands members cannot help feeling that the exposé of the Indonesian Group gives them the impression that the investigation by the Committee — which, consequently, would not be permitted to contribute towards strengthening the Netherlands standpoint — should merely serve to strengthen the Indonesian point of view.

This impression is confirmed, in point of fact, by the pronouncement embodied in the Indonesian Note (page 2) on the conception of the Joint Committee's task: „They (i.e. the questions formulated by the Netherlands Group) rather suggest a strengthening of the one-sided standpoint of the Netherlands Government adopted at the R.T.C.‟. The Netherlands members — leaving alone for the present the qualification of one-sidedness of their standpoints, which, in this conception, is certainly not clear to them — find a further corroboration of their views in the statements made by the Indonesian spokesman at the informal assembly of the 19th inst., viz. that the question formulated by the Netherlands group aim at strengthening the Netherlands standpoint, and that the reply to the three main questions
— whatever the result of the investigation may be — to the Indonesian members is a foregone conclusion.

Naturally, the Netherlands members would be remiss in this state if they agreed to such a one-sided conception of the committee’s task. After the exposé given by the Indonesian group they are compelled to demand integral acceptance of these views to the effect that both parties are entitled to an objective investigation of their standpoint, as marshalling agreements and data to support or contest the mutual standpoint is the task of the Committee. On these grounds they feel they should once more urge the incurtailed discussion of the complete series of questions.

They are only prepared to drop this if the Indonesian members are willing to confirm that, in their opinion, an objective investigation as requested by the Netherlands members will lead to a strengthening of the Netherlands standpoint and that for this reason they object to it.

Hollandia, May 22 1950.
No C Ir I/Not/8
App. C Ir I/AM/P/7
Statement of the Ind. Group dated 28/6/50

JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Minutes of the 8th formal meeting on Wednesday, June 28th 1950, in the Ministry for Union-Affairs and Overseas Dominions at The Hague

Present are:
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Chairman;
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Vice-Chairman;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
Dr. Muh. Yamin, Member;
Dr. L. H. F. S. Makaliwy, Member;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;
Dr. Teng Tjin Leng, Secretary;
J. A. van Beuge, Adviser;
N. Jouwe, Adviser;
S. Papare, Adviser;

Union-Secretariat:
Dr. W. Schols, Comittee-Secretary;
Moh. Jahja.

At 2.05 p.m. the Chairman opens the meeting with a word of welcome to those present and in particular to Mr. N. Jouwe, who to-day for the first time attends the meeting of the Joint Committee as adviser to the Netherlands Group. The meeting then proceeds to point

2. Remark on the Indonesian side concerning the recording of the hearings in New Guinea/Irian.

Dr. J. Latuharhary declares that the Indonesian group adheres to its standpoint that the formalisation of the hearings belongs to the task of the Joint Committee and he proposes that the meeting finds that the records of the hearings drawn up by the secretaries are correct. For the rest he expresses his appreciation of the manner in which the secretaries have acquitted themselves of their task.

The Chairman concludes that the material collected by the four secretaries is recognized as factual documentation of the committee; he declares that with pleasure he seconds the Vice-Chairman’s words of appreciation in respect of the work of the four secretaries.
3. Discussion further work of the Committee.

Dr. J. Latuharhary declares that the Indonesian group for the greater part agrees to the Chairman’s proposal to provide contributions and to adhere to the target-date July 1st. Because however the documents concerned need to be retyped, he hopes to be able to hand the first contribution on Friday to the Netherlands Group.

As regards the frame-work of the final report, the Indonesian Group had desired in order to prevent misunderstanding to advance some observations, which the Indonesian Group regards as guiding principle for its contribution to the final report and which comment the notes of the Netherlands Group. This guiding principle is not meant to be a component part of the final report, but only to bring some order in the factual material. This guiding principle in its provisional form will be read by the secretary of the Indonesian Group, Dr. Teng Tjin Leng. In its provisional form the observation is rather sharply worded and little polished owing to the haste with which it has been drawn up. He hopes that on Thursday-morning this observation may be submitted to the Netherlands Group of the Joint Committee in its definitive form.

The Chairman asks the secretary of the Indonesian group to read the observation.

Dr. Teng Tjin Leng then proceeds to read the provisional Indonesian observation which briefly comes to:

The definition of the problem of the political dispute concerning New Guinea is regarded by the Indonesian members as the most important element for the solution of this dispute. A faulty or incorrectly rendered definition of the problem has as its consequence a false picture regarding the whole problem, as a consequence of which problems or questions derived therefrom prove to be irrelevant, incorrect or even tendentious. The Netherlands conception of the problem may be viewed on the one hand from the \textit{formal} or procedural aspect and on the other hand from the \textit{material} or essential side \textit{Formal A} the Netherlands Group starts from the thesis that only one of the parties to the dispute, viz. Indonesia, will have to prove its rights. It would suffice for the Netherlands to deny these rights and to qualify the arguments advanced by the Indonesian members as irrelevant or to conclude that these have no or insufficient value as proof. Unilaterally and incorrectly therefore in this manner for the solution in this political dispute between the Netherlands and Indonesia the procedure is taken of a civil lawsuit, in which the one party has to prove everything, it remaining sufficient for the other party to deny the opponent’s thesis.
Conclusion: On account of the aforementioned factors the Indonesian Group concludes that the conception of the Netherlands standpoint is unjust and unacceptable.

B. The Indonesian Group further opposes the standpoint of the Netherlands Group that Irian in linguistical, zoological, botanical, ethnological and anthropological respects does not belong to Indonesia. For, the history and the reality of the forming of States and Nations prove that oneness in linguistical, botanical etc, respects is not conclusive for the question whether a certain territory forms a part or not of a certain state. For instance, in Switzerland, Russia, India, China, the population speaks in various territories a different language. In the U.S.A. (Alaska), the Southern states of America, Indonesia, there are zoological differences between certain territories of the state. These circumstances apply, mutatis mutandis, also to the botanical, ethnological, anthropological, geological characteristics.

Conclusion: a purely scientific investigation of the factors referred to is inconclusive, incorrect and confusing for the judgement and decision of the „political” dispute under discussion. The Indonesian Group considers it incorrect to draw this investigation into the work of the committee.

Material (essential).

The Netherlands Group purposely starts from the standpoint that the Netherlands at present are the most efficient nation for the building up as referred to, with reference to Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations.

The Netherlands Group however starts thereby from the faulty idea, that the respective relations of the Netherlands and Indonesia with Irian administration of a non-self-governing territory. The respective relations differ however in essential, historical and political respects. Indonesia considers Irian to be an essential part of the Indonesian state and considers the people of Irian to be a part of the population of Indonesia.

The Netherlands can however be nothing but „possessor” of a part of the late colony Netherlands Indies, which part the Netherlands only recently qualify as a so-called” non-self-governing territory”. Chapter XI of the Carter of the United Nations referred to, does however not say that a state on account of the fact that it considers itself the most efficient to administer a little developed territory, is therefore entitled to annex or to keep such territory and to administer it. According to the chapter of the Charter referred to, a member of the U.N.O. is, „in as far as a little developed territory (former colony) has already been removed from its control, not entitled afterwards again to exploit such territory arbitrarily as a colonised
territory, but has to take article 73 of the Charter into account. If however the thesis is adopted that the most efficient state is the best entitled to administer an undeveloped territory, then the borders of weak states would be unsafe opposite mighty efficient states as the U.S.A. and Russia. For, many states can be named which have less developed territories within their borders (Spain, South-Africa, China, the Philippines) etc. During the 120 years of administration of Irian the Netherlands have for the rest done little for the development of the country. It is premature to assume that Indonesia would not be able to develop the country. Like the Netherlands, Indonesia too will make use of foreign support in the build-up. And in this respect first of all the Netherlands will be kept in mind. Indonesia too will therefore as a matter of course consider the development of country and people as an important factor. The Indonesian Group is of the opinion that first the definition of the problem of the political dispute must be considered and laid down, before other questions can be taken into consideration.

The Chairman says that he has listened with interest to the observation of the Indonesian Group and he mentions that the Netherlands group has already presented its opinion in a note which has been handed to the Indonesian Group in Djakarta, after which at that time the Indonesian members have drawn up a counter-note. He regards the statement of the Indonesian Group which has now been read by the secretary of the Ind. group in draft-form, as an elaborated counter-document to the Netherlands note referred to. He appreciates the clear form in which the observation has been drawn up, in this way both groups know exactly where they are; the Netherlands members will gladly study the document more deeply after they have received it. If both groups are free in the conception of their task, then there exists also freedom to oppose each other’s standpoint. It is the right of both groups to have an opinion of their own. The Netherlands group would for instance consider a chapter on a zoological aspect of the problem as important, while the Indonesian Group considers this unnecessary and in this case a Netherlands chapter would be obtained with Indonesian comments.

The Chairman expresses his expectation of receiving the Indonesian statement in its definitive form in time to be able to study it.

Prof. Pieters, though admiring the Vice-Chairman’s optimism in being able to hand the first contribution of the Indonesian Group to the final report on Friday and still to adhere to the target-date July 1st, says that he can hardly assume that such will still be possible in the very restricted time.
The Chairman explains that as appears from a conversation he has had with the Vice-Chairman Dr J. Latuharhary, the Indonesian contribution is next to ready in draft and only needs verification on some points. The Netherlands contribution too is now next to ready and already today the first chapter can be handed to the Indonesian group, though it should be remarked that the form is not yet definitive and the Netherlands members reserve their right to make all desired alternations therein. For this reason the Chairman requests that these documents for the time being be not included in the Committee’s reports.

Mr Latuharhary then submits the supplementary note of the Indonesian Group.

The Chairman confirms the receipt of this document.

It is then decided to hold the next meeting of the Committee on Friday, 30th June 1950, at 2.00 p.m. in the same building.

Nothing being left to discuss the Chairman closes the meeting at 2.40 p.m.

Confirmed 14/7-50.
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff.

Drawn up by,
Moh. Jahja.
Statement of the "Indonesian Group" of the Joint Committee concerning the crucial problem of the Netherlands-Indonesian dispute-Irian and some principles in the procedure to be followed by the Committee

Definition of the problem

The definition of the problem of the political dispute between the Netherlands and Indonesia concerning the ultimate political status of Irian after the one year after the transfer of sovereignty as referred to in article 2 of the Charter of the Transfer of sovereignty, belongs to the most important elements for the solution of the political dispute referred to.

Once the problem is faulty or incorrectly defined, the immediate direct consequence is, that a false picture of the whole problem comes into being, as a consequence of which unavoidably further derived problems as well as the problems derived from the crucial question, are being either incorrectly or tendentiously defined, or prove to be irrelevant.

Netherlands definition of the problem

How has now in the Joint Committee-Irian the crucial problem been defined by the Netherlands Group of the Joint Committee?

We have to look at this question from two viewpoints, viz. on the one hand from formal or procedural and on the other hand from material or essential viewpoint.

I. Formal

A. The Netherlands Group has, in our opinion, in the dispute concerning the future and ultimate political status of Irian after the fixed period of one year, repeatedly started from the wrong idea, that in the political dispute between the Netherlands and Indonesia under consideration (therefore concerning the question, wether after the accepted year of political status quo, Irian must come under the sovereignty of Indonesia or of the Netherlands), it only rests with one of the parties to the dispute, i.e. with Indonesia, to prove its rights to Irian; for the Netherlands, according to the Netherlands conception, it being sufficient only to deny the rights of Indonesia referred to, and subsequently to qualify the arguments advanced by Indonesia as irrelevant, or to conclude in this respect without further ado, that they have none or not sufficient value as proof.
Unilaterally and wrongly therefore, in this way, for the solution of this political dispute between Indonesia and the Netherlands, the formal procedure is followed of a civil lawsuit, as embodied in the Netherlands Code of Civil Procedure, according to which only one of the parties (the claimant) has to prove his statements and rights, the other (the defendant) only having to deny the supposed rights of his opponent and subsequently to oppose the arguments presented.

It needs no further motivation that such a procedure will not do for the solution of the "political" dispute between the Netherlands and Indonesia under consideration, in which dispute both parties undoubtedly are equal parties. For, on the contrary, each of the parties to the dispute has to prove its better right to Irian (West New Guinea). It does therefore not suffice to the Netherlands to merely deny Indonesia's rights to Irian and to only oppose the arguments advanced by Indonesia, but if the Netherlands oppose these arguments persist that they are entitled, rather than Indonesia) to keep Irian within their sovereignty also after the year after the transfer of sovereignty, then it is juridically logical and just if in the dispute the Netherlands too, on their part, in the same are considered obliged to prove their better rights to Irian.

This argumentation herefore has to be done by each of the two parties simultaneously and in accordance with the same procedure. For the rest this conception concurs entirely with the principle of article 2 of the Charter of the transfer of sovereignty.

On account of the foregoing it is concluded that the conception of procedure as stated by the Netherlands, has started from a train of thought which is wrong, illogical, unfounded and in any case unjust and therefore unacceptable.

B. The Netherlands delegation further suggests in opposing Indonesia's rights to Irian, the faulty thesis as if at the question whether Irian presently must come under the sovereignty of Indonesia or of the Netherlands, also the question must be determining whether Indonesia can make plausible that Irian linguistically, zoologically, botanically, ethnologically, geologically and anthropologically belongs to Indonesia, which the Netherlands deny.

Apart however from the obligation of each of the parties to the dispute, therefore also of the Netherlands, to prove its better rights to Irian, for which reason therefore also the Netherlands have to prove that Irian linguistically, zoologically, botanically, ethnologically, geologically and anthropologically (more than Indonesia) belongs to the Netherlands, it must be clearly noted that the aforementioned thesis of the Netherlands Group is in our opinion positively wrong.

For the history and reality of the forming of States and Nations show, that oneness in linguistical, zoological, botanical, etc. respect,
is not determining for the question whether a territory is a part of a State, or whether a certain territory can not be part of a State. Although further strengthening of the foregoing actually is superfluous, reference may be made to the following realities:

*Linguistically:* In Switzerland, Belgium (especially before the first worldwar), Russia, India, Pakistan, China, various territories of Indonesia, Australia (vide the autochthonous population) the population in different territories speaks a different language.  
*Zoologically:* In the U.S.A. (vide Alaska), the Southern States of America, Russia (vide Siberia), China (North and South China), Indonesia (Sumatra, Celebes), Australia (North and South Australia) there are zoological differences in certain parts of the State, sometimes very marked.

*Botanically, ethnologically, anthropologically, geologically.* Mutatis mutandis as the preceding.

**Conclusion:** The factors previously mentioned have no relation to our problem, which is a pure political problem, because a political problem between the Netherlands and Indonesia concerning the future "political" status of Irian, for which reason a purely scientific investigation of the factors referred to, would be irrelevant, superfluous and even unfounded for our problem, such a procedure on the other hand also leading us too far from the crucial problem and from the very task of the Committee, confusing the actual problem. Therefore the Indonesian delegation considers it wrong to draw such investigation into the work of the Committee.

**II. Material (essential).**

An other suggestive detraction from the whole crucial problem, is the thesis of the Netherlands Group, as if the political status of Irian after the status quo-period, would have to be decided by the question which of the two parties to the dispute (the Netherlands or Indonesia) is the most efficient and the best equipped to develop Irian.

The Netherlands delegation elucidates this thesis, by arguing that it takes the interest of the population of Irian as criterion in this respect. The intention of this faulty definition of the problem and of this only recent gesture of the Netherlands, appears in our opinion already at once from its conclusion, viz. that the Netherlands are at present the most efficient for this development, further referring to Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and to the Pacific Commission.

In our opinion however, this is definitely based on the wrong assumption that the relation of the Netherlands and Indonesia in respect of Irian were "of the same character", that both would be considered for "administrator" of a non-self-governing territory (the
modern word for a colonial power and for a colony, vide Prof. François: Handbook of international law, page 241).

It is however clear that the respective relations differ essentially, historically and politically greatly of each other. Indonesia considers Irian to be an essential part of the Indonesian state-nation and regards the Irian people as part of the people of Indonesia from Sabang to Merauke, the Netherlands not being able to be anything but "possessor" of a part of the former colony Netherlands Indies, which part only very recently has been regarded by the Netherlands as a non-self-governing territory. Apart however from the question whether Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations is applicable to the Netherlands with relation to Irian (quod non, because the chapter referred to, was at the most applicable to the former Netherlands Indies as a whole), the provisions referred to, do not say that the state which in the world is the most efficient, may take or retain the "administration" of the still little developed territory because the state referred to, considers itself the most efficient to develop this little developed territory. The said provisions of the Charter contain on the contrary nothing but the thesis that "in so far" a not yet well developed territory (former colony) is or has been put 'already' under the administration of a member of the UNO, this so-called administrator (former colonial power) is thereafter no more at liberty to exploit the colonised territory arbitrarily, but on the contrary must recognize the principle "that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories" (art. 73).

In case the thesis, that the most efficient state were the most entitled to administer a somewhat backward territory, would be accepted, then the borders of many weak states, both new and old ones, would no more be safe opposite mighty, rich and efficient states like the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. There are still many states which have less developed territories within their borders, like Spain, South Africa, many states in South America, China, Thailand, the Philippines, etc.

**Conclusion:** For the solution of the political dispute concerning the political status of Irian referred to, the question which of the two countries is considered the most efficient to develop Irian as a backward country, may not be taken as criterion. This is, as proved in the foregoing, essentially, historically and politically quite wrong and on the other hand only causes confusion and deception.

For the rest, the Netherlands have during their 122-year "administration" of Irian, shown to have done little for the development
of country and people, and it is premature and unjust to assume beforehand that on the other hand Indonesia would not be able to effectuate the work of build-up. For, it is overlooked that Indonesia too, once confronted with such a task, undoubtedly like the Netherlands will need in this respect the help and support of foreign countries, which it undoubtedly will call in, amongst them naturally in the first place the assistance of the Netherlands. Indonesia too therefore starts from the principle that the interests of the population of the territory concerned are to be regarded as paramount.

Final conclusion. In the foregoing the Indonesian group has, in arranging the facts necessary for the composition of a joint report for the preparation of the solution of the political dispute/Irian, pointed out the faulty definition of the problem of the said dispute, as promoted by the Netherlands.

In the opinion of the Indonesian Group this matter, viz. the correct definition of the problem of the political dispute under consideration, must first of all be discussed exhaustively and then recorded, before other questions and other problems may be gone into.

The Indonesian Group has attempted, in order to argue its opinion, to formulate its ideas as sharply as possible, in order that the further disputes shall not too much and unnecessarily derail on points which are not material or which are of none or little significance for the problem at hand. In this way also the work of the Committee for the solution of the dispute-Irian is being made more practical and efficient.
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Minutes of the ninth formal meeting on Friday, June 30th 1950, in the Ministry for Union-Affairs and Overseas Dominions at The Hague, 1 Plein

Present are:
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Chairman;
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Vice-Chairman;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
Dr. Muh. Yamin, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;
Dr. Teng Tjin Leng, Secretary;
J. A. van Beuge, Adviser;
N. Jouwe, Adviser;
S. Papare, Adviser;

Union-Secretariat:
Dr. W. Schols, Committee-Secretary;
Moh. Jahja.

1. At 2.05 p.m. the Chairman opens the meeting with a word of welcome to those present and then presents to the meeting a motion of adatheads and prominent personalities from the population of Hollandia, addressed to the Queen, copy of which has been presented to the Chairman of the week of the Committee through the intermediary of Mr Jouwe.

It is decided that this document be registered by the Union-Secretariat and circulated amongst the members.

2. Confirmation minutes of the 7th formal meeting.

After some alterations and additions have been made, it is decided to confirm the minutes of the 7th formal meeting.

3. Method of drawing-up the joint report.

The Chairman requests that the discussions on the statement of the Indonesian Group be postponed to a next meeting, because the text has only been received in the course of the morning, so that here was no opportunity yet to study it.

It is thus decided.
Dr Teng Tjin Leng explains that, because of many inconvenient typing errors, the Indonesian Group had decided to present a new text — however not different from the old one — to the members of the Netherlands group.

Dr J. Latuharhary declares that the Indonesian Group, though agreeing with the Chairman's proposal to achieve an exchange of contributions to the final report and a mutual comment thereon, still would like to advance the following.

As has already on behalf of the Indonesian Group been explained by mouth of our secretary, dr Teng Tjin Leng, at the formal meeting of June 28th, 1950 of the Joint Committee, the Indonesian Group is firmly of the opinion that the dispute still pending between Indonesia and the Netherlands concerning Irian, is a purely political dispute, for it concerns the ultimate determination of the status of Irian (West New Guinea), so that linguistic, botanical anthropological and geological factors essentially are not relative to the crucial problem as such.

Without detracting in the least from our standpoint referred to, nevertheless the submission of notes and other documents on the part of the Netherlands Group as supposed building-material for the report of the Committee to be composed, gives cause to the Indonesian Group to give on its part its own vision concerning the observations contained in the aforementioned Netherlands notes.

The Indonesian Group has thought fit to do so — though therefore superfluously —, because the final report to be composed, is work of the committee, which therefore emanates from each of the two groups of the Joint Committee.

Dr Latuharhary proposes to hold as few meetings as possible.

Prof. van Dijk asks the Chairman whether the latter still considers it opportune to fix a date for a possible next meeting for the exchange of contributions, or whether such can be done unofficially. For the rest he requests that it be taken into account that a.o. on 11th and 12th July he is prevented in view of other obligations from which he can not withdraw.

The Chairman considers it unnecessary to fix already a meeting for the exchange of contributions. A mutual agreement between himself and the Chairman of the Indonesian Group will suffice for the handing thereof.

4. Nothing being left to discuss, the Chairman closes the meeting at 2.30 p. m.

Confirmed 14-7-50

Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff M. Jahja — Committee-Secretary.

99
Joint Committee New Guinea/Irian

Minutes of the 10th formal meeting on Friday, July 14th, at 2.00 p.m.
in the Ministry for Union-Affairs and Overseas Dominions,
1 Plein, The Hague

Present are:
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Chairman;
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Vice-Chairman;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
Dr. Muh. Yamin, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;
Dr. Teng Tjin Leng, Secretary;
J. A. van Beuge, Adviser;
N. Jouwe, Adviser;
S. Papare, Adviser;

Union-Secretariat:
Dr. W. Schols, Committee-Secretary;
Moh. Jahja.

At 2.00 p.m. the Chairman opens the meeting with a word of welcome to those present and then presents to the meeting a letter from the Ministry for Union-Affairs and Overseas Dominions dated July 14th, 1950, no. 5-885-DIV with attached two official records in respect of M. Wali and H. Jokou (document C. Ir I/AG/P/27).

It is decided to have this document registrated by the Secretariat of the Netherlands-Indonesian Union and to have the letters of the P.I.D.R.I.S. concerned, forwarded to the respective addresses with an accompanying letter of the Chairman of the Joint Committee and the official record as appendix.

Confirmation minutes of the 8th and 9th formal meetings.

It is decided to confirm the minutes of the 8th and 9th formal meetings with some alterations and additions.
Confirmation summaries of the 7th, 8th and 9th informal meetings.

The Chairman says that, with regard to amendments proposed by him, a new draft of the summaries was drawn up. He reads the alterations made by him.

Dr Teng Tjin Leng deeply regrets that this new stencilled draft has become known to him only now at the commencement of the meeting, therefore has not been given to him for perusal before distribution to the members. This puts him as group-secretary in a difficult position. He states that here has been deviated from a procedure adhered to till now, viz. that the draft of the summaries first is considered and if necessary amended by the four secretaries before it is stencilled for distribution to the members, and that it is not the usual thing that after the distribution of a draft further amendments are made by one of the groups and subsequently a new draft is presented to the meeting. Because of the speed with which Prof. van der Kolff enumerates the many, sometimes important alterations made by the Netherlands Group, the Indonesian Group can not get a correct picture of the whole summary.

The Chairman explains that of the 7th informal meeting two texts of the draft have now been presented. One of these contains the alterations, desired by the Netherlands Group in the original draft. These alterations could only this morning be worked into a new stencilled form by the Secretariat, which also explains the late receipt of the altered draft. In making the alterations he has attempted to have the summaries closer conform to the words spoken at the meeting. He remarks that — as far is known to him — everyone is entitled to propose alterations at the meeting. His words could also be regarded as such.

Dr Schols requests permission to speak and explains that indeed it is customary that the draft-minutes and -summaries first are sent to the two Group-secretaries for perusal. Alterations proposed by them are taken into account, possibly after discussion in case they are more important. This custom promotes the quick confirmation at the meetings. In the case under consideration the draft was not returned to him by the Netherlands Group-Secretary in time, notwithstanding special enquiry. Compelled by want of time, because confirmation was on the agenda, he was obliged to present to the members as draft, the draft without the proposed alterations of the Netherlands Group-Secretary. When the proposed alterations arrived this morning at 10.30 o’clock, he has thought it best to have a new draft stencilled, in order to save the members the trouble of having to note down all proposed alterations. Consultation with Dr Teng was naturally not possible under these circumstances.
Dr. Teng Tjin Leng says that this is not a juridical question, but that good sport requires that an agreement once made and a procedure once followed are being adhered to. For, he must be able to see whether alterations have been made in the original text. If however one of the four secretaries is left out of alterations as those under consideration, this is opposite this secretary at least an "unfriendly" act.

Dr. van Baal says that in this question the fault is neither with Mr. van der Kolff nor with the Secretariat, but only with himself as group-secretary. The draft had been presented to him for correction by the Secretariat, long before. For the correction of the text he had called for the help of the Chairman of the Netherlands Group, Prof. van der Kolff, because he was of the opinion that the summary did not give a true representation of the discussion at the meeting. Owing to Prof. van der Kolff's illness the draft, which was already partly corrected, was left with Prof. van der Kolff in Amsterdam and could only this very morning be returned to the Secretariat, when the first text of the draft had already been distributed. He agrees with Dr. Schols' standpoint that it is not customary that the four secretaries have to meet together to correct the draft. During the stay of the Committee in Biak it was only informally agreed between the four secretaries that the Group-secretaries would separately put corrections to the original text and leave the rest to the Union-Secretariat. The idea advanced by Dr. Teng, viz. that the four Group-secretaries first have to peruse the text conjointly, is quite new. There can be therefore no question of an unfriendly act.

Dr. Teng Tjin Leng remarks that he would not object if the altered draft-summary had been presented to him before. He considers it however not elegant that the unaltered draft-summary has been presented to him officially, therefore giving the impression of being the original one, afterwards, immediately before the meeting, outside his knowledge however a second draft being presented to the Indonesian Group, in which the Netherlands Group has already made alterations without the knowledge of the formal meeting.

Dr. Schols again requests permission to speak and repeats that the corrected drafts have only been meant as expedients and could not be produced earlier. He would propose that the unaltered drafts be put up for discussion and then the alterations one by one be regarded as proposals of the Netherlands Group for alterations.

The Chairman proposes that, if indeed the alterations are considered drastic — as Mr. Teng considers them — and this opinion
of Mr. Teng is also shared by the members of the Indonesian Group, the meeting be adjourned in order to enable the Indonesian members to consider them. It is thus decided.

At 3.00 p.m. the Chairman reopens the meeting.

Dr. Latuharhary announces on behalf of the Indonesian members that they have no objections against the proposed alterations.

The Chairman concludes that, since no further alterations are being considered necessary, that the altered summary is confirmed.

After the adjournment Dr. Muh. Yamin says that he has understood that it was agreed and therefore had become usual for the four secretaries to peruse the draft-summaries. It is only a matter of course that this is adhered to, in the very least for courtesy's sake. And courtesy is nothing new to us.

Moh. Jahja, having obtained permission to speak, says that in Djakarta documents have been handed to him for presentation to the Committee, which originated from the Badan Perdjoangan Irian at Djokjakarta. He would like to know whether these documents like the motion of the adatrehads from Hollandia which also has been addressed a.o. to the Joint Committee through the intermediary of Mr. N. Jouwe, will be attached to the minutes or summaries as appendixes.

It is decided that these documents will not be attached to the minutes or summaries as appendixes, but will only by registrated and filed in the archives of the Union-Secretariat, because it is not usual to attach such documents to the minutes and summaries. The documents received through the intermediary of Mr. Jouwe will neither be included in the appendixes to the minutes.

It is then decided, after some alterations and additions, to formalize the summaries of the 8th and 9th informal meetings.

Discussion further framework of the final report

Dr. J. Latuharhary says that the Indonesian Group has developed in writing its observation with regard to the Netherlands standpoint. He further explains that at the conclusion of that observation some questions have been put which the Indonesian Group hopes to see answered during this meeting. At Dr Latuharhary's request and the Chairman's permission obtained, Dr. Teng Tjin Leng proceeds to read the observation of the Indonesian Group referred to, which reads as follows:

"The Indonesian Group wishes to conclude from the further contribution of the Netherlands Group to the discussion on the procedure of drawing-up the final report — which contribution has
been put in writing and has been read by the Chairman of the Netherlands Group at the informal meeting on July 8th, 1950 — that in fact the said Group has admitted that the Netherlands Group has changed its attitude with regard to the procedure followed by the Joint Committee up till then.

Naturally the Netherlands Group has further argumentated its proposal referred to (which will be further gone into hereafter), but the Indonesian Group is of the opinion that it has in any case been established that its attitude regarding the procedure for the composition of the report, as up till then had been accepted in practice, has suddenly been radically changed. It is understandable that such an unexpected change in the attitude of the one group in a joint Committee, which is composed on a par, creates with the other Group a surprising and painful impression. In any case the Indonesian Group wishes to declare straightforwardly that what has happened, has indeed — as the spokesman of the Netherlands group at the meeting of July 8th, last presumed — created both a painful and surprising impression with the Indonesian Group, and that the feeling of uncertainty and disappointment caused by it has not been neutralized by the arguments adduced.

The Indonesian Group has further been struck by the further statement of the Chairman of the Netherlands Group, made at the same informal meeting of July 8th, that it would be wrong to appeal to an arrangement concerning the procedure of composing the report of the Committee, because according to this speaker the statement referred to had only been a personal opinion of himself.

Once more the Indonesian Group wants to remark in this respect that, when at the informal meeting at Biak on May 19th, 1950, both groups could not agree concerning the procedure of composing the report of the Committee, Prof. van der Kolff has indeed made the suggestion referred to. However, it should be added to this at once, that subsequently this suggestion was accepted by both groups and that it has in any case been effectuated in practice, that at least a real start has been made by the exchange of the first chapters of each other’s final reports, which were to be drawn up independently. And the Netherlands Group was the first to submit its contribution, viz. first unofficially and subsequently officially on June 26th, last.

The first contribution of the Indonesian Group then followed and was received by the Netherlands Group on July 1st, 1950.

The second contribution of the Indonesian Group was formally submitted on July 4th, 1950. The Indonesian Group will further refrain from once more quoting parts from the minutes of the committee-meetings held in order to further strengthen the foregoing argumentation, but it may suffice to quote the own words of the Chairman of the Netherlands Group spoken at the informal meeting
of July 8th, viz: „It may be disappointing to give up the original idea of writing the report conjointly after this has proved impossible in an honest attempt to effectuate the idea, but that does not need to lie heavy on the conscience”.

Now I would like on behalf of the Indonesian Group to consider the arguments of the Netherlands Group for its changed attitude.

The Netherlands Group has put it in this way, that two things have influced its attitude, viz.:

Firstly: the want of time into which the Committee had fallen, and

Secondly: the fact that a report to be composed on this basis, would become unreadable.

1. Want of time: At a conference time indeed mostly is an important factor. The more so for the delegation who has to travel far, like in this case the Indonesian Group.

The Indonesian delegation has indeed at the time made known, that it would like to return to Indonesia as soon as possible, in case before July 20. From the fact however that the idea with regard to the new procedure had already arisen with the Netherlands Group after the statement of the Indonesian Group, therefore on June 28th 1950, and in any case after receipt of the first chapter of the Indonesian Group, therefore on July 1st, it appears that at that time there was undoubtedly sufficient time available to both delegations for the completion of their own independent reports and also for the annotation of the chapters of the other Group already received.

Moreover he date of departure of the Indonesian Group had at that time not yet been fixed even „provisionally”, so that naturally, if necessary, that date of departure could, as is now the case, have been postponed without too much difficulty.

The appeal to the stipulation in the resolution of the first Union-Conference, viz. that the report of the Joint Committee must be completed before July 1st, 1950, and that the Joint Committee on that date must have completed its work, appears to us also unfounded. For, this period had already been exceeded when the Netherlands Group submitted its proposal for a radical revision of the procedure followed, viz. at the Committee-meeting of July 5th, last, the Indonesian Group having moreover already at its arrival in the Netherlands provisionally fixed its time-schedule on 20th July, 1950, at the latest.

But above all it must have become known to the Netherlands Group from the minutes of the first Union-Conference, that originally, at the proposal of the Netherlands Group in the special Committee-Irian, the timescheme referred to before, was fixed on July31st, and that only at the final meeting in pleno the period for the final
report of the committee was, at the proposal of the Indonesian Delegation shortened till July 1st, 1950.

If therefore the Indonesian Group subsequently, as a consequence of further changed conditions, showed itself prepared to extend the aforementioned period by some weeks, then it appears therefrom that there was no want of time, for which reason the Indonesian Group wonders whether the appeal made thereto can be taken as meant in earnest. The Indonesian Group is further of the opinion that an appeal to want of time is also irrelevant for this reason, that until today the date of the Union-Conference to be held with regard to the dispute under consideration, has not yet been fixed. For the rest, it may be mentionel that the Indonesian Group can have completed its report in a few days.

There still remains the remark of the Netherlands Group that its members ultimately wish to return to their normal work. Without in any way doubting that this remark was meant in earnest, the Indonesian Group considers it nevertheless useful to say in reply that on the one hand at least the same necessity existed for the Indonesian members of the Committee and on the other hand the importance of the political dispute concerning the future status of Irian³, is to both states, the Netherlands and Indonesia, so paramount, that it may be considered quite evident which interest must weigh heaviest.

2. The readability of the report.

The Indonesian Delegation has explained at the informal meeting on July 8th, last, that the method of composition of the final report, originally suggested by the Netherlands Group and subsequently put into practice, would not detract from the readability of the independent reports, but on the contrary, would in this way make the problem of Irian better ready for discussion by the two Governments.

Opposite this, the Netherlands Group puts its concern that, if the accepted procedure be continued (successive exchange of chapters of the independent group-reports, with the right of each group to annotate the other’s working-documents), then each of the two groups would proceed to formulate its critique as sharply as possible, through which the two Governments would obtain a report demolished to the very bottom. The Indonesian Group can to its regret neither share this objection of the Netherlands Group. It may, for shortness’ sake, only remark that the critical consideration of each others reports does not deserve the qualification „demolish”, but on the contrary in this way the two Governments will, already from the start of the dispute between parties, be led straight to the lines of agreement and of non-agreement. On the other hand, the distance between two independent reports, drawn up according to different systems, is so large and so vague, that it will be difficult and time-
devouring to the parties to the dispute, to find first the points of agreement and of non-agreement, before commencing the dispute itself. Therefore it belongs also to the preparatory work of the Joint Committee to trace in advance these points of non-agreement. And finally, at the Union-Conference regarding the dispute-Irian under consideration, each of the two Governments will also and in any case have to study critically the reports of the other party. And there is no reason for these Governments to take in this respect a more or less critical attitude than its Committee-members would have done, in particular because probably they will appoint some of the present committee-members their advisers to the Conference.

Conclusion. The Indonesian Group has come to the conclusion that the crucial objection of the Netherlands Group against the originally accepted procedure, in fact exclusively exists in the possibility, originally suggested by this group itself, of mutual „critical consideration” of each others’ reports. And the Indonesian Group must, to its regret, conclude that, because of the positive unpreparedness of the Netherlands Group to allow in any way the aforementioned critical consideration, the principle in the Joint Committee-Irian of freedom of each of the equal groups to put its own judgement opposite the judgement of the other, is being infringed.

Since the task of the Joint Committee only lies in the field of a political dispute, it can not be avoided or obscured that on the points of non-agreement mutual critique is exercised. It is therefore unjust to exclude a priori such critique, a.o. in order that the „outside world” otherwise would get a certain impression of the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, already at the previous meeting the Indonesian Group has straightforwardly declared that, since the present difficulty naturally may be of far-reaching influence on the further solution of the dispute-Irian, the Indonesian Group therefore is now suddenly confronted by a very important decision.

The Indonesian Group is prepared to announce its decision already in this meeting. In order to come to that, it considers it however necessary and useful, that previously on some particular concrete and material points concerning the work of this Joint Committee, a joint decision be taken.

In view hereof the Indonesian Group would like to put to the Netherlands Group the following questions:

1. How will the ultimate report look?

2. The Indonesian Group can have its contribution ready in a few days. It would like to know whether the Netherlands Group can say when it expects completed its contribution.
3. When and how will the formalisation of the respective contributions take place?

4. What documents will be presented to the two Governments and in what way?

5. In what languages will the final report be put?

6. When and how will the task of the Joint Committee be concluded?

7. In what way will the joint introduction to the final report be composed?

Mr Chairman, because the points raised by me are concrete points which do not need elaborate observations and discussions and on which for a great part there already exists agreement, the Indonesian Group hopes that these points may be decided at this meeting, so that during this meeting on all points of the procedure of composition of the report definitive and complete decisions will be taken.

At the Chairman's proposal the meeting is adjourned to enable the Netherlands Group to consider the statement read.

At 4.15 p.m. the meeting is reopened.

The Chairman explains the standpoint of the Netherlands Group and says that it is also on the part of the Netherlands members realized, that now a critical stage has been reached. And just as the Indonesian Group needed a week's time to be able to react to the standpoint of the Netherlands Group, the members of the Netherlands Group would like to get time to react to the written observation of the Indonesian Group, which gives rise to some questions and in which some incorrectnesses have appeared which can be corrected. In order to be able to proceed with the work as soon as possible, he proposes that the Committee meet again on Sunday-afternoon. The Indonesian members however have objections against this because on Sunday and Monday the Leberan Puasa is being celebrated.

It is decided to hold the next meeting on Tuesday-afternoon at 14.00 p.m. in the building of the High Commissioner of the R.I.S., no. 3 Schimmelpennincklaan. The Indonesian Group will hand on Saturday-morning, Juli 15th, the text of the Indonesian observation to the Netherlands Group (six copies).

After having obtained the Chairman's permission to speak, Mr. S. Papare, Adviser of the Indonesian Group, now takes the word and says:

108
Mr. Chairman,

I may acknowledge my gratitude for the opportunity given to me, to advance my opinion during this meeting.

1. As a purebred Indonesian from the isle of New Guinea, I feel very pleased to be able to work as Adviser in this Committee. The dispute is to us people of New Guinea extremely important, because it is our interest to know whether we will come under the sovereignty of Indonesia or remain in eternity under the colonial administration of the Netherlands.

2. I feel very disappointed having heard that the Netherlands Group after July 1st has come back on the ideas it has advanced originally, in order to reach agreement with regard to the drawing-up of the joint report. This agreement is of great importance, because that report will be used as a basis for the conclusion of a solution of the dispute under consideration in a special Union-Conference on the question West New Guinea.

This attitude of the Netherlands Group causes a confusion in the looking for a solution of the dispute, December 27th, 1950, nevertheless already approaching. As regards myself, it is again a proof that the Netherlands Group has no attention for the interests of the autochthonous population of New Guinea.

3. I would like to give this advice, that both reports be sent to the two Governments with one joint accompanying letter. In the meantime we must continue our work and it would be right if both groups exchange their contributions which are completed. I further express the hope that the two Governments, both the Indonesian and the Netherlands, will submit both reports to their respective parliaments and also to the U.N.O. through the intermediary of the U.N.C.I., so that the national and international world will in general be informed of the dispute concerning my native country.

I thank you.

Prof. Pieters says that Mr. Papare's statement is connected with the observation of the Indonesian Group read by Dr. Teng Tjin Leng. In view hereof he proposes that also Mr. Papare's statement, together with the observation of the Indonesian Group, be forwarded the next day in six copies to the Netherlands Group, if possible in a Netherlands translation.

The Indonesian Group promises to do so.

4. Nothing being left for discussion, the Chairman closes the meeting at 5.30 p.m.

Confirmed 20-7-50

Dr. J. Latuharhary
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At 2.15 p.m. the Chairman opens the meeting and says that no
agenda was circulated. The meeting has been convened at the request
of the Netherlands members, in order once more to consider the
procedure.

Prof. van der Kolff says that indeed the Netherlands members
have requested once more to discuss this point, because the Nether-
lands Group is becoming concerned about the results of the proce-
dure which is now being followed and which finally would have to
lead to the drawing-up of the final report of the Committee.
There are two points which cause the concern. The Netherlands
members have the feeling that the Committee will become short of
time. In the second place, even if sufficient time would still be
available, the question still remains whether the present procedure
will lead to a satisfactory result in the shape of a readable final
report.

Speaker wishes to recall to mind that the Netherlands members
have received a statement from the Indonesian Group regarding the
crucial problem. On account hereof and of the first chapter of the
contribution of the Indonesian members to the final report, the con-
cern referred to previously, has arisen with the Netherlands group.
If the previous work and discussion in the committee is recalled, the Speaker wishes to remind that always it was considered an important point to exchange views not only with regard to the procedure, but also about the conception of the task. This has therefore led to the exchange of several notes in Djakarta and New Guinea/Irian. Jointly the conception was accepted that each group would follow its own idea and could collect the material considered necessary by it. Also each group would have the right to oppose and comment the standpoint of the other party. According to this conception each group would draw up a contribution to the final report.

At the continuation of the discussion in the Netherlands it appeared that the Indonesian members felt the need of further discussions, in particular on the definition of the problem.

It appears from the statement of the Indonesian Group concerning the crucial problem, that the standpoints of the Indonesian and the Netherlands member are still even farther apart than was thought after the discussions in Djakarta.

Without desiring to comment this statement, Speaker considers it desirable to give attention to some points therefrom, in order to make clear the nature of the difficulties which have caused the concern of the Netherlands members.

In the statement referred to previously, mention is made of a correct definition of the problem and in particular of the Netherlands definition of the problem. To the Netherlands the crux has always been: the interest of the population; in particular the question in what way that interest of the population would best be served; whether this could be done best by keeping New Guinea/Irian under Netherlands administration or by transferring New Guinea/Irian to Indonesia. This standpoint as crucial problem for the Netherlands does not find expression in the statement. The crucial problem is therein viewed in proving the rights to New Guinea/Irian. To the Netherlands it is not in the first place a matter of rights, to the Netherlands the interest of the population comes — as said — first. On the Indonesian side mention is then made of a fault in the definition of the problem. But the problem has not been defined in the way the Netherlands standpoint has been reproduced in the statement.

The statement further refers to what may be called the approach to the problem and it contains the reproach that the Netherlands group was confining itself to criticizing the Indonesian claims and was contributing itself only few arguments to prove own rights.

Again this in the first place can be brought up that the Netherlands Group starts from a different definition of the problem so that indeed few arguments have been contributed to the definition of the problem attributed on the Indonesian side to the Netherlands
group. But this does not mean that the Neherlanders have shunned arguments wherever they considered these necessary for their starting-point. And if this matter is after all under discussion, it may be recalled how in the first instance this argumentation was made difficult to the Netherlands Group, because on the Indonesian side objections were raised against the collection of certain material, since this would only serve to strengthen the Netherlands standpoint.

It is quite a different matter if on the Indonesian side it were expected that the Netherlands members would bring forward arguments in order to prove the rights of the Netherlands to New Guinea/Irian, and in this respect, in their turn would have to prove the natural bonds between New Guinea/Irian and the Netherlands. This point stands quite differently. The natural oneness of New Guinea/Irian and Indonesia has been stated on the Indonesian side, whereupon the Netherlands side requested that arguments be brought forward for this thesis, in which respect it may be remarked that the Indonesian statement concerning the oneness of Irian and the Indonesian state-nation can not count as a legal ground.

Speaker only mentions these points for as far as they can serve to illustrate his argument that the respective standpoints appear now indeed to be far apart. On the Netherlands side herefore the correctness is recognized of the conclusion of the Indonesian statement:

"In the opinion of the Indonesian group first of all this matter, viz. the pure definition of the problem of the political dispute concerned, must be discussed conclusively and recorded, before further questions and different problems may be gone into".

Although after the reading of the Indonesian statement it was proposed on the Netherlands side to continue the accepted procedure for the time being in order to prevent stagnation in the work, after further consideration the Netherlands group has asked itself whether there is still any hope that a joint report may be issued.

It will after all cost very considerable time to reach a good understanding of each other's definitions of the problem and to reach agreement concerning the approach to these problems. Notes and counter-notes would be produced, but the manner of planning and of approaching the problems would all the time come from the own definition of the problem, so that all the time lengthy discussions would be the result.

Thus it is, for instance, with the first chapter of the Indonesian contribution to the final report which the Netherlands members have now received. They could go into this and provoke a reply, but continuing in this way, the achievement of a joint final report would still require a very lengthy period.

To this would then be added that other point on which grave concern has arisen, viz. the question whether, if a joint final report
after all can be composed, this will appear to be readable, because then it will be interspersed by every kind of contradictory comments. The question has therefore arisen with the Netherlands group whether it were not advisable to follow a different procedure. The ideal of a joint report will then have to be given up, which is unavoidable because of the great difference in outlooks. The Netherlands group wonders whether as a consequence of these circumstances it will not be necessary that each group proceeds to draw up its own report.

A decision in this respect however can only be taken in mutual consultation. The Netherlands group has therefore thought fit to submit this question to the full committee and requests a discussion thereon. In order to avoid misunderstanding it will then be necessary to have the reports preceded by a joint introduction, in which the reasons are briefly explained why it was decided to draw up two reports.

The Chairman says that he has listened with great interest to Prof. van der Kolff’s speech. Two points are therefore at issue: want of time and the readability of the report. Naturally the Indonesian members find it difficult to give at once their opinion. They will gladly consider this matter.

Prof. van der Kolff can very well see this. The other work need also not to be held up for this reason.

Dr. Teng Tjin Leng would like to hear whether the explanation given also contains a discussion on the Indonesian statement or not. In the affirmative case the Indonesian group feels compelled to continue this discussion.

Prof. van der Kolff says that he only very briefly mentioned some points to strengthen his argument. The Netherlands members have however not given up their right to go further into the note if necessary and desired.

Dr. Teng Tjin Leng further would like to hear some elucidation on the following subject. In the previous minutes he has found Prof. van der Kolff’s suggestion to have two contributions to the final report drawn up, with mutual annotations or comments. Speaker would like to hear whether therefore this suggestion is dropped.

Prof. van der Kolff affirms this.

Dr. Teng Tjin Leng then asks the Netherlands group whether it is Prof. van der Kolff’s intention that the exchange of some chapters which has already taken place in the committee, is no longer to be considered as the joint work of the committee.
Prof. van der Kolff is of the opinion that the chapters exchanged always must be considered as highly confidential mutual information. It is better to act as if these chapters have not been received.

The Chairman concludes that the next meeting on this matter will take place on Friday, July 7th 1950, at 2.00 p.m. in the same place; he then closes the meeting at 2.45 p.m.

Confirmed 14-7-50.

Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff.
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At 2.00 p.m. the Chairman opens the meeting. It was the intention
that at this meeting the Indonesian members would explain their
views about the observations of Prof. van der Kolff at the last meeting.
The Indonesian group has thought it desirable, for clearness’ sake,
to give its reply in writing, this reply reading as follows:

"At the informal meeting of the Joint Committee at Djakarta on
May 19th, 1950, the Chairman of the Netherlands group has proposed
that ultimately it must be possible to have the final report split up
into two parts, viz.

a. the report of the Indonesian members annotated by the Nether-
lands members,

b. the report of the Netherlands members, annotated by the
Indonesia members”.

"Mr van der Kolff has further requested the Indonesian Group to
consider again the Netherlands suggestion advanced at the last in-
formal meeting, and to further discuss this suggestion in the Joint
Committee at this meeting of today.
The Indonesian Group has carefully considered this suggestion, which
it regards as a very important stage in the work of the Committee,
and it desires to make known at this meeting its provisional opinion.
In the first place it be straightforwardly said that this unexpected attitude of the Netherlands Group with regard to the continuation of the work of the Committee, has struck the Indonesian Group. For, the standpoint of the Indonesian Group with regard to the definition of the problem and the conception of the task concerning the dispute Irian, as it was stated by Dr Teng Tjin Leng at the formal meeting of the Committee on June 28th 1950, can not be regarded as to have been unknown to the Netherlands Group. For the Chairman of this Group declared after the announcement of the aforementioned standpoint: "It is the right of both groups to have an opinion of their own. For instance, the Netherlands Group would consider a chapter on a zoological aspect of the problem important, while the Indonesian Group considers this unnecessary and in this case therefore a Netherlands chapter with Indonesian comments would be obtained”.

The standpoint of the Indonesian Group with regard to the definition of the problem and the conception of the task of the Committee has further already been contained — although less systematically and complete — in the two notes previously submitted, subsequently the two groups in the Joint Committee having seriously discussed it. Finally, the Netherlands and the Indonesian standpoints in this respect have already been debated at the R.T.C., although at the time these standpoints had not yet been sufficiently clearly and thoroughly elucidated.

It was therefore already at the commencement of the work of the Committee to be reasonably expected that the different standpoints of the two groups of the Committee, also with regard to the points under discussion, could not or hardly be brought together.

However, and we would like to stress this, in general it is very well possible and such was already at the very start to be expected in respect of certain characteristic points of the Irian-dispute, that the opinions of the Netherlands group with regard to certain subjects or points of this dispute will differ very strongly or radically from those of the Indonesian Group. Such is frequently the fate of every committee-work on a particular dispute, if the judges are composed from members of each of the parties to the dispute.

For these reasons the Indonesian Group therefore considers it incorrect and little real to find reason — as the Netherlands Group did — in this difference of opinion, to presume that further joint work in the shape of successive exchanges of documents as parts of each other’s final report and containing elaborations of the respective standpoints towards certain subjects, would not be desirable respectively useful.

The abrupt attitude of the Netherlands Group has struck our Group the more, because after all at the informal meeting on May
19th, 1950, and at the formal meeting of the Committee of June 28th, 1950, the Chairman of the Netherlands Group submitted, for the very solution of the situation arisen when the standpoints of the two groups proved to differ so much that a joint report did not look feasible, the proposals referred to previously. And since the said proposals, which after all could be regarded as accepted, both groups have based their further work, in particular the arranging of the facts and of other material relative to the dispute under discussion, accordingly.

After Dr. Teng Tjin Leng had pronounced the statement referred to before, the Indonesian Group has received the first part (Chapter I) of the separate report of the Netherlands Group, whereupon it, on its part, shortly afterwards has submitted its first document (Chapter I) to the Joint Committee.

These documents submitted by both parties, are undoubtedly of great value to the future dispute on Irian between the two Governments of the Netherlands and Indonesia, even if the documents referred to, were to contain radically differing opinions. For, because of these, not only the points of agreement, but also those of non-agreement can be put before the two Governments in ready form.

Further, at the Union-Conference at Djakarta on 28th March, 1950, the Joint Committee of which the Netherlands Group constitutes an equal part, has, by resolution, been given the obligation to collect as much as possible material relative to the dispute on Union-level. Such, also in view of the decision at the R.T.C. that at that time the problem of Irian had not yet been looked into thoroughly and exhaustively.

If now the positive question is asked, whether indeed the working-documents submitted by each of the two groups until today will have a disturbing effect on the future dispute between the Governments or will even cause a chaotic avalanche of data, the Indonesian Group would have to reply emphatically in the negative. The Indonesian Group has studied the first chapter of he document of the Netherlands Group with great seriousness and it can not say that, although its own standpoint is frequently different, this document is unclear, or has a disturbing effect. On the other hand the Indonesian Group on its part has attempted to compose its documents as systematically and documented as possible. In any case it can not assume that these documents have disturbed the problem or the further elaboration thereof.

Now the question, whether it is correct to regard the further reports of each of the groups of the Joint Committee as for only internal use to the own Governments. As has already been said, the first task of the Committee has been clearly outlined, viz.: „to collect material within the Committee”, which material is therefore to be chrisrtallized
in the final report. None of the groups can therefore withdraw from this work. Therefore, every collection of data, every investigation, every statement concerning this investigation, and every report and every note of each of the two groups in this regard, is "work of the Committee", is therefore submitted to the full Committee and discussed there. And of each document and of each report of each of the groups, copy is officially given, pending the drawing-up of the report, to the other group, naturally not only for courtesy's sake but also on non-personal grounds. And then it can only lead to a deepening and clarification of each other's investigation and standpoint, if at the exchange of documents each group — in pursuance of Prof. van der Kolff's proposal — gives its annotations to the documents of the other.

The Indonesian group can not see in this procedure a danger of disturbance of the dispute concerning Irian, but — as said — it can only expect from it a deepening and clarification. For, it is clearly the intention, that the final report of the Committee will constitute the base for the negotiations to be conducted at the forthcoming special Union-Conference on the problem Irian.

Apart from this, the Indonesian Group has sufficient faith in the skill and ability of the respective Government-delegations which are to conduct at the forthcoming special Union-Conference the decisive debate concerning this political dispute which still exists between Indonesia and the Netherlands. And the Indonesian Group has been strengthened the more in this faith, because to its knowledge the said Union-Conference will be attended by ministers and advisers who already during the R.T.C. have conducted extensive debates on the dispute under discussion, and have since followed and studied very carefully the further development of this problem. Consequently, every note, every document of each of the two groups, however different of colour or principle they may be, would for them not have any disturbing effect, but rather create a broadening and deepening of material and knowledge.

On these grounds the Indonesian Group can therefore reach no other conclusion than that the Joint Committee, as well as each of its groups, continues its task and the procedure followed until today, viz. exchange of documents which each group draws up separately for achieving ultimately a final report, with the mutual right to annotate each other's documents, each contribution as a matter of course to be submitted to the Committee as having been drawn up within the frame of the Committee.

Finally as to the remark of the Netherlands group that its suggestion is supported by the remark in the previously mentioned statement of the Indonesian Group (final conclusion), viz. that the clear definition of the problem of the political dispute under con-
sideration must be discussed exhaustively, before further questions and other problems may be gone into. The Indonesian Group desires to say in this respect that the discussion on this point has not ended with the declaration in the statement referred to. For, as previously has been remarked, the Netherlands spokesman has replied to this that according to the Netherlands views, the exchange of documents with mutual comments can be continued. That this has been accepted by the Indonesian Group, appears from the following statement of the Chairman of the Indonesian Group, Dr. J. Latuharhary, at the next formal meeting on June 30th, 1950: „without detracting anything from our standpoint referred to, nevertheless the production of notes and other documents on the part of the Netherlands Group will induce the Indonesian Group to give, on its part, its own vision concerning the explanations contained in the aforementioned notes”.

In conclusion the Indonesian Group wishes to declare that it can agree to the provisionally by Mr. van der Kolff at the previous informal meeting raised suggestion, to give the final report, although this will consist of two independent parts of the respective groups, a joint introduction, in which the work of the Committee is expressed as well as the respective opinions concerning the drawing-up of the report referred to.

Over and above that, the Indonesian Group is of the opinion that it will be necessary also to attach to the report the summaries and minutes of the Committee, the „hearings” held in Irian, as well as all other documents and appendices which have been addressed to the Committee.

Prof. van der Kolff commences by expressing the thanks of the Netherlands members for the considerable time and trouble, the Indonesian members have spent in drawing-up this clear reply.

Speaker has indeed at the time made suggestions regarding the final report. In the effectuation of the procedure proposed in these suggestions the very objections have arisen which have created the concern of the Netherlands members. In particular this concern applies to the want of time, in which the Committee will fall, and the possible unreadability of the report.

With regard to the statement which was just made on behalf of the Indonesian members, Speaker wishes to remark that the Indonesian Group has declared therein that in its opinion the chapters which already have been exchanged, do not give rise to confusion by themselves. The Netherlands Group has however not meant to say so. In using the notion „confusion”, the Netherlands members only had in view the possibility that the report would not become readable. For, if this report were to contain all kinds of annotations and comments, it becomes more or less a patchwork quilt. Apparently the
Indonesian members are of a different opinion; Nevertheless Speaker had liked to elucidate briefly what was meant by the Netherlands members by "confusion".

In conclusion, Speaker would now like to put the question to the Indonesian members, whether they feel with the Netherlands members that, if the method is applied of contributions with annotations and comments, the Committee will fall want of time.

The Chairman says that the Indonesian members have indeed considered this point, but are not concerned about it. Both groups have completed the material. Therefore it only remains a matter of arranging.

Prof. van der Kolff remarks that the study of the contribution of the other group and the drawing-up and exchange of annotations and comments will require considerable time.

The Chairman is of the opinion that also the number of times of comments being exchanged, will be determining. It is intended to restrict this number.

Prof. van der Kolff also sees much loss of time on account of translations.

The Chairman considers this unavoidable. However, it can be examined whether the translations can not be speeded up by employing extra translators.

Prof. van der Kolff considers composition of a joint report as was visualized at first, not impossible, but he persists that in his opinion this will require much time.

Mr. van Beuge, having requested permission to speak, thinks that he has heard in the statement which was read, that the Indonesian members assume, that the separate reports only will be submitted to the own governments for internal information. This was however not the intention of the Netherlands Group. The intention was: a joint foreword, attached to which the two contributions, which threefold document then would constitute the report to be submitted to each of the two Governments.

Prof. van der Kolff confirms this.

Prof. Pieters finds that the Indonesian members are therefore not so much concerned about falling into want of time. But what is their opinion on the readability of the report and how do they visualize in practice the digesting of the annotations and comments?

The Chairman visualizes that beside the document of one group, the annotations of the other group can be inserted.
Dr. Muh. Yamin remarks that it has been clear from the start, that each group would start from its own standpoint. He visualizes — in reply to a question put by Prof. Pieters — that after each chapter of one of the groups the annotations of the other group can be inserted. In that case the report will also show that there are two standpoints.

Prof. Pieters remarks that therefore in the chapter itself notes will refer to the remarks inserted behind the chapter.

Dr. Yamin confirms this.

At 2.45 p.m. the meeting is adjourned at the request of Prof. van der Kolff in order to enable the Netherlands members to consider the statement of the Indonesian Group.

At 3.00 p.m. the Chairman reopens the meeting and calls upon Prof. van der Kolff to speak, who says that once more he wants to state clearly that the question raised by the Netherlands Group at the previous meeting, only was meant to submit to full Committee the concern arisen in the Netherlands Group. In pursuance of the elaborate observation of the Indonesian Group, the Netherlands Group intends to give its reply at very short notice, for instance tomorrow Saturday, July 8th, at 11.00 a.m.

The Chairman agrees with pleasure to this.

Prof. van der Kolff would like to be informed — in pursuance of Dr. Yamin’s remark that it had been clear from the start that each group would start from an own standpoint —, whether he meant by this remark the same as was declared by him at the R.T.C., viz. rejection of every possibility of a compromise-solution.

Dr. Yamin says that at the R.T.C. he spoke on behalf of the Republic Indonesia. Now he has a seat in the Committee as member of the group directed by the Government of the R.I.S., therefore in a quite different capacity. The Indonesian Group will formulate its standpoint with regard to these compromise-solutions in its report.

Prof. Pieters therefore assumes that it is the intention to consider the possibilities, the pros and contras, of compromise-forms.

Dr. Yamin confirms this.

Nothing being left for discussion, the Chairman closes the meeting at 3.15 p.m.

Confirmed 14-7-50
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff.  

Drawn up by
Dr. W. Schols.
JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Minutes of the 9th informal meeting held at the Ministry for Union-Affairs and Overseas Territories, 1, Plein, The Hague, on Saturday 8th July 1950, at 11 hours

Present are:
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Chairman;
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Vice-Chairman;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
Dr. Muh. Yamin, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
Dr. J. van Baal, Group-Secretary;
Dr. Teng Tjin Leng, Group-Secretary;
J. A. van Beuge, Adviser;
N. Jouwe, Adviser;
S. Papare, Adviser;

Union-Secretariat:
Moh. Jahja;
Dr. W. Schols, Committee-Secretary.

At 11.20 a.m. the Chairman opens the meeting and calls on Prof. van der Kolff, who says that the Netherlands Group has thought fit, on its part as well, to lay down its standpoint in writing. He then proceeds to read the statement embodying the result to the plenary Committee.

"The contribution towards the further exchange of views with regard to the procedure to be adopted for drawing up the report, as laid down in writing by the Indonesian Group and read in the meeting of 7th July last, by the Chairman of the Committee, Dr. Latuharhary, induced the Netherlands Group to develop its views as follows in order to define its standpoint":

Indeed, the ultimate aim the Netherlands Group had in view was the presentation of a joint report, in accordance with the instructions given to the Committee, and this group suggested that each group should write its chapters separately, following the general plan that the groups had communicated to each other in the Notes exchanged. As the work proceeded, the chapters would then be successively submitted to the other party to enable each other to make comments. This procedure appeared necessary in the first place, if the groups dealt with one and the same subjects, to reconcile divergent views in order to come to the adoption of one common text, in the second
place, if one group deemed it necessary to include a particular subject which the other group thought irrelevant, to enable the latter at any rate to make comments.

However, since this procedure, to which the Indonesian Group agreed, has been put into practice and some experience has been acquired with it, with the Netherlands Group doubts have arisen as to its practicability, which doubts were expressed to the Indonesian Group through Prof. van der Kolff in the meeting of the Committee held on 5th July last, and for the motivation of which reference is made to the minutes of that meeting.

It should only be recalled here that the Netherlands Group was concerned about two things: the pressure of time arising for the Committee, and the unreadability — and, consequently, the inexpediency — of a report to be drawn up on this basis.

In the reaction of the Indonesian Group — as may be observed in passing — the Netherlands Group believes to hear a tone of astonis hed disappointment at the sudden change in policy of the Netherlands, perhaps a reproach of whimsicality and inconsistency. Should the Netherlands Group have been right in this interpreting the feeling of the Indonesian Group towards it, this group would make a point of declaring that it does realize that the impression described is created, but that, after reconsideration of the question, it would not be fair to maintain that impression. It may be disappointing to abandon the original intention to write the report jointly after an honest attempt to carry this into effect has revealed its impracticability, but such an course need not be objectionable from a moral point of view. Even if the idea should be departed from to have each of the groups draw up a separate report, to be commented upon by the other party — on which point further details will follow — it may be pointed out that, according, to the minutes of the meeting held on 19th May, Prof. van der Kolff, though reserving his personal opinion, which he had still to think over, suggested this form of compromise, so that it is not just to allege it as an agreement entered into.

Meanwhile the exposé in writing of the Indonesian Group and the verbal complementary statements made at the meeting have actually revealed that the Indonesian Group is prepared to amend the procedure adopted to such an extent that this group wants to revert to the above suggestion made at the time by Mr. van der Kolff, viz. of two reports being written, the other party presently placing its observations at the end of each chapter, assuming that these comments would not be followed by counter-comments. A joint preface would precede these reports, and annexes would be added jointly as well.

The Netherlands Group has noted with appreciation the readiness of the Indonesian colleagues to meet in this form the objections raised by the Netherlands. In accordance with the promise made, the
Netherlands Group has ascertained carefully if and to what extent it can agree to this Indonesian view. Thus, the consultation to which the Head of the Netherlands Group referred to at the time in connection with his suggestion has now taken place.

To the regret of the Netherlands members, the outcome of this consideration is that they see no way to adopt the compromise proposal put forward by the Indonesian group, although they realize thus to come back on the suggestion that formed the starting point for it. In the end, the only possible solution appeared to them that both groups draw up this report independently and thus complete this commissorial task, which implies that the reports of both groups will be issued without comments of the other party.

To motivate this ultimately adopted standpoint, the following considerations apply:

Taking into account the period of just over ten days available before the Indonesians return, it must be considered out of the question to have the report ready for the press in time, the more so as it should first be provided with the comments of the other party. A longer period must certainly not be reckoned with, as we have already now exceeded the target date of 1st July set us by both Governments. So much for the time factor, with regard to which it should be remarked that for the Netherlands members too, it is going to be time to return to their normal occupations.

Moreover, there are the requirements to be met to obtain a readable and expedient report, which requirements will need be detracted from if we should agree to the proposal of the Indonesian group. Actually, what would be the consequence, if an exchange of draft reports with comments by the other party sufficed? Certainly nothing but either group expecting the other party to criticize the report concerned as thoroughly as possible. Realizing this, one will in anticipation formulate one’s criticism very sharply, the more so as there is no check now that a reply is not forthcoming.

The result will be that both Governments receive a report consisting of nothing but two reports demolished to the ground. We do feel that we must not place our Governments before such a situation.

Could this inconvenience be prevented by allowing countercomments? But in that case we should be extra hard pressed for time, since the time devoured by such a procedure is clearly shown by the debate again started by the Indonesian Group on problematics, etc. Moreover, in that case the Governments would not receive a report, but a debate, which, in our sustained opinion, will cause confusion and be inexpedient.

It appears to us that in the impossibility of drawing up a joint report meeting all requirements — i.e. embodying the result of the
ample discussion of two standpoints — the only possible course will be for us to submit to our Governments at any rate a view. We are convinced that if those Governments want comments on the view of the other party, they will have sufficient means at their disposal to secure them. However, they are then spared the hardly attractive situation of receiving a demolished report. Moreover, should it be possible, for both reports to be issued, as one publication with a joint preface, also to the outside world the Committee would not appear as a body that only succeeds in producing demolition of the statements made by the other party”.

Under the circumstances, the Chairman concludes that the Netherlands Group adheres to the standpoint which it communicated in the meeting of Wednesday 5th July.

*Prof. van der Kolff* says that this is indeed so, but wants to add that this was the outcome of serious considerations.

The Chairman then has to establish that a fairly serious difficulty has arisen and adjourns the meeting to enable the Indonesian members to deliberate further on the matter.

The meeting is adjourned at 11.35 m. until 12.25 p.m.

After the meeting has been reopend, the Chairman states that the Indonesian Group has now also laid down its standpoint in writing in a provisional declaration, which he reads as follows: "As the Netherlands Group has suddenly withdrawn and revised its own original suggestion as regards the drawing up of the joint commissorial report of the Joint Committee, which report will have to serve as a basis for the forthcoming negotiations between the Governments of Indonesia and the Netherlands concerning the Irian dispute, the Indonesian Group is of the opinion that this hampers the activities of the Committee as a joint Committee to a considerable extent and feels that this will lead to an unexpected final stage of these commissorial activities being reached.

As the difficulty that has thus arisen may naturally have a far reaching influence on the solution of a question as important as the pending political dispute with regard to the future political status of Irian, the Indonesian Group is suddenly faced with the obligation of taking a decision of the greatest importance.

Seeing that the Indonesian Group may assume that the Netherlands Group will not fail to realize this serious and delicate position of the Committee, it expresses the hope that the Netherlands Group may not object to the Indonesian Group asking in this instance ampler time than usual for a further study of the position resulting from this step, as well as for further deliberation.
Therefore, the Indonesian Group considers it necessary to adjourn to this end, all meetings of the Committee until Friday 14th July next”.

Prof. van der Kolff feels he speaks on behalf of the Netherlands members when declaring that he fully appreciates the attitude of the Indonesian members. He is quite alive to the fact that a serious difficulty has arisen with regard to the solution of the part of the New Guinea/Irian problem entrusted to the Committee. Therefore he appreciates it that the Indonesian members ask time for ample consideration and careful deliberation.

There being nothing further to discuss, the Chairman closes the meeting at 12.30 p.m.

Confirmed 14-7-50.                      Minutes drawn up by:
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff.          Dr. W. Schols.
Minutes of the 11th formal meeting held in the Office Building of the High Commissariat of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia, 3 Rutger Jan Schimmelpennincklaan, The Hague, on Tuesday 18th July, 1950, at 2 p.m.

Present are:

Dr. J. Latuharhary, Chairman;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Vice-Chairman;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
Dr. Muh. Yamin, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;
Dr. Teng Tjin Leng, Secretary;
N. Jouwe, Adviser;
S. Papare, Adviser;

Union-Secretariat:

Moh. Jahja;
Dr. W. Schols, Committee-Secretary;

At 2 p.m. the Chairman opens the meeting, bidding those present welcome at this first meeting in the Building of the High Commissioner of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia.

At the last meeting, the Indonesian members asked a few questions. The Netherlands members have asked permission to answer these questions in the present meeting.

Prof. van der Kolff states that the Netherlands members have looked upon the questions asked as resulting naturally from the preceding exposé given by the Indonesian members. Therefore time was required for a careful consideration of this exposé and the ensuing questions. The Netherlands members have laid down the reply to both in writing, but as sufficient copies of this document are not yet available, the speaker asks permission for it to be read. On Wednesday morning the Netherlands Group will forward more copies as soon as possible.

Dr. Van Baal then reads as follows:

With some measure of astonishment the Netherlands members have noted that even after the exposé given by Prof. van der Kolff on the 9-th the Indonesian Group persists in maintaining that
the abandonment of the idea of a joint final report „creates an impression as surprising as it is painful.” In addition, the Netherlands members recall that according to press reports both His Excellency Minister Suparmono, after the Committee’s return from New Guinea, and Dr. Latuharhary, on arrival in the Netherlands, made statements from which the conclusion may be drawn that they, too, were considering the possibility of separate reports at an early date already. Therefore, the painful impression to which the Indonesian members refer is not based on just motives. It is founded on an interpretation which is tendentious as well as incorrect of what has been observed on this point by the Netherlands members.

To begin with, it is not true that the possibility suggested by Prof. van der Kolff on 19th May should ever have been adopted as procedure for drawing up the Committee’s final report. The truth is that on this point neither then nor later anything was agreed upon. The only point on which agreement was clearly reached was fixed at the meeting held at Djakarta on 6th June, where it was decided that each group should proceed on its own to lay down a provisional contribution towards the final report, after which parties would consult with each other with a view to drawing up the final report from those contributions.

To carry the latter into effect, on 26th June the Netherlands members suggested that the chapters completed (in this provisional version) of the contributions should be exchanged between parties, in order that both groups could study them. Dr. Latuharhary replied to this that in his opinion both groups had still to think over the mode of cooperation.

Then the Indonesian members answered on 28th June that in the main they agreed to the proposal to supply contributions, but at the same time they produced a statement, the final text of which (received by the Netherlands members only on 30th June) meant a serious warning to the Netherlands members not to proceed on the same lines and to stop the exchange of contributions, which had meanwhile been started. The Netherlands Group has never been mysterious in this respect. Already on 5th July it intimated that on this point further deliberation was considered necessary. Consequently, it is not just to depict the position in such a way that on 8th July the Netherlands Group admitted that it had changed its policy. The Netherlands Group has nothing to admit. It has merely to observe that the Indonesian Group has given a false and offending representation of the affairs by putting into the mouth of the Chairman of the Netherlands Group that it would be incorrect to allege an agreement entered into with regard to the procedure for drawing up the committee’s report, because the statement alluded to merely amounted to a personal opinion of himself. In reality, the Chairman of the
Netherlands Group said that „according to the minutes of the meeting held on 19th May, Prof. van der Kolff, though reserving his personal opinion, which he had still to think over, suggested this form of compromise, so that it is not just to allege it as an agreement entered into”. Consequently, whereas Prof. van der Kolff expressly recalled that this suggestion, made under a double reserve, concerning independent reports commented by the other party not an agreement, the Indonesian members distorted these words, which admit of no misunderstanding, into the incriminating statement that it would be incorrect to invoke an agreement made, which implies that Prof. van der Kolff sanctions word-breaking. But this is not all; moreover, the Indonesian members attack to this entirely distorted quotation of Prof. van der Kolff’s words the conclusion, as untrue as inappropriate, that the above suggestion made on 19th May has been adopted by both Groups. Actually, it has not been adopted by any party. The suggestion was made in a connection in which it was not directly relevant; therefore, it was left out of the discussions at the meeting of 19th May. Neither then nor at a later date was an agreement entered into on this point. It has not even appeared at any moment that anybody was in agreement with that suggestion, which was not brought up again until in the informal meeting of 8th July, where it was included in the statement advanced by the Indonesian Group. The Netherlands members object strongly to this words being handled in such a way. They cannot help observing that, if even the word laid down in writing is attacked in such a manner and then made subservient to drawing the other party’s own conclusion, the basis for an exchange of documents is lacking.

The only reproach that might be made to the Netherlands members (if there were any cause for reproaches) is, therefore, that they have given up the attempts to come to a joint final report. But could they act otherwise? Actually, when on 28th June the Indonesian members agreed to the exchange of contributions — as was assumed — as a first step towards a joint report, this was done under the reserve that a statement read on that occasion, the final text of which was received later by the Netherlands members, should be thoroughly discussed „before further questions and other problems are dealt with.” On 1st July the first contribution was received from the Indonesian members. When a more detailed study revealed that the statement could only give a caricature of the Netherlands standpoint and the first provisional contribution betrayed diametrical opposition to the Netherlands point of view even as far as simple matters were concerned, it was clear to the Netherlands members that a „discussion” on such matters could never be completed within reasonable limits of time and that in this was the final report could not possibly be developed into a readable whole.
The Netherlands members fail to realize why the Indonesian members do not take seriously their objection of the pressure of time. They feel grieved by this insinuation of insincerity on their part, since they could not know that the Indonesian Group did not speak its last word when mentioning 20th July as its deadline.

What is now advanced by the Indonesian members as a compromise solution (the possibility suggested one day under a double reserve by Prof. van der Kolff as his personal opinion) is unacceptable to the Netherlands members. It does partly meet the pressure of time, but it adds to the Netherlands objection as regards the readability of the report. The Netherlands members cannot share the favourable expectations of the Indonesian members with respect to the addition of critical comments.

They feel that the way in which up till now in the Indonesian documents the Netherlands standpoint has been represented, as well as the way in which in the statement under consideration exposes' given by the Netherlands Group have been handled, are proofs of a criticism to which they will not cooperate by supplying further contributions. Nor do they wish to have a form of discussion forced upon them which — within the framework of a committee and in the light of publicity — they think incompatible with the reverence the members of a Joint Committee own each other. If they adopted the proposal of the Indonesian members, their scientific conscience would compel them to check systematically the facts, quotations and conclusions alleged by the Indonesian Group. They are convinced that yielding to the pressure evinced by the Indonesian Group to proceed along those lines will only result in creating abysses under the guise of bridging a gap. That by this flat refusal of the Netherlands members to agree to the Indonesian proposal "the principle of freedom of each of the groups composed on a parity basis to oppose its own judgment to that of the other party" would be detracted from, is not true. Naturally that freedom remains and cannot be taken away by anybody. It is true that the possibility of criticism in a particular way the other party's standpoint is restricted, but this does not derogate from the instruction given to the Committee. The essential point of that instruction lies not so much in the joint character of the report, nor in criticizing each other's contributions, but in supplying the two Governments with the necessary material.

The Netherlands Group believes to have thus made its standpoint sufficiently clear and on its part considers the discussion on this question as closed. However, the Group is quite prepared to discuss in greater detail the possibilities of independent reports to be drawn up. One of these possibilities has already been put forward by it for consideration, and the Group makes a point of declaring that it is receptive to other possibilities within their scope. Consequently, what
it offers for consideration in reply to the question asked under 1 and 3 up to and including 7 by the Indonesian members bears the character of proposals on which it would like to come to a joint decision following a mutual discussion.

The following contains what the Netherlands members deem most recommendable. To avoid misunderstanding, they observe here that they will invariably speak of report instead of contribution of each Group separately, because they assume that each Group will lay this down separately in a final text.

**Question I:** The final report might consist of the following parts:

1. a joint foreword of the Committee in its entirety;
2. two reports, one of each Group, drawn up independently of each other in a final text;
3. joint annexes indicated for that purpose by mutual consent by the Committee.

II. Provided that the Netherlands Group be given an opportunity to continue its activities in a quiet atmosphere, the Netherlands Group expects to have the final text of its report ready about 1st August. This date has on purpose been set slightly later, as the adoption of a final text requires more time for consideration than that of a provisional contribution.

III. According to the views of the Netherlands members, formalization of a joint foreword would have to be effected by a meeting of the plenary Committee. Formalization of the reports of each Group can take place by a formal exchange, parties bending over their reports to each other. As for that purpose it is not necessary for all the Committee members to remain assembled on the same spot for a prolonged period of time, the Indonesian members might, if they wished to do so, have themselves represented by the High Commissioner of Indonesia of The Hague, and the Netherlands members by the High Commissioner of the Netherlands at Djakarta, in order that the exchange be effected at each of those places with the Group in session there. These sessions will take place on the same day, viz. on that following the day on which the Union-Secretariat is advised by both Groups that they are ready for the exchange. This day may be later than a date to be fixed by the plenary Committee. Should either of the Groups fail, the other one, as well as the Government appointing it, will be free to act with the report drawn up by it as it thinks fit.

IV. Besides the documents referred to in the reply to question I, in the opinion of the Netherlands members no documents need be submitted to the two Governments.
V. The joint foreword should be drawn up in the Indonesian and Netherlands languages; the reports of the two Groups should be made out by each Group in its own language, whilst the joint annexes could be produced in the language in which they are worded. In so far as translations are available of the reports and annexes, they should be added at the same time.

VI. The task of the Committee should be completed by submitting to the Governments the final report referred to under I, after the exchange referred to under III has taken place. The report should be submitted by each Group to the Government that appointed it. Both Groups will be free to forward their own report to their Government already prior to the exchange referred to under III.

VII. The point foreword of the Committee should comprise:

a) mention of the situation to the Committee according to the resolution by which it was set up

b) specification of the names of its members and advisers

c) summary of its activities

d) summary, without detailed considerations, of the reasons for this mode of reporting.

For the purpose of drawing up a draft the Committee might create a sub-Committee, consisting of a member or group secretary to be appointed by each of the two Groups.”

Prof. van der Kolff says that this, then, is the answer from the Netherlands members. The speaker regrets that it has been couched in rather sharp terms, but it was unavoidable now to lay down in a straightforward manner the opinion of the Netherlands members.

At 2.30 p.m. the Chairman adjourns the meeting to enable the Indonesian members to consult with each other.

After the meeting has been re-opened, at 2.50 p.m., the Chairman states that the Indonesian Group has noted with interest the answer from the Netherlands members. In the reply he believes to discover considerations on the question itself on addition to points of emotional value. As regards the reply to the questions asked, he says that there are many parts to which the Indonesian members could agree; about others, however, they would like to consult each other further. Therefore he requests to receive the documents promised to-morrow. In that case the next meeting can be held in the same room on Thursday 20th July 1950 at 11 a.m.

Mr. Jouwe, asking permission to speak, thanks for the opportunity offered him and reads the following statement:
Mr. Chairman,

Allow me to express my gratitude for the opportunity afforded me, too, to express at this meeting in a few words my personal conviction with regard to the course of the activities of the New Guinea Committee.

1. As a son of Irian, who must on no account be considered as an Indonesian who can be forced to assume "Indonesian citizenship", I see with profound regret how the lot of my country and people is put to stake by the Indonesians, who have no right at all to interfere with it.

2. Up to the present, I — who am actually sitting in this Committee only by sheer massity at the instance of my people, in order to defend the sacred desires of my people, namely to enjoy freedom for our own country — fail to see how the Indonesian delegation together with the Netherlands delegation has tried to find a real solution for the problem of improving the lot of my country and people (Irian).

What is quite clear to me is that the Indonesian Group aims exclusively at demanding from the Netherlands Group, with all kinds of offending words and by means of false statements that the Netherlands Government should transfer New Guinea with its population to the Indonesians, as if it were merchandise.

3. In point of fact, the Indonesian Group has never yet brought the interests of the people of Irian itself to the forefront, interests which must be considered by the two parties in order that the problem round Irian should be solved as soon as possible. The contrary is true, however. What they do depend with all possible means in the interest of the Indonesian to take possession of the territory of the people of Irian, which territory is actually only the property of the people of Irian itself. I would recommend that this problem concerning Irian should be solved by combined efforts, parties basing themselves on the interests and the demands of the people of Irian itself, demands which are very strong and which were presented plainly to the members of the Committee in New Guinea in the month of May last.

I further hope that the Indonesian will be fully active to all democratic principles with respect to the people of Irian and that, in addition, the rules of the right of self-determination, which the Indonesian Government confirmed itself with its signature at the Round Table Conference will be adhered to by the Committee with respect to the people of Irian.


(sgd) N. Jouwé.
During the reading the Chairman interrupts and objects to the use of the word "antjamen". During the work of the Joint Committee no "antjamen" has ever been made on the part of the Indonesian Group and this word, which has the meaning of "threat", has never been used.

Prof. van der Kolff, though being of opinion that he is no linguistic authority and cannot feel the shade of difference of the term, believes that indeed the use of this word should not be gratified as customary if it means "threat".

Prof. Pieters observes that the Chairman has the right to object to the use of words he does not consider correct. Mr. Jouwé then declares that he is prepared to withdraw the word "antjamen".

The Chairman agrees.

There being nothing further to discuss, the Chairman closes the meeting at 3 p.m.

Confirmed on 29th July, 1950.

The Chairman:  
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff.

Minutes drawn up by  
Dr. W. Schols.
JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Minutes of the 12th formal meeting held in the Office Building of the High Commissariat of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia, 3 Rutger Jan Schimmelpennincklaan, The Hague, on Thursday 20th July, 1950, at 11 a.m.

Present are:
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Chairman;
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Vice-Chairman;
Dr. Muh. Yamin, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
Dr. Teng Tjin Leng, Secretary;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;
S. Papare, Adviser;
N. Jouwe, Adviser;

Union-Secretariat:
Moh. Jahja.

1. At 11 a.m. the Chairman opens the meeting and proceeds to deal with the items on the agenda.

2. It is decided to effect the formalization of the Minutes of the 10th formal meeting at a later date, as owing to the late receipt of the draft Minutes the members have not had sufficient time to study them in greater detail.

3. The Chairman, Dr. Latuharhary, remarks that, as he already stated in the previous meeting, during the discussions held the Netherlands Group has advanced in its reply as read considerations on the question itself and points of emotional value. He cannot help saying that the Indonesian Group regrets very much that the reply referred to from the Netherlands Group should have been couched in such sharp terms and in such a form as have never yet been used in this Committee. The Indonesian Group, too, considers the debate on the way of drawing up the final report closer, however. In conclusion he declares that the Indonesian Group adheres to its standpoint and exposés. In order to come to an early compilation of the final report, however, the Indonesian Group has nevertheless decided to continue the Committee's activities in the sense that each of the Groups should
make an independent contribution, whilst the plenary Committee should draw up a joint foreword.

Further the Chairman establishes that there are many points of agreement between the Netherlands and the Indonesian views, but there are still a few other points which, in the opinion of the Indonesian Group, do not link up so well with the decisions taken at the Union Conference.

On having obtained the Chairman’s permission to do so, Dr. Tjin Leng reads a statement embodying the standpoint of the Indonesian members, as follows:

_re item I. 1. The Indonesian Group is also in favour of a joint foreword to be drawn up by the plenary Committee.

2. In order that the attempts towards the compilation of a final report may proceed, after mature consideration the Indonesian Group has finally agreed to the principle involved. As regards the denomination of the independent papers, the Indonesian Group pointed out that the resolution concerning Irian taken at the first ministerial conference of the Netherlands-Indonesian Union refers under 5 and 6 to "the report of the Committee". Therefore it might be preferable to speak of "main components" instead of "reports".

To avoid misunderstanding, for the time being the term "report" will still be used further in this connection.

3. The Indonesian Group suggests the following addition: "They will include at any rate the _formalized_ Minutes of the formal and informal meetings of the Committee, all so-called "hearings" held by the Committee in Irian during its orientation trip there in May and June 1950, as well as all resolutions and motions received by the Committee."

_re item II. The Indonesian Group asks for explanation of the meaning of the remark: „provided that the Netherlands Group be given an opportunity to continue its activities in a quiet atmosphere”, contained in the Netherlands Group's reply. Further the Indonesian Group suggests that all documents to be considered for that purpose, including therefore, the „reports” under discussion, be formalized by the plenary Committee not later than 31st July next.

_re item III. As according to the information given by the Netherlands Group the latter will not be ready with its own report until 1st August, the Indonesian Group has postponed its departure to _1st August next_, in order that the plenary Committee may have an opportunity of formalizing all documents and completing its other work. Consequently, it will not be necessary to wait with this formalization until the Indonesian Group is back in Indonesia, as was intended at the outset. Therefore the Indonesian Group appeals
to the Netherlands members to lend their cooperation to render formalization on 31st July at the latest possible.

The Indonesian Group has practically completed its own „report”. This Group holds the view that the Netherlands and Indonesian High Commissioners as representatives of the respective Governments are not the appropriate persons to act as representatives of the members of the Committee for the exchange of the commissorial document.

_re item IV._ The Indonesian Group proposes the addition of the words „on the part of the Committee”. The Indonesian Group also suggests that the following formality be adopted in the compilation of the final report.

1. In the bundle containing the Indonesian main component the Indonesian text shall precede the Netherlands text. In the bundle comprising the Netherlands main component the order will just be inverse.

2. In the Indonesian text, in the term „Netherlands/Indonesian Union” the word „Indonesian” shall precede „Netherlands”. In the Netherlands text the order will be inverse.

3. In separate documents, in the Indonesian text the word New Guinea should be superseded by „Irian”. In joint documents, in the Indonesian text the word „Irian” should precede „New Guinea”; inversely in the Netherlands text the word „New Guinea” should precede „Irian”.

_re item V._ The Indonesian Group feels that the separate „reports” should be made out in both languages, in accordance with the resolution taken at the 1st Union Conference. With regards to the annexes this bilinguality also applies. So far all the Minutes of the meetings have been drawn up on the Netherlands language. Here, too, the principle applies, however, that both texts are binding. The documents can be translated most efficiently and speedily if this work is started already now and parts are translated as they become available. For a few days past this procedure has been followed successfully by the Indonesian Group, with the assistance of the Union-Secretariat.

_re item VI._ The Indonesian Group is of opinion that the proposal made by the Netherlands Group, viz. that both Groups should be free to forward their own report to their respective Governments already prior to the exchange this outside the scope of the commissorial task and, therefore, should not be included in the terms under consideration, as this is a matter for the Governments concerned to decide.
According to item 5 of the resolution instituting the Committee, the instruction given to the Committee reads ........... „to submit its (i.e. the Committee’s) report to the Governments ...........”.

re item VII. With regard to c and d the Indonesian Group suggests that the word „communication” be superseded by the word „report”.

Further, to the last sentence should be added: „........... assisted by the Union Secretariat”. Actually, the Indonesian Group proposes that the joint foreword be drafted by the Union Secretariat.

_Prof. van der Kolff_ proposes to adjourn the meeting in order to enable the Netherlands members to deliberate in the views of the Indonesian members.

It is _decided_ to adjourn the meeting.

At 11.45 a.m. the meeting is re-opened.

_Prof. van der Kolff_ declares to be very pleased that the Indonesian Group should have existed itself to meet the views of the Netherlands Group on many points. He points out that it takes much time to prepare a final text. Nor it is a simple matter to have part of the text translated at this juncture, as when later sections are ready it sometimes appears necessary to amend those which were already completed. This polishing up takes time, and in connection with the request of the Indonesian members to have the documents ready on 31st July, the Netherlands members now want to draw up a time scheme for themselves to see whether this is possible.

Therefore he proposes to close the meeting for the time being, and to meet again on the same day at 4 p.m.

It is _decided_ to hold the next meeting in the same Building on Thursday afternoon at 4 p.m.

The _Chairman_ declares that the Indonesian Group has perused Mr. N. Jouwe’s statement and has agreed to its being added to the Minutes concerned.

4. There being no further questions to discuss, the Chairman _closes_ the meeting at 12.15 p.m.

Confirmed 29th July, 1950.

_Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff._

_Mah. Jahja._

Minutes drawn up by:
JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Minutes of the 13th formal meeting held in the Office Building of the High Commissariat of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia, 3 Rutger Jan Schimmelpenninklaan, The Hague, on Thursday 20th July, 1950, at 4 p.m.

Present are:
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Chairman;
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Vice-Chairman;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
Dr. Muh. Yamin, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
Dr. J. van Baal, Secretary;
Dr. Teng Tjin Leng, Secretary;
N. Jouwe, Adviser;
S. Papare, Adviser;

Union-Secretariat:
Moh. Jahja.

I. At 4.05 p.m. the Chairman opens the meeting and calls on Dr. van Baal to speak.

Dr. van Baal proceeds to read the Netherlands consideration of the following questions.

I a/b. The Netherlands members establish with satisfaction that as regards items I a and b there is agreement between the two Groups, subject only to the fact that reference will not be made to report of the various groups, but to main components of the Committee's report.

The Netherlands members have no objection to this.

c. With respect to the addition of the Minutes and reports to the Committee's report, the Netherlands members observe that they consider this procedure entirely unusual. They do not want to have the discussions broken off for this and therefore — if the Indonesian members insist — they will agree to the proposal, but they request the Indonesian members to reconsider this point. On their part, however, they declare to appreciate that then also all notes and statements exchanged should be produced, in so far as they have not yet been attached to the Minutes and reports.
The Netherlands members correspondingly object to the inclusion of resolutions and motions; they wonder whether the Indonesian members have fully realized the consequences of such a procedure. For instance, have they thought of it that in that case inter alia the records on the disturbances that took place at the presentation of the motion at Hollandia should be produced as well?

II. By the remark „provided that the Netherlands Group be given an opportunity to continue its activities in a quiet atmosphere” the Netherlands Group means that this Group will appreciate it if as few meetings as possible will be held and at any rate no further time-devouring work will be demanded for the discussion and answering of notes on questions of procedure and the like.

With regard to the second part of the reply from the Indonesian members it may be asked whether they — like the Netherlands members — mean by formalization of the mutual main components the formal exchange of these papers, parties handing over their reports to each other.

III. Now that the Indonesian members are prepared to put off their departure, it stands to reason that a procedure such as the Netherlands members had proposed will be superfluous for the time being. Therefore, the latter feel they should not concern themselves with the question as to who can act as representation of the members, if required.

They have to observe, however, that they have not declared to be ready on 1st August, but about that date. At present they are making every effort to be ready for the exchange on 31st July, but they would not be honest if they did not prepare the Indonesian members that — to their own serious dissatisfaction — they might require a few days more. If the Indonesian members would rest assured that the Netherlands Group is doing is utmost to meet their wishes to have at any rate the Netherlands text ready on 31st July, so that on the strength of this they would if need be postpone their departure for some days, the procedure as the Indonesian members want it could essentially be followed. It must be stated, however, that if the exchange is to take place at so early a date, the Netherlands Group will in all probability be able to hand over only the Netherlands text.

Although measures have now been taken to start the translation of parts of the documents, the translation as a whole will always be ready at a later date than the original. In the opinion of the Netherlands members, the translation might also follow within a week via the Union-Secretariat, if required.

IV. The Netherlands Group does not object to the addition: "on the part of the Committee”, but for linguistical reasons it would
prefer the expression: in the opinion of the Netherlands members, etc. "by the Committee". Before proceeding definitely to it, however, the Netherlands members would like to hear what is the intention of this addition, as this is not quite clear to them.

V. The Netherlands members have noted with satisfaction the declaration made in this morning’s meeting, viz. that for the Indonesian main component, the Indonesian text shall be binding, and for the Netherlands main component the Netherlands text. They propose to issue a similar declaration with regard to the annexes in the sense that the text in which they were originally worded and formalized shall be normative. They agree to the idea that all these documents should also be translated, so that an Indonesian and a Netherlands bundle will be formed. As regards priority, the usual procedure will be followed, to which end the Group Secretaries can consult with each other.

VI. The observation made on this point by the Indonesian Group can be agreed to if in the last sentence instead of "respective Governments" "respective Groups" may be read. The Netherlands members had the impression that this is more in line with the intention of the wording. They would like to hear whether this is indeed so agreed.

VII. The Chairman suggests that, before the Indonesian Group will be given an opportunity of formulating its answer to the Netherlands consideration, the formalization of the Minutes of the 10th formal meeting should be proceeded to. This is thus decided.

2. It is decided to adopt the Minutes of the 10th meeting after a few amendments and corrections have been made.

Therefore, at the request of the Indonesian Group the meeting is adjourned to enable the Indonesian members to deliberate further on the Netherlands considerations with regard to the Netherlands views on the questions asked.

At 4.15 p.m. the meeting is re-opened by the Chairman, Dr. Teng Tjin Leng, having obtained the Chairman’s permission to speak, declares that he is pleased about the modus found for the compilation of the final report.

It considers that the Netherlands view, according to which each group should produce its report only in its own language is a simplification of the detailed procedure proposed by the Indonesian Group. The Indonesian Group agrees to each Group keeping a bundle, which will be made out in two different languages.

The Indonesian Group, too, fears that pressure of time may arise if the "reports" are to be presented in two languages.
re item Ia. The Indonesian Group does consider it important to insist upon the formalized Minutes and reports of the meeting and assemblies being attracted to the final report. The group is in agreement with the addition of the notes and statements to the final report.

re item III. The Indonesian Group express its gratitude to the Netherlands Group for the latter's readiness to make the departure of the Indonesian Group for Indonesia on 1st August possible.

The Indonesian Group has decided that the formalization of the Committee documents will take place on 31st July, 1950, at the latest, unless extraordinary circumstances should make it necessary to postpone this departure for a few days.

The Indonesian Group would be pleased to hear, however, what are the views of the Netherlands members on the addition of the "hearing", held to the final report.

re item IV. The Indonesian Group also agrees to the use of the term: "by the Committee" instead of "on the part of the Committee". No particular feelings or intentions of the Indonesian Group have induced them to use the term "on the part of the Committee".

re item V. In broad lines, the Indonesian members can agree to the procedure proposed by the Netherlands Group with regard to the text of the main components of the final report.

The Indonesian Group does consider it important that the Minutes will only become binding when they have also been translated into Indonesian. The Union Secretariat has practically completed the translation.

The Chairman wants to stipulate once more that it is intended to effect the joint formalization of the Committee documents on 31st July, unless extraordinary circumstances should arise.

He also wishes to advance again that, after translation, the Indonesian text of the Minutes will be binding upon the Indonesian members and that these Indonesian texts will be submitted to the Government and Parliament of the R.I.S.

Prof. van der Kolff, speaking on behalf of the Netherlands members, declares that, as the Indonesian members adhere to their wish to include Minutes and reports in the annexes, no further objection will be raised to this and such inclusion will be agreed to.

The discussion of the "hearings" held in New Guinea/Irian has indeed been overlooked. This entails a great difficulty, however. During these "hearings" the people heard were given to understand that they could speak frankly, but they were not told that their communications would be published.

Another question is the formalization of the separate main components. The Netherlands Group feels that it will suffice to hand
over the copy signed by the member concerned. It is of opinion that each page should also be initialed by the members of the Group concerned and inquires what are the views of the other members on this point.

The Chairman concludes, after some discussion, that, instead of the initialling of the pages, it will be sufficient to mention and lay down the number of pages. Thereupon a discussion ensues on the purport of the word „formalization‟.

Dr. van Baal, having obtained permission to speak, declares that by formalization he means the handing over to the other party of each others contribution under the name of main component; consequently, it is a formal confirmation of that act.

Dr. Yamin sees in the signing of the joint foreword an act comparable to the signing of the covering resolution of the R.T.C.

Prof. Pieters would like to have established that there is no difference of opinion on the question that „formalization” means solely: „handing over each party’s signed contribution to the final report”. Consequently, this would mean: handing over the final text of the main components.

Dr. Yamin is of opinion that with regard to the wish to have the text of the final report and the annexes made out in both languages use can be made of the regulations laid down in the instructions to the Union-Secretariat. These regulations provide that all outgoing documents shall be drawn up in both languages.

It is of course necessary to give the Union-Secretariat a reasonable spice of time if texts are required. If, at the handing over, the main components of the final report are each made out in the Group’s own language, there can, properly, speaking, be no question of formalization.

What is done is merely establishing that the documents are ready and have been received, and this does not mean, therefore, that agreement has been reached by the parties.

In that case it will be preferable to speak of an exchange of each other’s independent contribution.

Prof. Pieters wants a reply to the question asked by him.

Prof. van Dijk feels that the formalization of both main components consists in the exchange, and signing by the Groups concerned of the main components in question. The translation of the separate main components can later be left the Union-Secretariat.
The Chairman establishes that both parties agree that the joint foreword and the Minutes and reports on the meetings and assemblies of the Committee should be translated.

Dr. van Baal inquires whether he has understood well that the motions and resolutions will *not* be included.

Dr. Yamin confirms this, but remarks that the resolutions may be incorporated in the main component, though not in the Commissorial report.

Dr. van Baal notes this and asks the Chairman whether, in this connection, it may be assumed that there is agreement to the *non*-inclusion of the motions and resolutions, which is confirmed by the Chairman.

Thereupon the speaker requests the meeting to voice its opinion on the "hearings". He adds that, acting as interpreter on behalf of the Netherlands Group, he has always told the people heard that they could speak frankly and needed not to be afraid that others might take cognizance of their statements. It would weigh upon his conscience if that assurance could not be carried into effect in the event of publication of such statements.

Prof. van Dijk is of opinion that the report on the "hearings" may be submitted to the Governments, subject to strict secrecy, mentioning the reasons for this proviso.

With regard to the Minutes he observes that to avoid misunderstanding it is more correct to say that the Minutes have been *drawn up* in the Netherlands language, but that they have been translated into Indonesian.

After ample consideration, the Chairman established that all agree that publication of the "hearings" would not be just. It is agreed to act in accordance with Prof. van Dijk's proposal, and it is further agreed that, naturally, data may be borrowed from the material of the "hearings", provided that no names be mentioned.

The Chairman, referring to a question to that effect, states on behalf of the Indonesian Group that in item VI of the Indonesian questions "respective Governments" should read "respective Groups", as was supposed by the Netherlands members.

Dr. Yamin suggests that in the respective bundles a Group's own main component should precede that of the other Group.

Prof. van der Kolff declares on behalf of his Group that he agrees to this.
The Chairman wishes to have established once more that agreement exists between the two Groups with respect to

1. legalization of the joint foreword
2. exchange of the main components
3. legalization of the Minutes in both languages provisionally on 31st July, 1950.

It is decided to entrust to the Union Secretariat the drawing up of the provisional draft of the joint foreword in two languages, which draft will be sent on Wednesday 26th July before noon to a sub-committee including, at the Chairman's proposal, the two Group Secretaries.

It is also agreed that the sub-committee will advise the two Chairmen when the frame of the draft of the joint foreword is ready.

The Chairman proposes to request the Union-Secretariat to forward the already translated Minutes for a preliminary check, since these documents are to be formalized in due course.

It is decided to ask the Union-Secretariat to send the already translated Minutes and reports to the two Group Secretaries on Monday 24th July.

There being nothing further to discuss, the Chairman closes the meeting.

Adopted 29th July, 1950.

Minutes drawn up by
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JOINT COMMITTEE NEW GUINEA/IRIAN

Minutes of the 14th formal meeting held in the Ministry of Union-Affairs and Overseas Parts of the Realm, 1 Plein, The Hague, on Saturday, 29th July, 1950, at 11.30 a.m.

Present:
Prof. Dr. G. H. van der Kolff, Chairman;
Dr. J. Latuharhary, Vice-Chairman;
Prof. Dr. J. M. Pieters, Member;
Prof. Dr. R. van Dijk, Member;
Dr. Moh. Yamin, Member;
Dr. L. H. P. S. Makaliwy, Member;
Dr. J. van Baal, Group-Secretary;
Dr. Teng Tjin Leng, Group-Secretary;
N. Jouwe, Adviser;
S. Papare, Adviser;

Union-Secretariat:
Mr. W. Schols;
Moh. Jahja, Committee-Secretary.

1. At 11.30 a.m. the Chairman opens the meeting and immediately proceeds to deal with the items on the agenda.

2. Adoption of the Minutes of the 11th, 12th and 13th formal meetings.
   It is decided to adopt the Minutes of the 11th, 12th and 13th formal meetings after some additions and amendments have been made.

3. Adoption of the final text of the joint foreword.
   It is decided to approve, after some amendments and additions have been made, the text of the joint foreword which was submitted in draft to the Joint Committee by the sub-committee consisting of the two Group Secretaries.

4. Further, the undermentioned points, bearing on the completion of the report, never brought up for discussion, and the following decisions were taken:

   I. The Committee Secretariat is instructed to draw up the draft of the letter presenting the report to the two Governments, in which the following points should be advanced:
a) mention of the presentation of the report of the New Guinea Committee comprising: Foreword, the two main components and the annexes:

b) additional presentation of the results of the hearings held by the Committee in New Guinea/Irian, with regard to which it is stated that the Committee submits the documents concerned to the Governments confidentially, mentioning the reason for doing so, viz. that some people heard in New Guinea/Irian have made declarations, expecting that they would not be published;

c) the information that the translation into English is omitted, presentation of the report to the U.N.C.I. not being included in the Committee's task.

II. On the leather binding of the bundles which are to contain the report, the following title will be placed:

Rapport
Commissie Nieuw-Guinea
Rentjana Komisi Irian

for the bundle to be submitted to the Netherlands Government, and
Rentjana Komisi Irian
Rapport
Commissie Nieuw-Guinea


At the bottom of both bundles the year 1950 should appear.

III. The adoption of the Minutes of the 14th formal meeting, the formalization of the translation of the Minutes and reports of meetings and assemblies, as well as of the documents exchanged between the Groups, the foreword and the hearing, and the adoption of the final text of the presentation letter will take place at the Ministry of Union Affairs and Overseas Parts of the Realm on Tuesday 1st August, 1950, at 5 p.m.

IV. The exchange of the main components by the Netherlands and the Indonesian Group and the signing of the Foreword and the presentation letters will take place in the Château "Oud-Wassenaar" on Tuesday evening, after the formalization of the documents referred to in item III at 8 p.m.

4. There being nothing further to discuss, the Chairman closes the meeting at 13.30 p.m.

Minutes drawn up by:
Moh. Jahja.
AUSTRALIAN SCHOOL OF PACIFIC ADMINISTRATION.