

chance of this. Jakarta has wiped out government by consent where there was a challenge, as in the case of the South Moluccas, to its unitary rule. The Australian case has been admirably stated. We believe that the United States will be wise and right to associate itself with this position.

THE NEW GUINEA CASE

The representatives of Indonesia have done no service to the cause of good government and free government by presenting their claim to Western New Guinea as a case of "colonialism" versus "anti-colonialism." The issue of "colonialism" is not involved and never has been. What the Indonesians are doing is confusing the situation by an easy resort to a popular slogan.

The essence of "colonialism" is the imposition of an alien rule without the consent of the governed. The issue of consent is paramount in the case of the racially different Papuans of New Guinea, just as it was paramount in the Indonesian objection to Dutch rule. There has not been the slightest evidence that the Papuans want Indonesian rule, that they would give their free consent to it or that they would prefer it to the government of the Dutch. On the contrary, most of the articulate opinion from the Papuans has strongly supported the Dutch and opposed the Indonesians.

Western New Guinea, with its extreme backwardness, its multiplicity of languages—most of them unwritten—will be a "colony" for some considerable time to come. The question is merely whether it shall be a colony of the Netherlands or of Indonesia. On the record, there is good reason to support the Netherlands rather than the Indonesians.

It cannot be urged that the Indonesian Government in Jakarta has respected the principle of government by consent when it destroyed the idea of a federal state. Jakarta has overridden attempts to preserve autonomy in the areas that it has controlled. It has destroyed the concept of a Netherlands-Indonesian Union that would have preserved at least some of the integrity of sub-groups in the Indonesian archipelago that desire self-rule. "Colonialism" does not necessarily mean the rule of a European over an Asian. It can mean the rule of an Asian over an Asian, as has been the case in Indonesia, and as is proposed by Jakarta for New Guinea.

A good case can be made for the retention of Netherlands government in New Guinea on strategic grounds. Sir Percy Spender of Australia made this plain in his excellent presentation of the attitude of his country in the United Nations debate. Particularly since the Indonesian Government now holds authority by permission and collaboration of the Communist party in that country, there is good reason why the Australians—and we as well—should be apprehensive.

This, however, is not the definitive consideration. The question is, Shall the Papuans of New Guinea have an opportunity to achieve government by consent? Under Dutch rule, we believe, they will have that chance. Under Indonesian rule there is less