

# FOREIGN AFFAIRS MALAYSIA



**Vol. 2 — No. 1 & 2  
DECEMBER 1969**

No. Perolehan: 1668

No. Kelas:

Tarikh: 08 JUL 1969

Harga: \$ 8.00

**Vol. 2 — No. 1 & 2  
DECEMBER 1969**

FOREIGN AFFAIRS MALAYSIA is issued by the External Information Service, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Malaysia. It is designed to provide information on Malaysia's foreign policy and foreign relations. Any material in the Journal may be reproduced but acknowledgement of the source would be appreciated.

# CONTENTS

Text of Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman's speech at the Commonwealth Prime Minister's Conference, 8 January, 1969. ...	2
Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman's statement on Commonwealth Co-operation at Prime Minister's Conference, 14 January, 1969. ...	5
Tun Razak's speech on 1 February, 1969, regarding co-operation between Australia, New Zealand and Malaysia. ... ..	8
Broadcast talk on "Elements of Malaysian foreign policy" by the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tan Sri Ghazali Shafie, over Radio Malaysia on May 7, 1969. ... ..	11
Joint communique issued at the end of the Five-Nation Defence Talks between Australia, Britain, Malaysia, New Zealand and Singapore in Canberra on June 20, 1969. ... ..	14
Statement by Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-haj at the Muslim Summit at Rabat from September 22—24, 1969. ... ..	17
Declaration of the Islamic Summit. ... ..	20
Text of speech by Acting Prime Minister and Director of Operations, Tun Abdul Razak bin Hussein, at the opening of the Soviet Trade and Industrial Exhibition at Kuala Lumpur, September 23, 1969. ... ..	22
Text of speech by Enche Ali bin Haji Ahmad, Assistant Minister of Finance, Malaysia, and Governor of the World Bank for Malaysia, at the 1969 Annual Meeting of the Boards of Governors of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in Washington, D.C., on 30th September, 1969. ... ..	26
Text of statement by the Prime Minister of Malaysia, Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-haj, at the United Nations General Assembly in New York on October 7, 1969. ... ..	29
Talk by Tun Abdul Razak bin Hussein, Director of Operations and President of the U.N. Association of Malaysia on October 24, 1969.	36
Opening statement by the Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-haj, at the ASEAN Foreign Ministers' Meeting at Cameron Highlands on December 16, 1969. ... ..	38
The Deputy Prime Minister, Malaysia, Tun Abdul Razak bin Hussein, made the following statement at the Third ASEAN Ministerial Meeting at Cameron Highlands on December 16, 1969. ... ..	44
Joint communique issued at the end of the Third ASEAN Ministerial Meeting in Cameron Highlands, December 17, 1969. ... ..	47
Presentation of credentials in Malaysia for 1969. ... ..	50
Diary of events for 1969. ... ..	54

## COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

*Following is text of statement by the Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-haj, at Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Meeting in London. January 8, 1969:-*

One of the virtues of the Commonwealth is that every region of the world is represented within its membership and therefore in a General Political review such as this, Prime Ministers have a unique opportunity of obtaining a comprehensive picture of what the International situation looks like as seen from the perspective of each region. I therefore propose in my own statement to restrict myself to the geographical area which is of more immediate interest and concern to Malaysia, that is the area of Southeast Asia.

On Vietnam there is nothing that I can tell you that you do not know already. This matter has been widely reported and I do not intend to waste your time going into familiar details. I hope that the talks in Paris will prove fruitful. But I must tell you that my experience of dealing with the Communists — I had talks with the Malayan Communist Party leader, Chin Peng — is that the Communists will only talk in order to achieve their own purpose or to try and recover lost position. They do not come to talk in order to reach a solution but simply to gain their objective. At the present time world sympathy is with the Vietcongs and the North Vietnamese. If the talks in Paris failed then people should know who is to blame.

The troubles in Southeast Asia are caused by the Chinese policy of attempting to dominate and to influence Southeast Asia. They do this by fair and foul means. We can see this in Indonesia where the PKI still remains active with the support received from China. In the Philippines the HUKS are becoming increasingly active. In Thailand the Northern Frontier is fast becoming an area of revolt and dissension. In the Thai-Malaysian border are about 1,000 hard-core Communists who obtain direct inspiration and assistance from Peking and who have become increasingly violent. Similar problems exist in larger or smaller degree in all other countries in Southeast Asia.

In Malaysia the Chinese schools are used as nurseries for Communist infiltration and subversion and to train the youngsters to take up the Communist cause. It is difficult for the Government to close down these schools without creating communal unrest and causing resentment from the Chinese population because the Communists could easily represent this as an attack on the Chinese race and culture. We in Malaysia however had managed to contain this Communist threat by a vigorous

policy of winning the hearts and minds of people. We do this by a massive economic and social development programme on which we are spending huge sums of money. This programme has to be slowed down because of British withdrawal from the region in 1971, which has already begun and whose effects are already felt now. I do not want to go into this here as this subject is to be discussed by the five Commonwealth partners interested in the defence of this region.

I believe that countries in Southeast Asia must be strong economically and socially in order to stand up to the threats posed by Communist subversion and infiltration. By establishing regional co-operation, countries in Southeast Asia and the Pacific could together and jointly strengthen the economic and social foundation of the region as a whole. Among the newly created regional organisations are ASPAC, which is the Asian and Pacific Council, and ASEAN, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. So much ground work has been done to make these organisations, in particular ASEAN, a going concern but unfortunately we are having trouble with the Philippines on their claim to Sabah. I do not wish to burden you with the details about our troubles with the Philippines. Sabah had joined Malaysia in accordance with the wishes of the people expressed through democratic process of self-determination which must be upheld. And Britain had agreed to this merger professing to have full and legitimate right to do so.

Indonesia with its strategic geographical location and a population of more than 100 million people occupies a place of special importance in the region. The political and economic stability in Indonesia could have a direct bearing on the security of Southeast Asia. President Suharto has a difficult task to tackle. He inherited from the Sukarno regime a national economy literally in ruin and unless he can show that he is making progress in restoring the national economy his authority and the political stability of Indonesia may be jeopardised. It is essential that the developed nations of the world must decide quickly to assist President Suharto in his programme of restoring the shattered Indonesian economy. President Suharto has to show that he can deliver the goods, and has delivered the goods, as otherwise there is bound to be trouble. Furthermore, although the Communists have been driven underground there is no doubt there is a strong under-current of the PKI activities with the object of doing battle another day. I must emphasise therefore that in the interest of the free world, the developed nations should respond quickly to Indonesia's need for massive aid because protracted delay to deliver the goods will jeopardise the authority of President Suharto and thereby the stability of Indonesia. This in turn would have disastrous repercussions on the peace and security in the region.

I feel that Indonesia's immediate neighbours, although they themselves are in need of foreign assistance to carry out their development programme, should participate in assisting Indonesia. Malaysia herself despite her financial difficulties has agreed to offer a few million dollar credit loan to Indonesia.

Recently the Indonesians published their five-year development plan for the period 1969-1973. President Suharto wants to do so much for the Indonesian people but he has not the means to carry out his plans unless he receives assistance from friendly countries. The estimated amount to be spent for the first year of the new five-year development plan is US dollars three and a half billion of which something like one billion will have to come from foreign sources. It is important for all of us to do whatever we can to assist Indonesia.

Malaysia and Singapore occupy a most strategic location controlling as they do the sea routes between East and West through the Straits of Malacca. Malaysia is a democratic state and the loss of Malaysia would represent a loss to the free world of important trade routes. Up to now Malaysia had received assistance from Britain under the Anglo-Malaysia Defence Agreement. We recognise that the primary responsibility for our own defence must rest with us but we also recognise our own limita-

tion. Hence I am more than ever convinced of the need to work out effective defence arrangements among the Commonwealth partners concerned.

This is the main problem confronting us. No amount of money spent on defence would make us invulnerable to attack, but the presence of British and allied troops in the region would at least give our enemy a second thought and will help to hold up any plan at open aggression against us.

Membership of the Commonwealth has increased three-fold since I first attended these Prime Ministers' Meetings. This increased membership by itself can be a source of strength in world affairs if we can stick together and work together. I would therefore like to pose my colleagues this question — are they satisfied that the Commonwealth members are sufficiently joined together in common understanding and unity in order to play an important and constructive role in world affairs, as otherwise our association is meaningless. We must be able to speak in support of one another in matters of importance when we meet at the United Nations or the other International Conferences. Our association at the moment is very loosely formed with a Secretary-General to act as agent for us. I think it is about time that we formulate a rule whereby we can be bound by common loyalty to one another and have a chairman as well as a secretary-general to help run the organisation on a proper footing.

# COMMONWEALTH CO-OPERATION

*The Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-haj, made the following speech during the discussion on Commonwealth Co-operation at the Commonwealth Association in London on January 14, 1969:—*

Co-operation has played a major part in the affairs of developing countries and the Commonwealth Association has hitherto devoted much of its energies towards co-operation and consultation. Commonwealth members have derived some benefit from this co-operation but for really effective co-operation and consultation more is needed.

The Commonwealth needs solidarity. It is necessary for the members to bind themselves together and give their loyalty to the Association. Without this loyalty and a genuine desire to be a member of the Association, one can hardly expect the Association to have depth and meaning. The co-operation we receive today is not given because of our membership of the Association, but to be really frank rather the motivation is self-interest.

In fact there is an absence of real loyalty and a sense of belonging to assist one another.

There are two factors which could bring about this greater solidarity. The Commonwealth has increased in number and like any effective association it requires a set-up endowed with authority which can be felt by the members. Any organisation without such a set-up cannot hope to achieve its objectives in the long run. We need machinery to provide for and facilitate consultation and co-operation. Today we have no such executive set-up. In spite of difficulties and other handicaps, Mr. Smith\* and his team of hard workers have managed to make a success of it but this success cannot be assured for all time because in effect it is not quite the set up we have in mind.

Here we have a Secretary-General but without focus of authority and so when he wants to arrange for anything, whether a conference or meeting or needs directive he has to write to all heads of the Commonwealth. Because of this, for example, it has taken almost a year to arrange for this conference in London. It must be most difficult for Mr. Smith to work under such conditions. The United Nations, for example, has all the necessary machinery for consultation and decision making and an association as large as ours should equally have some such machinery and agreed procedure.

---

\* Mr. Arnold Smith, Secretary-General of the Commonwealth Association.

The second essential for a strong and worthwhile association is leadership. In the past the deep sense of belonging has kept the Commonwealth together by effective leadership. The leadership was provided by Britain who held the role through her historical prestige, being the colonial power before the independence of the countries of the Commonwealth. Her colonies looked to her for help and guidance and Britain exercised her leadership as well as she could. She also enjoyed in the past the undivided loyalty of her members but then came the winds of change and colonies, big and small, became independent.

### **Commonwealth Co-operation**

In the process of evolution of the Commonwealth from its earliest days to the present, the elements of cohesion have slowly been eroded away. That is obvious to us all. The Commonwealth had begun with Britain having the power to exercise the influence and leadership with the Commonwealth members looking to her for this influence and leadership. Through the years it has evolved to the present stage where on the one hand Britain has lost the power and the will to exercise the leadership expected of her and on the other hand the emergent independent countries have not crystallised their thinking about their policies as independent nations. There is therefore a danger of disintegration and this is most obvious at International Conferences. Commonwealth Countries feel no sense of solidarity and are therefore vulnerable to the wooings of other countries to join other groups. So we now see Commonwealth Countries striking out in many directions diversifying their policies and reducing their dependence on Britain. This in itself has reduced Britain's position of influence vis-a-vis many members of the Commonwealth and has led to a position where the Commonwealth has no longer any effective leadership.

I can see where the Commonwealth will land unless care is taken to lay a proper foundation for effective co-operation and consultation. We do not want it to become so loose an association of countries as to have no real and substantial basis for unity and therefore without any force. A group that comes together merely for the sake of convenience can be found anywhere, existing like mushrooms and fading away as soon as they have achieved their objectives. But we want the Commonwealth to be something more than just that. Unless there is a basis for get together with clear cut aims and objectives I am afraid the Commonwealth might just become one of these mushroom bodies and fade away too, with members striking out in different directions.

Britain herself has found it more important for her to concentrate her interests in a loser association with her immediate neighbours; to narrow down her interests and to concentrate all her endeavours in this effort and we can see she is going all out in pursuit of her membership of the European Community. In these circumstances, she herself gave up the leadership of the Commonwealth and though she did not say so in so many words she feels that her leadership of the Commonwealth is onerous. Because of these factors heads of Government begin to depend on the Secretariat to bring about cohesion between members, but that alone is not enough without someone in authority to direct the machinery.

The lack of leadership is placing the Commonwealth in a void. The symptoms of the malaise are an apparent feeling of emptiness and insecurity in the hearts and minds of those who had previously looked to Britain for leadership. The Commonwealth has hitherto been a force in world affairs and this malaise could erode the position of influence we have so far enjoyed. Also the enthusiasm for Commonwealth Co-operation and Consultation will lose its momentum. Today we find the Commonwealth speaking in many voices whereas we should be able to speak with one voice.

It is necessary that this void be filled and that effective leadership be restored to the Commonwealth. I know that Britain's continuous leadership of the Commonwealth has made her tired of her role. This may lead to degeneration and decay and

might well prove the end of the Commonwealth as I see it. Perhaps we could rotate the task of what might be termed a chairman periodically among the heads of Government of the Commonwealth. This would provide the necessary continuity we are after in our search for leadership.

The leader will in effect be the custodian of the principles and spirit of the Commonwealth during his tenure. Further, the system of rotation will, I think, bring about a greater awareness and sense of responsibility and of belonging among members.

The Commonwealth Secretariat will continue to function and to provide the necessary servicing of Commonwealth activities. It could be available to assist the leader in all his activities and will provide effective leadership in order to keep this spirit of the Commonwealth alive. One matter we all are in agreement is that the Queen remains Head of the Commonwealth.

The Commonwealth Association is one that we value deeply and we are naturally distressed to see the Commonwealth on the verge of disarray. New thinking and new approaches are necessary if we are to see the Commonwealth again playing its role as an effective body working for the common good of member countries and of the world in general. To fill the position of leadership which Britain held by virtue of history I have suggested the Institution of Chairman to provide guidance and leadership for set periods. If the previous position of leadership had been held merely by virtue of greater status and prestige, my suggestion would have the situation replaced by an Institution of Chairman for Leadership who would hold authority by virtue of appointment to the position by fellow heads of Governments.

---

## MANZA DINNER

*Speech by the Deputy Prime Minister, Tun Abdul Razak bin Hussein, at the Malaysia, Australia, New Zealand- Association (MANZA) Dinner at Lake Club, Kuala Lumpur today, February 1, 1969 at 9.30 p.m.:—*

Mr. Chairman, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a great pleasure for my wife and myself to be your guest at this dinner tonight. Having visited Australia and New Zealand not very long ago and with the warm and friendly ties that have developed for many years amongst our people and our countries, we feel very much at home in this very pleasant company.

Australia, New Zealand and Malaysia have been good steady friends for a long time. We have a long and established association within the Commonwealth of nations and also in the larger family, the United Nations, in whose Charter and principles we have strong faith and belief and are pledged to uphold. We have so much in common between us that we may borrow an Australian Expression — it can be truly said that we are good mates which is equally expressive in our national language “kita kawan baik”.

There are other areas where our countries are similar. Let us look at our respective economies. Historically the growth and development of our countries had been sustained by the exports of staples such as wheat and wool from Australia, wool and dairy products from New Zealand, and rubber and tin from Malaysia. With our dependence on our few primary products we have shared common problems. In recent years, more recent for Malaysia than in the case of Australia and New Zealand, we have taken measures to spread out the economic base from relying too much on the exports of primary products. Australia and New Zealand have made rapid strides in their industrialisation programmes. Malaysia too is trying to develop her industrial potential as quickly as we can and in a large measure we look towards Australia and New Zealand as models for our economic development. We hope to learn as much as possible on techniques of developing new industries so that what we learn from you can be put to good use in developing our own economy.

We are encouraged that both Australia and New Zealand have shown their ready willingness to provide Malaysian training facilities. Our students have gone over there in hundreds for their studies, and your technical experts, businessmen, industrialists and particularly the soldiers have come to our country and, truly, it can be said that this two-way traffic has made a tremendous contribution to build close and warm relations between our countries. Your Association, the Malaysia, Australia, New Zea-

land Association, can feel proud in that it is making an important contribution in promoting personal contacts and developing warm feelings amongst people of our three countries.

There is so much to gain to our own countries by co-operation. All three of us have recognised the value of such co-operation by our membership to the Colombo Plan, ECAFE, ASPAC, Asian Development Bank and so on, all of which are designed for the development of this region. I feel that being members of these several regional bodies, our three countries should build on the present firm foundations to ensure that the partnership for progress, peace and prosperity in this region grows stronger.

The world has for long been divided into various groups. We hear of the East and West with the distinctions carrying with it certain connotations. I am more inclined to the usage of the warm and friendly term "down under" and equally warm and friendly term "near north" in describing our geographical situation than the cold "East-West" or oriental-occidental divisions. Jointly we can bring our people and countries closer together so that we can bridge what little gap there is between the "down under" and the "near north."

There are already signs that there is a growing awareness for this development in certain fields. It is heartening to see the growth in the counterpart town relationship such as between Temerloh in my home-State, Pahang, and Wagga Wagga in the State of New South Wales in Australia. There is also Kampong New Zealand. This is just but one expression of the interests Australia and New Zealand have taken in the development of Malaysia.

Development of sporting activities is another field which offers ample scope to put into practice, our common aspirations to contribute to this concept of partnership for progress.

Australia and New Zealand are already well known in the field of sports. Peter Snell's performance in the middle distance running readily comes to mind. I believe that Australia has held the Davis Cup far longer than any other nation. It is, therefore, much that Malaysia can hope to learn from Australia and New Zealand in developing our sporting activities. But, as there happens to be also a Thomas Cup for badminton which is now with us, I think, we too can do our bit in popularising this game in Australia and New Zealand.

The West Australian soccer team was a great hit at the Merdeka soccer tournament last year and now their hockey team is touring this country. We hope that our High Commissions will get together informally and discuss ways of broadening these sporting exchanges. I am all in favour of promoting our people to get to know each other and especially our youngsters in a person to person level. Sports is one such medium where the true basis of mateships are developed.

There are also other interesting possibilities. Our countries too are well-known in the Commonwealth for the liberal usage of the English language. When I was in Australia and New Zealand, I came to appreciate this particular similarity. Whilst the Australian says "Let's give it a go", the Malaysian puts it across with "Chuba try" and you hear "can-lah" to your "She'll be right".

There is therefore so much that binds our countries and I hope that your friendship should be considered not only for the present or immediate future, but for generations to come.

Malaysia has a great scope to develop and our countries have much to contribute to the stability of this region. Like Australia and New Zealand, we are developing our country quietly. Our silent revolution in the economic and social fields is noticeably transforming the entire landscape for the betterment of our people. Just like your countries, we are not easily excitable and we are not prone to "making a fuss."

Yet, what is interesting to note is that these warm friendly ties between our peoples and many of the similarities in outlook and aspirations have been of a fairly recent historical origin. It was not so long ago we in Malaysia put Australia and New Zealand in the same category as Europeans just because Australia and New Zealand had been populated mainly by people from Europe. But on the strength of the developments that I have alluded, we have been agreeably surprised, and I must say encouraged, to find that your countries have shown noticeable trends to look more to us in Asia than to Europe.

To come to think of it, this is only natural considering the basic facts of geography that the islands and mainlands of Asia are the nearest landmass to Australia and New Zealand. Such realisation is given further backing by economic factors in that countries in Asia are replacing those in Europe as the main buyers of Australian and New Zealand goods. If peace and prosperity is assured in Asia, both Australia and New Zealand will be well placed to serve the growing markets of this region. There is no doubt in my mind that it is in our mutual interest to provide the conditions that would make for peace and progress in this region. We are of this region and we cannot shy away from this responsibility. Peace, however, cannot be had without security and with the withdrawal of British presence from this area at the end of 1971, there is a new need for Australia and New Zealand to identify even more closely with the peace and security of this region.

The time has come for both Australia and New Zealand to decide for themselves the role and the image that they wish to project in this area.

Two centuries after Captain Cook made his famous voyage, Australia, and New Zealand are now at the cross-roads. The question that faces all of us is that whether we have the capability to discern our collective interests in this region and act effectively for the peace and security of this region or whether Australia and New Zealand intend to be inward looking. This is, of course, a political decision for the Australian and New Zealand Government to make. But, for us in this region, it is of abiding concern.

No doubt some believe that what happens elsewhere is not their concern. But our mutual interests and interdependence cannot support this line of thinking. Malaysians are aware of the fact that in this age, no country can afford the luxury, if luxury it can be described, of keeping to oneself and of not being interested and concerned with the affairs of its neighbours. With the advent of nuclear weapons, intercontinental missiles and manned spacecraft that can travel to the moon and back, each one of us must be increasingly concerned with the larger and wider interests of this region. Every country has to be concerned with what happens to its neighbours both immediate and those not so immediate. The economy and defence of any one country is closely tied up with that of its neighbours; those that are near and not so near. In the international co-operation, regional co-operation in trade, development and defence arrangements are the keys to national survival in this age. We in Malaysia have always been aware of this. Like you, we in Malaysia value our democratic way of life and I can assure you Malaysia will not be found wanting in doing whatever is within our capability to protect our sovereignty and independence.

I will end on this note and wish your association success in all its undertakings for this year and years to come.

## ELEMENTS OF MALAYSIAN FOREIGN POLICY

*Broadcast talk by the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tan Sri Ghazali Shafie, over Radio Malaysia at 10.15 p.m. on May 7, 1969.*

I believe it was Plato who said somewhere that the affairs of the world will not be satisfactory until the philosophers become rulers or the rulers become philosophers. I do not know whether our rulers are philosophers — and I have no wish, of course, to contradict the eminent Plato — but our affairs with the world, which is what our foreign policy is all about, are very satisfactory indeed.

Foreign policy is one subject which is so susceptible to rhetoric. It is perhaps not possible to wax too eloquently about the improvement of riverine postal services or the increase in the number of public stand-pipes — though these are certainly important — but it is only too easy to speak of peace, freedom, non-alignment, disarmament, human rights or whatever other ideals one may wish to expound in prose in which one can almost hear the exclamation marks. And therefore, in talking of foreign policy — if we mean to be serious — we will have, first of all, to liberate ourselves from the imperialism of clichés and of slogans because clichés and slogans are no substitutes for policy. We must look beyond the style for the substance.

When it comes right down to it, foreign policy is concerned with safeguarding and promoting the national interests. Relations among nations are in a constant state of flux. Thus it is our task in Wisma Putra as the guardian of Malaysia's foreign relations to study these changes in terms not only of Malaysia's relations with other countries, but also of their relations with one another and to respond to these changes appropriately. Therefore, it is important that our ideas must go beyond the unassailability of our own self-evident truths, for we must recognise that in this world these are no permanent enemies or, indeed, permanent friends, but only our own basic permanent interests to be safeguarded and promoted.

What are these basic national interests? What is our basic objective in foreign policy? To put it at its simplest, our basic objective is to have as many friends as possible and as few enemies as possible. We want to be on the friendliest terms with everyone or at the very least to have no one hostile to us. Of course this is sometimes not possible. There was, for example, the episode with the Sukarno/Subandrio regime in Indonesia. There remains our unresolved relations with, to whom only recently the Prime Minister has once again extended our hand of friendship when he said that Malaysia was even prepared to have diplomatic relations with China if she recognised

Malaysia's sovereignty and stopped interfering in the internal affairs of the country. There is still, of course, the curious case of the Philippines, who despite what took place in Bangkok last June, insist they have a legal claim to Sabah, and despite the clearly expressed wishes of the people of Sabah, insist on going to the World Court as if the destiny and the will of a people can be disposed of by a judicial decision.

In each case, however, we will have to go beyond the immediate statement or argumentations about our position. We will have to find out why our adversaries behave as they do, to see whether they have any legitimate fears or grievances and to seek ways and means of reconciling our differences. This we did successfully when General Suharto came to effective power in Indonesia to resolve *konfrontasi*. We continue to maintain our reasoned and reasonable attitude towards China despite years of abuse and interference. We tried patiently for five years to understand and to accommodate the convolutions of the Philippines with regard to their claim: there was, you will remember, the ascertainment by the United Nations, there were the elections in April 1967, and we met them in Bangkok last June, but all, alas, to no avail. A distinction must be sharply drawn, however, between legitimate grievance and illegitimate ambitions. When we are faced with old-fashioned expansionism, then our response must be the old-fashioned assertion of our rights and of our willingness to defend them.

To go back a little to our diplomacy during the time of confrontation: I think it can be said, without appearing too immodest, that we came out victorious in our various diplomatic skirmishes with Mr. Subandrio. These culminated most publicly at the time of the debate in the Security Council in 1964 when, but for the Soviet veto, we would have emerged not only with the substance which we did achieve, but also the form of a resolution which expressed disapproval of Indonesian aggression. The attempt to challenge our sovereignty in international bodies obtained no support whatever. We were elected to the Security Council in 1965 despite thunderous warnings from Mr. Sukarno which led him in frustration to take Indonesia out of the United Nations. And there can be no doubt that despite his violent opposition we would have participated at the Afro-Asian Conference in Algiers in 1965 if it had taken place.

I recall these matters not to indulge in vigorous self-congratulations, but to examine why we were successful. It must not be forgotten that in 1962 when the Sukarno/Subandrio opposition to Malaysia began, we were only five years old as an independent country, and we were being opposed by a then giant of the world of Afro-Asian and of non-alignment. How, therefore, were we able to be successful? Partly I think, because we were in the right — but alas, that alone is never sufficient: if justice by itself is the determining factor, then there would have been little cause for concern. More important was the fact that we had friends in the world, and we had them because we had consistently followed certain principles in our foreign relations.

What are these principles? First of all, a steadfast adherence to the ideals and purposes of the United Nations Charter and of the Organisations itself. That could sound more rhetoric, to which, as I have said, statements on foreign policy are so prone. But we in Malaysia have given practical evidence of our commitment to the United Nations. Thus our support military, financial and diplomatic, for the extraordinarily difficult United Nations Congo Operations and our support also, financial and otherwise, for such United Nations activities as the United Nations Force in Cyprus, the United Nations Anti-Apartheid Fund, the United Nations Development Programme, the Relief and Rehabilitation of Palestine Refugees and so on.

Central to the philosophy of the United Nations is the concept of peaceful co-existence and this is a basic tenet in our foreign policy. We believe that all states have the right to choose their own political ideology and their own economic and social system and that they should scrupulously respect each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity and refrain from interfering in each other's internal affairs. We are guided by these principles in our relations with other states and we only ask in return that they be similarly guided in their relations with us. We have steadfastly

maintained these principles ever since our independence and most recently they have borne fruit in the exchange of diplomatic missions between the Soviet Union and Malaysia in the last year. It is not that the principles of our foreign policy have changed; it is rather that these principles of co-existence which we, together with many other states, have long expounded have won gradual acceptance.

In speaking next of anti-colonialism and anti-racism as fundamental elements of Malaysia's foreign policy, I can again sound merely platitudinous, but for the fact that in practice Malaysia has so clearly manifested her support for anti-colonial movements. Hence our diplomatic initiative in 1960 on the question of West Irian which was finally resolved some years later along lines which we had earlier advocated. Hence also our support for the historic anti-colonial struggle of Algeria and our support today for the people of Southern Rhodesia and the people of Angola and Mozambique in their fight for freedom. And likewise the lead which we have taken in the determined opposition to apartheid in South Africa, which is one of the cruelest forms of colonialism today.

These political questions aside, Malaysia has also placed great emphasis on solving the problem of poverty which is the lot of the vast majority of the world's population. Thus we have participated actively in the work of the various United Nations and other inter-governmental economic organs: we have often taken the lead in the International Rubber Study Group and the International Tin Council, we have served on the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme and we serve today on the Trade and Development Board of the UNCTAD. Likewise we took the initiative as long ago as 1959, when regional co-operation was less fashionable than it is now, to form A.S.A. which is the precursor of the present ASEAN.

Above all, it seems to me we have won friends in the world and we have retained their respect and esteem because we have been consistent and we have been principled in the conduct of our foreign relations. I do not think that there is any need now to go into the semantic niceties of whether or not Malaysia is non-aligned or neutral, or whatever the phrase may be, which can only too often mean all things to all men. What is undeniably true is that we have sought to formulate our position on the basis of the facts of each case without any pre-conceived attitude, and we have expressed ourselves plainly and honestly without prevarication for fear of not sounding enough or of offending some other sacred shibboleths. Thus we were the first to come out unequivocally in support of India when she was attacked by China. We condemned the Israeli occupation of Arab territories after the June war not on grounds of any religious affinity but simply because such occupation constitutes aggression. We believe that China should occupy her seat in the United Nations because it is so obviously right but at the same time we cannot accept that the people of Taiwan should be denied their right to choose their own future because we are consistent with our basic position of supporting the rights of all peoples to self-determination. We have been critical of the intransigence of the Soviet Union and her socialist allies and also France on the question of peace-keeping role for the United Nations just as we have been critical of certain Western states which dragged their feet in the implementation of United Nations resolutions particularly those relating to colonialism, apartheid and economic development. By the same token we have given our support to the Soviet Union or the Western powers, or indeed, to anyone else, solely on our judgement of the merits of their proposals. But we have been careful at all times to resist the temptation to make the grandiose statement or the extreme gesture which would win easy but empty applause. On the contrary we have shown at all times a concern for deliberate and purposeful activity which achieves concrete results while remaining absolutely consistent to our basic principles.

A "yes" or "no" said firmly and quietly has the same meaning as when it is said violently and loudly — but is often more effective. And that in a phrase is the aim of Malaysia's foreign policy: to be effective in safeguarding and promoting the interests of the nation.

## FIVE-NATION DEFENCE TALKS — JOINT COMMUNIQUE

*The following joint communique was issued at the end of the Five-Nation Defence talks between Australia, Britain, Malaysia, New Zealand, and Singapore in Canberra on June 20, 1969.*

After noting delegation members and procedures, the full text read:

The five Nations affirmed their continuing interest in the peace and stability of the area and their joint concern with practical questions arising from the withdrawal of British Forces from Malaysia and Singapore. In accordance with their desire jointly and separately to promote stability, peaceful development and regional co-operation in Southeast Asia, they reaffirmed the need to live in harmony with the other countries of the region.

Noting their common concern for the maintenance, within this wider context, of the Security of Malaysia and Singapore, the five Nations expressed their intention to continue the practice of close consultation among them about the situation in the area and about developments affecting the Security of Malaysia and Singapore.

The conference reaffirmed that the principle, declared at the Kuala Lumpur meeting by the representatives of Malaysia and Singapore, that the Defence of the two countries was indivisible, constituted an essential basis for future defence co-operation.

Recalling that the representatives of Malaysia and Singapore had affirmed at Kuala Lumpur their resolve to do their utmost for their own defence, the conference welcome the substantial progress made by the two Governments in developing their own defence capability and the assistance in training and equipment provided to them by Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom.

The representatives of Malaysia, Singapore, and the United Kingdom welcome the announcements that had been made by the Governments of Australia and New Zealand with respect to the continued stationing of elements of their armed forces in Malaysia and Singapore after the British withdrawal in 1971.

The representatives of Malaysia, Singapore, Australia and New Zealand also welcome the reaffirmation by the representative of the United Kingdom Government of its intention to continue exercising and training in the area.

The conference saw these steps as a practical expression of the desire of the countries concerned to assist Malaysia and Singapore in developing their own effective defence capability and as a contribution to the security and stability of the area.

The conference went on to discuss practical defence problems arising from the British run-down, the progress so far made and the further steps necessary to meet the situation after 1971.

In this connection the conference considered and noted with approval the work of the Navy, Army and Air Force Advisory Working Groups on the questions referred to them by the previous conference.

Dealing first with the major combined exercise to be held in 1970, the conference expressed satisfaction with the arrangements reposed for this exercise, accepted the detailed proposals which had come forward, and noted that substantial forces would be contributed by all five countries and that a five-power exercise planning staff was continuing work in Kuala Lumpur.

The conference noted that the exercise would, among other things, demonstrate the capability of the United Kingdom rapidly to deploy forces to the area.

It was noted that joint exercises were to continue into the period beyond 1971 and it was agreed that a schedule of such exercises should be developed for consideration. These exercises would enable the techniques of co-operation and of support of local forces to be practised.

The conference approved the outline organisation and related proposals developed by the Army Advisory Working Group to establish a Commonwealth jungle warfare centre. It was agreed that the group should be reconvened to develop its proposals further.

Turning to naval matters, the conference noted the arrangements made by the Singapore Government in regard to certain of the former Royal Navy facilities, which would ensure the continuing availability of dockyard and other maintenance support.

The conference welcomed the readiness of Malaysia to maintain and operate the armament depot on Singapore Island for the use of the partner countries requiring such facilities and the plan whereby the Malaysian Navy would train Singapore naval personnel, which was a demonstration of the close co-operation between the two countries.

The conference also welcomed the advice of the Singapore Government that the existing Royal Navy facilities in the stores Basin area could be made available to meet requirements for the continuing presence of the Australian and New Zealand navies.

It was agreed that the Naval Advisory Working Group should be reconvened to continue the study of the transfer of Royal Navy sea and shore training facilities and of other naval facilities that would be required in the Singapore area.

In the discussion of air defence matters arising from the report of the Air Force Advisory Working Group, the conference noted with satisfaction the constructive developments which had occurred since the last Ministerial meeting.

These included the deployment of a second squadron of Australian supersonic Mirage fighters to Butterworth, with arrangements for the rotation of an element of the Tengah Air Base in Singapore and the availability of Australian aircraft after 1971 for assignment as might be appropriate to the proposed integrated air defence system, the arrangements made between Singapore of Bloodhound missiles, the development of the Singapore Air Force, the impending transfer of a number of Australian Sabre jet fighters of the Royal Malaysian Air Force, the arrangements made by Malaysia and Singapore for the provision and manning in good time of the radar facilities appropriate to the integrated air defence system, and the contribution being made by the United Kingdom and Australia in the training of Malaysian and Singaporean personnel.

The conference welcomed the information conveyed to the meeting by the Malaysian delegation that the Malaysian Government had entered into a contract for the supply of radar equipment, of which one set will be positioned at Butterworth and will be operational in September, 1971, when the British Government closes Western Hill.

The conference agreed that the integrated system for the air defence of Malaysia and Singapore which was accepted at the Kuala Lumpur conference should be further developed. Consultations would continue regarding detailed arrangements that might govern contributions to the establishment of the system and the arrangements for its control.

The conference welcomed the positive response by Australia to the proposal of the Air Force Advisory Working Group that, when the form of the air defence system had been finally settled, Australia should provide the first air defence commander.

The Ministers considered that there had been a valuable review at the conference of the significant developments and the extensive and detailed work done since the last Ministerial Meeting. They believed that the conference had consolidated the progress made at Kuala Lumpur. They agreed that there was a real need to translate the important decisions in principle which the conference had taken into practical working arrangements.

It was noted in the context of the continuing work of the Advisory Working Groups that a number of the issues requiring further study could best be considered in a joint services forum. The conference therefore agreed to set up a Joint Service Advisory Working Group to consider various problems affecting more than one service.

The conference agreed that there should be close consultations at various levels to carry forward the momentum of defence co-operation and that the form of these consultations should be left to the governments concerned to arrange as circumstances might require.

The Ministers agreed that they themselves would meet again after the major Commonwealth exercise planned for the middle of 1970.

---

## MUSLIM SUMMIT AT RABAT

*Text of speech by Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-haj at the Muslim Summit at Rabat from September 22—24, 1969:—*

Your Majesties, Your Excellencies:

I must begin by expressing first of all my profound gratitude to His Majesty King Hassan II for the invitation he has so graciously extended to hold this Muslim Summit Conference here in his lovely Capital City of Rabat. The warmth of the reception we have received and the arrangements made for our comfort have been so well arranged.

I am grateful to Almighty God from the bottom of my heart that it has been possible for us to meet together. This unique gathering of ours as has been said is indeed an occasion of historic significance where leaders of all Muslim countries throughout the world are meeting together to discuss a subject which moves us beyond all words. Who among us can contemplate the issue of the Holy City of Baitul Maqdis and of the Al-Aqsa Mosque which is the third most holy mosque of all Muslims and the place of ascension of the Holy Prophet himself without a feeling of the most profound reverence? At quite short notice we have journeyed over many miles to come together to share our thoughts and to contribute in whatever way we can to safeguard the good name of the religion to which we all belong. I would like to express my humble thanks to His Majesty King Hassan II for having provided His Majesty's personal plane to bring me here from Rome so as to be in time for this meeting.

I have come here as a brother in Islam moved by my very deep concern and anxiety for the holy places of Jerusalem. We are all here at this gathering not as so-called Arab Muslims or non-Arab Muslims, but simply as brothers in Islam. The future of Jerusalem is not a matter between Israel and Jordan only, or even between Israel and the other Arab States only. It is a matter of the deepest concern to us all as Muslims. Indeed it is a matter not only the concern for us present around this table but that rather the millions of Muslims not represented here whether they be in China or Russia, Thailand or the Philippines, Ethiopia, Yugoslavia, Albania or Cyprus, for it is in their interest for us to speak on their behalf as well. For they, like us, must feel equally as we do the pangs and sorrow caused by the events which had taken place in Jerusalem. This indeed must be the most important conference held so far in connection with this question and world attention must inevitably be focussed and drawn to what is taking place here. Everything said will be taken down and recorded for world consumption and Muslims throughout the world will act on it. Let us therefore

discuss the matter with some reasoning and not to be overcome by emotion nor concern ourselves with affairs of individual countries but rather concentrate on important issue before us.

At the Muslim Conference held in Kuala Lumpur in April this year, which is the first conference of its kind ever held, the issue of Baitul Maqdis was discussed and the Conference passed resolutions some of which were:

1. This Conference condemns Israel for having usurped the Arab territories and in particular the Holy City of Baitul Maqdis, which includes the first Qibla and the third sacred mosque of the Muslims and place of ascension of the Holy Prophet;
2. Appeals to all Muslim nations to hold as soon as possible a Conference at high political level to discuss the issue of Baitul Maqdis in all its aspects.

The present conference may therefore be regarded as fulfilling the second paragraph in that resolution and what is more the mosque referred to in the first paragraph has been the subject of the worst act of sacrilege known to history and so what was said of the mosque is almost prophetic. The sacrilege of the holy mosque has brought us helter skelter to a conference.

In addressing the closing session of that Conference I referred to the situation in the Middle East as one fraught with danger. I said then that what was happening in the Middle East was a matter for serious attention of world powers but that sooner or later it must inevitably draw all the Muslim nations into the conflict because Muslims regard Jerusalem as their Holy City. Muslims everywhere had felt a sense of great loss and tragedy when as a result of the June 1967 war, Jerusalem fell into the hands of Israel. It is inevitable that Muslims everywhere should be profoundly concerned over such a severe setback with the loss of Jerusalem to the Israelis. I had hoped and prayed that the big powers would be able to settle this conflict before it explodes into a religious war with incalculable and dire consequences to world peace. Unfortunately, the powers have not given it the importance it occupies and so this conference must alert them as to the seriousness of the situation. After more than two years, the Israelis remain in control of Jerusalem and have even enacted legislation to incorporate the Holy City as a part of their State. This is the matter Muslims of non-Arab race are most deeply concerned. There have been many resolutions passed by the U.N. on the issue of Jerusalem and I would like to make some brief references to them here.

“Resolution 242 demanded the withdrawal of Israel from occupied territories; Termination of all claims to all territories occupied;

Guaranteeing freedom of navigation, etc.,

Resolution 252, 1968 reaffirmed that military conquest is inadmissible;

Deplores the failure of Israel to comply with General Assembly Resolutions;

Resolution 267 condemns Israel for having changed the status of the City of Jerusalem and showing disregard for General Assembly Resolutions;

And on 15th September another Security Council Resolution 271 was passed which recalled the Resolutions 252 of 21st May, 1968, 267 of 3rd July, 1967 and earlier General Assembly Resolutions 2253 and 2254 of 4th and 14th July, 1967 respectively concerning measures and actions on Israel affecting the status of the City of Jerusalem and reaffirming the established principle that acquisition of territory by military conquest is inadmissible and declared that any act of destruction or profanation of the Holy places, religious buildings and sites in Jerusalem etc..... may seriously endanger international peace and security.”

No one can deny the fact that Israel had wantonly and contemptuously disregarded all these resolutions. And I have not the slightest doubt that Israel will treat

whatever resolution which might be made at this conference or U.N. would be treated in the same way as in previous instances. I have heard the views expressed around this table and I fully understand the sentiments so expressed without repeating them here — the best that we could do, in the circumstances as I myself propose to do, is to project our consensus and our stand to the General Assembly of the U.N. with a view to winning sympathy and support for the Muslim cause amongst the countries of the world thereby giving effect to decisions taken here.

---

# DECLARATION OF THE ISLAMIC SUMMIT

The Heads of Islamic States and Governments and representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Chad, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Kingdom of Jordan, Kingdom of Morocco, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Pakistan, Senegal, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, Yemen, met at the First Islamic Summit Conference held in Rabat from 22 to 24 September, 1969.

Representatives of the Palestinian Liberation Organisation attending as observers.

Convinced that their common creed constitutes a powerful factor bringing their peoples closer together and fostering understanding between them.

Resolved to preserve the spiritual, moral and socio-economic values of Islam which remain one of the essential factors for the achievement of progress by mankind.

They affirm their unshakable faith in the precepts of Islam which proclaim the equality of rights among all men.

They reaffirm their adherence to the Charter of the United Nations and fundamental Human Rights, the purposes and principles of which establish a basis for fruitful co-operation among all peoples.

Determined to strengthen the fraternal and spiritual bonds existing between their peoples and to safeguard their freedom and the heritage of their common civilization founded in particular upon the principles of justice, tolerance and non-discrimination.

Anxious to promote everywhere welfare, progress and freedom.

Resolved to unite their efforts for the preservation of world peace and security.

*To these ends*

*hereby declare:*

Their Governments shall consult together with a view to promoting between them, a policy of close collaboration and assistance in the economic, scientific, cultural and spiritual fields.

Their Governments undertake to settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

Their Governments shall endeavour to contribute to the development of friendly

relations among nations by promoting a better understanding of the precepts of Islam with a view to developing conditions conducive to peace, security and welfare.

Decide to establish a Permanent Secretariat to ensure liaison between their Governments, in accordance with the spirit of this Declaration. The temporary headquarters of the Permanent Secretariat shall be in Jeddah pending the liberation of Jerusalem.

Having considered the act of arson in the Holy Al-Aqsa Mosque, and the situation in the Middle East, the Heads of States and Governments or their representatives *hereby declare:*

The grievous event of 21 August, 1969 which caused extensive damage by arson to the Sacred Al-Aqsa Mosque, has plunged over six hundred million followers of Islam throughout the world in the deepest anguish.

This sacrilege against one of Humanity's most venerated shrines and the acts of destruction and profanation of the Holy places which have taken place under the military occupation by Israel of Al Quds — the Holy City of Jerusalem, sacred to the followers of Islam, Christianity and Judaism, have exacerbated tensions in the Middle East and aroused indignation among peoples throughout the world.

The Heads of States and Governments or their representatives declare that the continued threat upon the Sacred Shrines of Islam in Jerusalem is the result of the occupation of this City by the Israeli forces. The preservation of their sacred character and unimpeded access to them, require that the Holy City should be restored its status, previous to June 1967, which was established and sanctified by the history of thirteen hundred years.

They therefore declare that their Governments and peoples are firmly determined to reject any solution of the problem of Palestine which would deny Jerusalem the status it had before June 1967.

They urge all Governments particularly those of France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States of America to take into account the deep attachment of the followers of Islam to Jerusalem and the solemn resolve of their Governments to strive for its liberation.

The continued military occupation of Arab territories by Israel since June 1967, the refusal by Israel to pay the slightest heed to the calls by the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations to rescind the measures purporting to annex the Holy City of Jerusalem to Israel, have caused their peoples and their Governments the most profound concern.

# SOVIET TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION

*Text of speech by the Acting Prime Minister and Director of Operations, Tun Abdul Razak bin Hussein, at the opening of the Soviet Trade and Industrial Exhibition at Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kuala Lumpur, at 4.00 p.m. September 23, 1969:—*

Your Excellency, Honourable Ministers, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen.

I am happy to be able to personally welcome you, Mr. Minister, and members of your delegation to Kuala Lumpur. You have come all the way to stage this first Soviet Trade and Industrial Exhibition which, I am advised, is the biggest exhibition ever held by the Soviet Government in this part of the world.

We in Malaysia, therefore, feel greatly honoured and proud of the fact that your Government has chosen our country as the venue of this important exhibition.

Ladies and Gentlemen: two weeks ago, I declared open the Engineering Seminar at the University of Malaya sponsored by the British Board of Trade. Now, today, I have the privilege of declaring open this trade and industrial exhibition organised by the Soviet Government. Both these events clearly show the faith and confidence that our friends from overseas have toward the continued political and economic stability and viability of Malaysia.

It has always been the policy of this Government since we assumed our role as an independent and sovereign nation twelve years ago to do everything possible to generate rapid growth of our economy — to encourage the flow of foreign capital and investment from abroad and, at the same time, to accelerate the economic development of our country. Today, we can say with a measure of pride, that we have succeeded in bringing about changes in our country both in the rural and urban areas. Our people of all races are now enjoying amenities in life and a standard of living which they have never enjoyed before. We have succeeded in doing this not only because of sound economic policies which we have followed and the dedicated efforts of our leaders, public servants and the co-operation of the people of this country, but also because of the confidence that our friends overseas have shown in our country. That is why it has been our policy that while devoting our energy and resources toward economic development, we have also kept a vigilant eye on the security of our country. We believe that without peace and security, our people cannot enjoy progress and prosperity. Therefore we are conscious of the importance of maintaining law and order



The Acting Prime Minister and Director of Operations, Tun Abdul Razak bin Hussein declared open the Soviet Trade and industrial Exhibition at Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kuala Lumpur. The visiting Russian Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade, Mr. M.R. Kuzmin, is shown (second from left) standing next to Tun Razak.

and peace and security as well as accelerating the pace of development in economic and social fields.

Recently, we were faced with an internal trouble. However, due to prompt and firm measures taken by the Government and to the loyalty and devotion of our military and police, we were able to bring the situation under control and today the internal situation has almost returned to normal. While as an independent nation, we are solely responsible for our internal security and for safeguarding our borders and coastline, we also realise that we belong to an important part of the world—Southeast Asia.

Our national security must, therefore, necessarily be tied up with the security of this region. As a small nation in this region, we will do everything possible to work together with our neighbours and other nations here to maintain peace and stability and to preserve the security of this area. As a small nation, our main wish is to be left alone to follow our way of life, to carry out economic and social development, to give our people a rightful place among the free and developed nations of the world.

We, therefore, look towards other countries who have interest in this region and who have investment in this country and other parts of this area and to major powers of the world to help maintaining security and stability in this region.

Mr. Minister, just a little more than a year ago, I had the privilege of visiting your great country, Soviet Russia. I am very grateful to your Government for the kindness and hospitality that they had extended to me and members of my delegation. It was the first official delegation from this country to visit the Soviet Union and, as a result of the discussions that I had with your Ministers, we agreed that there should be greater contact between our two countries and our two people particularly in the field of trade. I am happy that soon after that we had the privilege of receiving your Minister of Foreign Trade and today this industrial and trade exhibition from your country.

Within the last two years, we have witnessed considerable development in Malaysia/Soviet relations. Besides diplomatic and trade relations, Malaysia and the Soviet Union will soon be signing an Air Services Agreement paving the way for a direct air link between Moscow and Kuala Lumpur.

While I was in Moscow, I was impressed by the desire of your Government to strengthen friendly relations between our two countries. We reciprocate this sentiment and I do hope that this exhibition will lead to further co-operation between our two countries in other fields.

We, in Malaysia believe in fostering and maintaining friendly relations with all countries, irrespective of their political, economic and social systems so long as those countries believe in the principle of peaceful co-existence and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. We believe that in the final analysis, a country's sovereignty and territorial integrity can best be safeguarded by a policy of friendly relations with as many countries as possible.

I am happy to have this opportunity to see for myself the wide range of goods, machinery and equipment on display here today. What we see here is clearly indicative of the great strides Soviet industry has made over the past few decades. Many of us are fully aware of the vast expanse of the USSR and its tremendous resources, ranking among the foremost industrial and manufacturing powers of the world. We in Malaysia having been used to seeing products from all over the world, I must confess know very little and have not seen much of the products of Soviet industry. This is due, no doubt, to the fact that in the past trade between our countries has been very limited. I am sure, you, Mr. Minister, are sincerely hoping that from the result of the exhibition, Soviet products will become more known and accepted in Malaysia in the near future.

Malaysian exports to the USSR have exceeded the M\$200 million mark in recent years. On the other hand, sales to Malaysia from the USSR are relatively low, totalling only M\$7.5 million in 1968. The balance of trade is, therefore, heavily in favour of Malaysia. But it does not necessarily follow, Mr. Minister, from this imbalance that Malaysian exports to the USSR should remain static or be reduced. Our exports to you are high but they consist mainly of rubber and tin. Just as you, Mr. Minister, are hoping to increase your sales here, so would we like to export a wider range of Malaysian products to your country.

This industrial and trade exhibition is probably the best way open for Soviet Union to make known her products and to penetrate the Malaysian market which I can assure you is an attractive one. Besides having one of the most stable currencies in the world, our economy is also strong and buoyant. The size of import bill is surpassed only among all developing nations in South and Southeast Asia by a very few nations. Malaysia imports more per annum than any of the developing nations of Africa and most of the countries in Latin America.

Mr. Minister, your presence here together with a high-powered Soviet delegation clearly reflects the importance which your country attaches to this exhibition. This exhibition will, I am sure, enable Malaysian manufacturers and industrialists to see at first hand the wide range of products which are available, what they can do and their potentialities. I would also hope that the representatives of the various Soviet export firms who are here would take the opportunity of seeing for themselves just what it is that Malaysian manufacturers require because I think they will appreciate the fact that in international trade it is not just a question of buying what the other country produces but rather for the manufacturing country to export what the importing country wants. In other words, your exports should be tailored to meet the precise requirements of our manufacturers and industrialists.

I am sure that the holding of this trade and industrial exhibition would achieve this objective and would lead to greater economic co-operation between our two countries.

Once again, Your Excellency, we here are happy and honoured to welcome you and your delegation to this exhibition and to our country. I hope that you and members of your delegation, while you are here, will be able to see our country — meet and learn about our people at first hand.

Finally, Your Excellency, I do hope that you and your delegation will have a pleasant and enjoyable stay and that you will carry back with you happy memories of your visit to our country.

Now, I have great pleasure in declaring this exhibition open.

## MONETARY FUND AND WORLD BANK MEETING IN WASHINGTON

*Text of speech by the Enche Ali bin Haji Ahmad, Assistant Minister of Finance, Malaysia, and Governor of the World Bank for Malaysia, at the 1969 Annual Meeting of the Boards of Governors of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in Washington, D.C., on 30th September, 1969:—*

A quarter of a century has gone by since the Bretton Woods Conference of July 1944 which gave birth to the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. These 25 years have indeed been eventful years. The passage of time has neither diminished the need for nor the magnitude of the tasks facing these two organisations. On the contrary, a wider and more influential role is now being expected of the Fund and the Bank. Today, we see the Fund undergoing a further evolution of its functions as it moves forward to undertake the creation of a new reserve asset, the special drawing rights, to meet part of the growing shortage of world liquidity. Of more direct interest to the primary producing countries, both the Fund and the Bank, as their response to the Rio Resolutions, are introducing new approaches in assisting the stabilisation of the prices of primary products.

Since our last meeting, the international monetary system had gone through two further crisis, both of which represent a new source of instability to the system and have their origin in the relative strength of the Deutsche mark and the weakness of the French franc. Last month, the devaluation of the French franc removed part of the pressure in this area but the source of instability is unfortunately still present in the system and will continue to exist, unless all grounds are removed for speculation in the Deutsche mark. If we also examine the crisis that recently preceded these, namely, the devaluation of Sterling in November 1967 and the gold rush in March 1968, we shall find that all these have essentially the same root cause, that is, an inability or reluctance on the part of the national authorities to take effective and timely measures to correct a fundamental disequilibrium in their balance of payments. In the interest of a more stable world monetary system therefore, deficit countries must take appropriate measures, even if they are harsh, to correct their payments imbalance. At the same time, it is necessary for the surplus countries to be prepared to take more positive and timely measures in helping to facilitate the adjustment process. The world monetary system cannot indefinitely function smoothly when major currency countries fail to correct fundamental disequilibrium in their balance of payments position. The last quarter of this century has shown that the Bretton Woods system of stable exchange rates has served well the economic and financial interests of the world at large and if

these could emerge a greater diligence in observing the rules of the game, crises of confidence and speculation against the major currencies need not occur so frequently as in the past two years. To help achieve this objective, it would be useful for a serious appraisal to be made of past actions and to search for new approaches which could facilitate national authorities in making their contribution towards this end.

Monetary crises and currency speculation are by no means the only source of concern, particularly if these increase the vulnerability of the reserve currencies. The nature of the measures taken to correct payments disequilibrium is also of direct interest to the world at large. In this connection, we recognise that insofar as the United States is concerned there is a need for the authorities to control the growing inflationary pressures as failure to do so will have adverse consequences not only for the United States but also for the rest of the world. We also recognise that an early establishment of equilibrium in the balance of payments of the United States is necessary to ensure a firmer and more widespread confidence in the present world monetary system. However, in pressing towards these objectives, the United States authorities seem to have placed emphasis on monetary restraint, thereby contributing to an escalation of world interest rates. For the world and particularly for us in the developing countries, this is a very unsatisfactory state of affairs. We are now faced not only with the continuing problem of having to step up the flow of financial resources from the developed to the developing countries, but also the additional burden of more costly capital.

It is relevant here to point out that the rising market costs of borrowing have been used as a justification by the World Bank for raising its lending rate by  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent to 7 per cent with effect from August this year, the highest ever charged by the Bank. We do not of course agree that such a justification should apply to a development institution like the World Bank, especially when it has accumulated considerable reserves. But the fact still remains that the developing countries are now forced to accept a heavier burden on their borrowing through circumstances not of their own making.

Stability of the world monetary system is one of the basic conditions for a greater flow of resources to the developing countries. From this standpoint, we also place considerable importance to the efforts of the major countries to correct their payments imbalance. In the search for measures to achieve this goal, we therefore urge these countries to be more selective and adopt only those measures that will have minimal adverse effects on capital flows to the developing countries. In this connection it is interesting to note that the small payments surplus of the United States, in 1968 was achieved because the measures taken had turned the United States, the main exporter of capital since the Second World War, into a net importer of capital. We hope this incongruous situation will only be temporary since its prolongation must inevitably reduce the flow of capital to the developing countries.

I now turn to the subject of international liquidity. We are about to take a very important step in augmenting world reserves in a deliberate manner. On this matter, it bears repeating that we in the developing world have always been given an insignificant role in the decision-making process and that we shall also be given an insignificant portion of the special drawing rights to be created. We have always questioned the logic and even the morality of this because we consider that the magnitude of our needs for liquidity are not necessarily reflected by the size of our quotas in the International Monetary Fund. While we do not expect this inequitable basis of allocating special drawing rights to be changed in the near future, we feel that the effects of this system can in the meantime be mitigated. One approach that has considerable merit is for the major industrial countries to set aside for purposes of development aid the equivalent of a portion of what they will receive in special drawing rights. This is not a new proposal but one on which Governor Colombo of Italy has called for serious consideration at the last annual meetings.

When we consider the various assessments of the liquidity needs for the next three years that may be met by allocations of special drawing rights and note the wide differences between the various estimates, it is perhaps also not out of place to suggest here that further work is necessary to develop more refined methods for conducting future exercises of this kind. This seems to me to be a fundamental aspect of the process of deliberate reserve creation if special drawing rights are to serve their basic purpose.

In the field of conditional liquidity, an exercise is now in progress to increase the quotas of Fund member countries for the next five years. For the developing countries, one of their major sources of liquidity is the resources of the Fund and the degree of their access to this source is determined by the size of their Fund quotas. While some broad consensus appears to have already been reached among the major Fund members on the magnitude of an overall increase in quotas, the manner in which this overall increase is to be distributed is still an open issue. Whatever formulas for distribution are decided upon, I hope that at least the following basic principles are observed. Firstly, there should be a general increase in quotas for all members and this should be equitably distributed. Special increases over and above this general increase may be accorded to those members whose needs are evident. Of paramount importance, however, is that the overall effect of both general and special increases should not result in the developing countries having to reduce their proportionate share of the total Fund quotas. On this last point, it is needless for me to say that the present share of the quotas of developing countries at 28 per cent of the total is already small and should not be reduced further.

As one of the primary producing countries, Malaysia has been looking forward to the solutions that would emerge from the Resolutions we approved in Rio de Janeiro two years ago, urging the Fund and the Bank to seek out their roles in assisting the stabilisation of the prices of primary commodities. Our Central Bank, together with those of other Southeast Asian countries, have watched with keenness the development of these solutions. In the course of the discussion on these, the Governors of the Central Banks in Southeast Asia have presented the managements of the Fund and the Bank with two joint memoranda, setting out our common position on these matters. With the completion of the exercise by the Fund and the Bank and the decisions taken by their Executive Boards at the end of June, our Central Bankers have made an assessment of these policy decisions. It is sufficient for me to point out that the policy decisions constitute only a modest advance to what should have been a bold and comprehensive approach to the problems of commodity price stabilisation. With the approval of the Rio Resolutions, our hopes were raised that at last something of significance was going to emerge to solve the price stabilisation problem. I regret to say that the initiatives shown by the Fund and the Bank have been considerably circumscribed by the Articles of Agreement of these institutions. Until we are prepared to break out from the confines of legal fetters and change the Articles of Agreement where necessary and appropriate as in the case of the creation of special drawing rights, the problems of price instability will continue to plague primary producing countries and, if I may say so, also the consumer countries. It is therefore heartening to see that the Executive Directors of both the Fund and the Bank recognised the need for a future review of the policy decisions. I hope that this review will be carried out within a reasonable period of time and that the Fund and the World Bank would adopt a more progressive and positive outlook.

As we assemble here today, we see ourselves on the threshold of a more conscious and united effort to meet the momentous and growing problems that keep us from achieving a large measure of world prosperity. We must, however, recognise that the measures we now prepared to take are yet far from adequate or bold. If this awareness is shared by all, a more prosperous tomorrow now lies within our grasp. If not, we shall stand adjudged by future generations for lacking in will and co-operation to turn this single step into a giant stride.

## PRIME MINISTER'S ADDRESS AT U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY

*Text of statement by the Hon'ble Prime Minister of Malaysia, Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-haj, at the United Nations General Assembly in New York, on October 7, 1969.*

Madam President, Mr. Secretary-General, distinguished delegates,

I am particularly happy that on the first occasion that it has been my privilege to attend the U.N. General Assembly, I have come to this rostrum with a signal honour to offer my felicitations to a representative of what mere man learned to refer to as the better half of man. But, if I may say so, Madam President, your election to this high office is a tribute not to a lady who happens to be a diplomat but to an outstanding diplomat who has made lasting contributions to the work of the United Nations and who happens at the same time to be a lady of great warmth, cordiality and personal charm. You may say, Madam President, that I am merely talking platitudes or that others say the same thing. But it is not quite so, in my case. For the last 12 years it had been my ambition to attend the General Assembly. Now as luck would have it, I am making my presence here on this rostrum at the time when you, Madam, are the President.

Madam President, before proceeding further I would like to join with others in expressing my condolences and sympathies to the delegation of Guatemala on the sudden demise of that State's Foreign Minister, Mr. Arenales, who had served this organisation and its Specialised Agencies devotedly in many capacities, finally crowning them all as President of the 23rd session of the General Assembly, to which office he brought added lustre.

May I also be permitted, Madam President, speaking from this rostrum to take this opportunity to pay the highest tribute to the Secretary-General, U Thant, who has brought to his high office and difficult tasks, a rare skill and great courage and foresight which are a source of comfort and encouragement to so many of us amidst the trials and tribulations of the present-day world. We all remember that three years ago in response to universal and popular appeal he was persuaded to remain in his office for another term against his deepest personal inclinations and we have come to accept and respect his steady hand and his wise guidance almost as a matter of course. I do not wish this occasion to pass, however, without expressing our gratitude to him for all that he has done and all that he has stood for and achieved over the years.

Madam President, I have come here almost directly from the historic Muslim Summit Conference held in Rabat on 22nd to 25th September and I would like to

outline to the Assembly the significance and the outcome of that gathering. The Conference was the first of its kind where Heads of States and Governments and other representatives from Muslim countries have gathered together to discuss matters of common concern. The subjects of common concern were the usurpation of Palestine by Israel, thereby compromising the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem, and subsequently, while under their control, the sacrilege committed on Al-Aqsa Mosque which caused anger and humiliation to all Muslims. The holding of that Conference to which Muslim leaders came over great distances at quite short notice was an indication of the grave concern of the entire Muslim world regarding the situation in West Asia. It can be said therefore that the status and the future of the Holy City of Jerusalem is no longer a matter between Israel and Jordan only or even between Israel and the Arab States. It is a matter of the deepest and mutual concern to all Muslims throughout the world, and it was this widespread emotion and pressure of Muslim public opinion which brought the various Heads of States and Governments and other representatives to Rabat. What has happened in West Asia is a matter for the serious attention of world powers for sooner or later, unless some solution is found, it must draw all Muslim nations into the conflict because Muslims regard the occupation of Jerusalem by force as a humiliation and an insult to their religion.

Muslims everywhere therefore felt a great sense of shame and tragedy at what has occurred. This loss was made all the more bitter by the sacrilegious act of vandalism against the Holy Al-Aqsa Mosque for which the Muslims hold Israel responsible. It must be appreciated that the Al-Aqsa Mosque is the third most holy mosque of all Muslims and the place to which the Holy Prophet and his followers turned as the first Kiblat. Who among the Muslims can help but look to it with feelings of the most profound reverence? It is understandable therefore that Muslims everywhere should be profoundly affected by the events in West Asia. Unless therefore the United Nations takes firm action to enforce its decisions, then the pressure of public opinion in the Muslim world will certainly explode and force their leaders to take some drastic action which would have very serious consequences on world peace. Israel will have to reckon then not only with the Arab people but all Muslims.

The Resolutions adopted at the Rabat Conference were indeed restrained and statesman-like. But this restraint should not lead others to under-estimate the intensity of feeling and emotion around the Conference table. In this connection I would like here to express my disappointment in that there has been so little publicity in the Western press with regard to the Conference itself and what happened or what came out of the Conference. In fact one cannot help feeling that there was an attempt at sabotage of the Conference by Western powers through suppression of the news. The Heads of States or Governments, representatives from 25 countries representing some 600 million people, had come together to discuss a subject of vital importance to them which must on that score alone hold world interest and attention. It is very important that the public of Western countries should be made aware of, and should understand, the deep feelings and anxiety of Muslim peoples. In short the subject of discussions involved the question either of peace or war, on one side the Israelis, and the other the Arabs backed by the Muslims of the rest of the world.

The Resolutions adopted at the Rabat Conference were arrived at after a most careful study by all participating nations. This was mainly due to the presence and counsel of the non-Arab Muslims and I cannot accept any characterization of the Conference such as that made by the Israeli representative in respect of the membership of the Security Council that "one-third of (its) members are States whose diplomatic relations and sentimental predilections are exclusively confined to one side of the Middle Eastern dispute."

On principle however the resolutions taken there leave no room for any compromise. I refer in particular to the appeal of the Conference to members of the international community "to intensify their collective and individual efforts to secure the speedy withdrawal of Israeli military forces from all the territories occupied as

a result of the war of June 1967 in accordance with the established principle of the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by military conquest." In other words Muslims would not tolerate the acquisition of Jerusalem by the Israelis through conquest and are determined to dislodge them by any means possible. The four major powers, Britain, France, the Soviet Union and the United States, are urged in the words of Rabat Declaration, "to take into account the deep attachment of the followers of Islam to Jerusalem and the solemn resolve of their Governments to strive for its liberation." The major powers should heed the depth of conviction and feeling of Muslims throughout the world on this question which shows that if no progress is made to restore Jerusalem to the rightful owners, then sooner or later a crusade to recover it will start in earnest. How then can we prevent the sporadic fighting from escalating into a holy war with dangerous consequences to world peace?

We must therefore explore all possible avenues which would alleviate the present situation and bring us nearer a peaceful solution. The Rabat Conference has declared unacceptable any solution of the problem of Palestine which would deny Jerusalem the status it had before June 1967. This brings us back to Security Council Resolutions 252, 267 and 271, which clearly stated that the legislative and administrative action taken by Israel which tend to change the legal status of Jerusalem are invalid and have no valid effect on that status. If these resolutions could be enforced the nett result will be to restore that part of Jerusalem to its rightful owners. It is imperative for the United Nations to give effect to its decisions as otherwise the decisions taken will become valueless.

According to Israel representative who spoke in this August Assembly, Israel is ever ready to discuss peace with the Arab states and to negotiate terms for a settlement of the present trouble. According to him, I quote "I have come back to repeat with increased conviction what I said to the Arab Governments at this rostrum in June 1967: you have chosen repeatedly to meet us in the arena of battles, you cannot refuse to meet us at the negotiating table." That was well said but the question is whether the words carry the meaning or intention on the part of Israel to make peace with honour and justice. If the intention is there, then what is the objection to the Israelis withdrawing their military forces from all the territories occupied as a result of the war of June 1967, in accordance with the established principles of the United Nations as a prelude to the talks? If Israel agree to accept Resolution 242 of the Security Council and Resolution 252 and following Resolutions pertaining to Jerusalem, I am certain that the Arab states will agree to a dialogue that might lead to peace. Malaysia is one of the countries attending the Rabat Conference which recognises the United Nations decision to create Israel and she is willing to use her best endeavours towards a settlement of the dispute. But Malaysia is not prepared to offer her services where it is obvious to her that Israel by offering to hold dialogue is in fact talking from a position of strength with the one hand holding a gun and the other the pen offering, so they say, to sign the treaty of peace. No self-respecting people with any pride left in them would accept these terms. The only answer to such Israeli offer to discuss peace will be for the Arab nations to prepare for war.

It is obvious that Israel elated with her successes would not willingly return the occupied territories but can she hold them for all time — two million people against 100 million Arabs and now the whole of the Muslim people who are united in their determination to back the Arabs. They may hold it for a time but it will not be for all time and that would be at great sacrifice of lives and of money. That is clear. The time will come when they will have to give up this territory or even more.

The United Nations must take a firm stand now and bring pressure upon Israel to accept the decisions reached both in the General Assembly and the Security Council and the big powers must make it their duty to see that they are carried out. Lasting peace cannot be built on war machines but only on mutual respect and understanding and co-operation between the peoples of that region of Asia who are now locked together in deadly conflict. Are the Israelis prepared to accept the animosity of the other

Asian Muslim nations who are finding the former's attitude repugnant, hostile and arrogant?

Within the framework of what I have said and bearing in mind the urgent necessity of some positive action to break out of the present impasse, it is for consideration that as a temporary expedience and pending a final settlement, the United Nations itself should assume authority and jurisdiction over Jerusalem. According to the Israeli representative, "Israel does not claim exclusive or unilateral jurisdiction in the Holy places of Christianity and Islam in Jerusalem, and is willing to discuss this principle with those traditionally concerned. There is a versatile range of possibilities for working out a status for the Holy places in such a manner as to promote Middle Eastern peace and ecumenical harmony." If that is so, there is no reason why Israel cannot accept this proposal, which has as its objective mainly of protecting the sacred places in Jerusalem and to ensure that occurrence as in the case of the Al-Aqsa Mosque would not incite intense emotion and animosity and hatred towards any one particular race of people. I repeat that this will not be made at the sacrifice of the principle I have enunciated earlier namely the evacuation by Israel of the territories acquired by aggression.

I hope this idea which I have put forward in all sincerity and humility would carry enough weight so as to influence the United Nations to gain wider support for its resolutions already made.

I would like to turn next to an area much closer home to Malaysia, that is to the region of Southeast Asia which is going through a period of much change and uncertainty. It has long been my view that the countries of Southeast Asia must get together and work together to ensure their security, stability and prosperity. Indeed as long ago as 4th February 1958, only six months after our own independence, during an official visit to Ceylon, I urged that a meeting of Southeast Asian leaders should be held to forge unity in the region. This was, if I may say so, at a time more than ten years ago when the concept of regional co-operation was perhaps less fashionable than it is today. I said then that we in Southeast Asia were rich in natural resources and that we were also rich in high ideals of justice, human rights, liberty and freedom. But we also had many problems in common and I expressed my belief that the only way we could tackle our problems was by getting together, working together, and planning together even more closely. In that same speech I warned that if the countries in Southeast Asia continued to drift apart then the danger would be that we might have to lean for support on big nations with the result that independence, of which we set so much value, would come to have very much less meaning. I believed that the sentiments I expressed then retains their validity with equal, if not greater, force today.

Following upon that statement, my Government took the initiative to engage in consultations with our neighbours which led to the formation of ASA, the Association of Southeast Asia with three member-states in 1961. The limited membership and the long interval that passed before its formation were indicative of the difficulties and obstacles which stood in the way of regional co-operation. Since then we have made greater progress. In 1967 ASA enlarged its scope and increased its membership and now goes by the name of ASEAN or the Association of Southeast Asian Nations with Indonesia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Malaysia as members. After a brief lull in its activities, for reasons I need not now go into, I am happy to report that the work of ASEAN is now proceeding apace.

All the practical programmes so far discussed or undertaken at different levels in ASEAN have been consciously bent to economic, social and cultural co-operation. At the same time, Malaysia is already co-operating with some of her neighbours in other fields of co-operation. But while our attention and our efforts are being directed towards peaceful development with our neighbours, we are are faced at the same time with act of terrorism and subversion by enemies who are out to wreck our efforts in that region of Asia and who are forever trying to undo our good work in

order to create disorder and disturbance. These enemies find ready support from followers within our territories whose loyalty towards their country of origin make them tools ever ready to carry out the orders emanating from that source. It is a matter of great concern to us as to how to deal with them. They are subjects of our country by operation of law but their hearts and minds are subject to outside power, a new type of imperialism that tries to gain control of Southeast Asian countries by the exercise of influence over these traitors. Many of the countries in Southeast Asia have suffered in one form or another from the subversion and other acts of violence from these enemies. Above all, apart from troubles that they cause us, their activities involve us in much expenditure, time and planning which should have been directed for other peaceful purposes for the betterment of men.

The situation in that part of the world demands each and every country of Southeast Asia to see how best we can face our common dangers. Of course I do not mean by this that there should necessarily be a multilateral defence pact among the Southeast Asian countries. I know that this is in many ways impractical and even, in the view of some, undesirable. But the countries of Southeast Asia should keep in close touch and consultation with one another in the interest of our very survival and see what sort of understanding we can work out regarding the defence of the region in the 1970s. There are many ways we can co-operate. Malaysia is co-operating with our neighbour in the north, Thailand, in joint border operations and we are similarly co-operating with Indonesia in East Malaysia along the border in Sarawak. These are examples of the ways open to us to co-operate in our mutual interests. I repeat that there should be no hard-and-fast plan and no rigid framework for such co-operation. What is important is that every country in Southeast Asia should do its utmost to co-operate in every possible way with its neighbours and in this way a web of inter-locking arrangements would be established in the region which will further strengthen regional co-operation.

I have cited our co-operation in joint border operations with Thailand and with Indonesia. Likewise we are co-operating closely with Singapore on defence questions with the framework of the Five Powers Defence arrangements. All this is done in our efforts to face the threats to regional peace and security which we see all around us.

There is the conflict in Vietnam. A dangerous situation is developing in Laos and in the northern Thai border. Recently in my own capital-city there were the regrettable eruptions of 13th May caused by these same enemies and what is worse, the foreign press, and in particular those of the Commonwealth countries, reporting on the incidents purposely played them up to the advantage of the enemy. This irresponsible reporting calls for censure and no place is more suitable than this rostrum for me to apply it.

On May the 13th an event which shocked our nation and shock it to the core broke out and it was an event known as the "Riot of May 13th" which caused loss of lives and damage to property unprecedented in the history of our young nation. Such an unleashing of violence had never happened before in that happy country where people of different races lived together in tranquility and peace.

As a result of the outbreak of the violence foreign correspondents converged on the capital as if drawn by a magnet. They turned out in droves in the troubled areas. They were there to collect news and to transmit them to the readers of their countries. It was expected therefore that they would give a correct account of what was happening there in that unhappy city but instead they turned up to create sensation abroad taking the proverbial attitude that no news is good news unless it is accompanied by stories of horror, terror or acts of atrocities and they made the most of it, seemingly to gloat over our misfortunes. Seldom has any country had to put up with such misrepresentation, distortion of facts and corruption of truth as was suffered by us. Any gossip, any rumour that they picked up from street corners, from hooligans and rumours mongers was news to them and for the readers in their own

countries. In fact the general run of coverage by many foreign correspondents was so exaggerated as to be out of proportion to what happened. Their head offices abroad showed equal lack of balance in publishing the news and some even suggested that Malaysia should be expelled from the Commonwealth. In all honesty can such reporting be considered fair? If the riots had been going on for some weeks instead of five days and were out of control, if the Government had proved incompetent and unable to deal with the situation, then headlines as were flashed in these papers might have been justified. In fact the Government was in control and within three days of the outbreak of violence the worst part of the trouble was over.

In these days some newspapers are blatantly and outrageously irresponsible. They care not a jot for the truth of the subject matter they publish, all they seek is headline news and the more sensational the better. It was a heart-breaking experience for me to read the extracts of the reports appearing in newspapers and journals abroad for they did a lot of harm to the image of my country and to the good name of the leaders entrusted with its care and administration. The goodwill and friendship which Malaysia had gained in the short years of her independence received a setback with the scandalous strokes of their pens. The damage they did to my country by wildly exaggerated reports, misrepresentation of facts and editorial comments of armchair critics writing thousands of miles away was mischievous, unjustified and uncalled for. It was an irresponsible, careless journalism of the worst kind.

When I consider this lamentable chapter in journalism today which published the incredible stories we have had to read in respect of current events, world and domestic affairs, I feel that many Asian and African leaders have been justified in barring some journalists from their countries. The image their countries suffered or they themselves have suffered as a result of this type of journalism is sufficient reason for it. What happened in my country is a clear instance of this. We have had to face internal threats, which I spoke about, instigated from outside and the part played by the foreign press during that troubled period lent support to the enemies and did further harm to our cause. What is worse is that most of these correspondents and journalists came from countries of the Commonwealth, of which we are a member. What irony this is when a nation like ours confronted with a situation instigated by our enemies finds our friends ranged alongside them. That was the situation we faced. May this never happen again — so we seek the co-operation of the members of the press from friendly countries to help us through the exercise of care and balanced judgement in their reporting of events.

With your leave, Madam President, I might now make a brief reference to the matter of the Philippine claim to Sabah. It is a subject with which the Assembly is quite familiar and Malaysian representatives here have more than once over the last six years stated our position in full. All I want to say is this: after all the technicalities, the debating points and the dust have been cleared away, it is an incontrovertible fact that the people of Sabah have, by democratic processes, decided to be in Malaysia. This fact was affirmed by no less an authority than the Secretary-General himself, in response moreover to a request made by inter-alia the Philippines herself. Therefore, howsoever or in whatever forum the Philippines now wishes to pursue her claim, unless she can explain how she can expect us to ignore the simple but fundamental fact that the people of Sabah have exercised their right of self-determination, then there is nothing more to be said on this matter. What is disturbing to us is that by playing up the matter of this flimsy claim, our neighbour is playing into the enemy's hands.

Finally Madam President, I would like to turn to some of the outstanding issues facing this 24th session of the General Assembly. My delegation will speak at greater length in the subsequent discussions on these particular items but because of their importance or interest I would crave your indulgence to refer briefly to them now.

The death of Cape Town's best-known Muslim leader, Imam Abdullah Harun, who died in prison on Saturday 27 September after being held for more than four

months under the South African 180-day detention law reminds us again of man's inhumanity to man as a result of the policy of apartheid. I have long felt strongly about this disgraceful and despicable policy ruthlessly pursued by the Government of South Africa and took the initiative as long ago as 1960 to have her expelled from the Commonwealth and to boycott all trade with her. South Africa must also be held accountable for her defiance of the United Nations over Namibia. Then there is the situation in Rhodesia which has turned away from any liberalization of its regime and has sought to imitate the inhuman and racist policies of its Southern neighbour. I wish, for example, to draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that the Government of Rhodesia has by act of proclamation ordered Chief Rekayi and the tribe of Tangwena to leave their traditional home as the Government has claimed their land for white settlers. Such acts of injustice continue unabated unless effective sanctions are taken to put a stop to them. I would wish to point out now that, like the situation in West Asia, the entire situation in Southern Africa in all its ramifications is of concern to more than just the immediate neighbours or even to the countries of the African continent. I appeal therefore in particular to the major powers to do their utmost to defuse the time-bomb which is ticking inexorably before it explodes with incalculable consequences to us all.

I would like finally to refer to the imaginative proposal for an international university contained in the Secretary-General's introduction to his Annual Report. I hope that this idea would be explored at greater length because I believe that it is essential to channel the energies, ideas and the enthusiasm of youth along constructive lines. The restlessness of youth today is a world-wide and disturbing phenomenon. They must be provided with a challenge such as the challenge for international service or international economic development. I welcome the suggestion that the primary objective of the university would be to promote international understanding both at the political and cultural levels. Of course the establishment of an international university would not itself lead to the achievement of that objective. The university would need to evolve specific and positive programmes for promoting international understanding and for spreading its methods and influence to the various institutions of learning at all levels throughout the world.

Madam President, as we stand today on the threshold of the 25th anniversary of the United Nations, may I express the hope that this 24th session of the General Assembly under your able guidance will make progress along the road to international peace, economic development and social betterment for which all mankind have yearned since time immemorial. I pledge the full support and co-operation of my Government in that task.

## UNITED NATIONS DAY — OCTOBER 24

*Text of speech by Tun Abdul Razak bin Hussein, Director of Operations and President of the U.N. Association of Malaysia over Radio/TV on October 24, 1969.*

Today we celebrate the 24th Anniversary of the United Nations Organisation. As for many years now, I have chosen this occasion to address the Nation to renew in all hearts the ideals that are embodied in the Charter of the Organisation. Let us join with men of goodwill in other parts of the world to pledge our faith in this Organisation which was brought into being by the common will of Man for peace and international co-operation.

The United Nations Organisation was formed by 51 member nations in the wake of World War II with the avowed purpose of preventing a repetition of catastrophe. Its membership has now grown to 126. In the 24 years of its existence, the world body has rendered great services to mankind. We cannot forget how it saved the world from catastrophe by bringing peace and order to troubled areas around the world such as Korea, Suez, the Congo, Cyprus and Cuba. But an organisation like the U.N. cannot succeed in its aims without the support of all its members, who by the very fact of their membership, inherit the special responsibility of contributing in every way possible to the ultimate realisation of the purpose for which this Organisation was created, i.e. to promote the evolution of world order under conditions of peace, justice and prosperity.

It is unavoidable that an organisation such as this which groups almost all the independent nations of the world would have its share of difficulties and shortcomings. So many countries with so many different social, economic and political patterns will, on occasion, find themselves disagreeing. But in this very divergence and diversity lies the greatest merit of the Organisation which today offers to mankind the possibility of a meeting ground to expose their ideals and problems amid an international desire to uphold the peace and security of the world and promote better living standards everywhere.

To this end, it has rendered enormous services and contributed widely to assisting developing countries in their economic and social development, in bringing relief and rehabilitation to refugees, comforts to the sick and food to the needy. In this context of international help, it has been Malaysia's policy to give all the support it can to the activities of the Organisation.

Where our own needs are concerned, we have obtained substantial assistance from the U.N. through its agencies such as the International Monetary Fund and the

World Bank, which is assisting us in the Jengka Triangle project among other things. We have, so far, received from the World Bank project loans totalling M\$570 million. Through the United Nations Development Programme (U.N.D.P.) we have received valuable technical as well as monetary assistance for projects such as the setting up of a Food Technology Research and Development Centre and the expansion of the Faculty of Engineering of the University of Malaya.

In other ways too, we have benefited from membership of the world body. Using the facilities which it offers its members for frank discussion and peaceful negotiation, we have succeeded in reducing the tension created by the Philippine's claim to Sabah and have made it known internationally that it is our foremost wish to have the friendliest relations with all our neighbours. One of the guidelines of our foreign policy has always been total respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other countries. In return we ask for similar respect for them.

Since the time Malaysia became independent, the main preoccupation of her Government has been the maintenance of peace, both abroad in her relations with other countries and at home. We have concentrated all our efforts of attaining and maintaining peace because we believe that it is the primary ingredient for everything else, for the promotion of social well-being, for economic growth as well as the political stability.

It is to be deeply regretted that in May of this year this peace which had become an integral part of our lives in Malaysia, was so tragically disrupted. But we were determined not to let this solitary disharmonious note mar our chances of happiness. We have since managed with the passage of time and the goodwill and confidence of the people to surmount this temporary incursion of violence into an otherwise peaceful existence. Let us continue to strive for this peaceful life through racial harmony, subduing personal animosities and ambitions to the general and national cause. Just as a family cannot withstand the trials of life unless there is co-operation from all its members, so too a young and multi-racial nation like ours cannot withstand the trials and difficulties of political, social and economic evolution without a sincere desire and will from everyone to work for its healthy growth. Let us find in the aims and functions of the U.N. a new incentive for further efforts to safeguard our national well-being and happiness.

In accordance with the U.N. Charter which calls for international co-operation, Malaysia has formed together with Thailand, Singapore, the Philippines and Indonesia, a regional grouping now known as ASEAN all over the world. Its objective is to promote among its members better understanding and greater friendship through cultural and economic exchanges. The Organisation has had its share of problems but its members are determined to continue with this worthwhile enterprise and work together for its success. This is one of the most positive ways in which we have shown our support of the U.N. Charter.

If we look back on the 24 years that the U.N. has existed, we find that it has had some spectacular successes but much more enduring and noteworthy are the unobtrusive services which it constantly renders to mankind through its example and through its social, humanitarian and technical assistance.

On this occasion of its 24th anniversary, I should like to renew Malaysia's belief in the standards and goals which form the Charter of the Organisation. One hundred and twenty six (126) Nations united in a common aim and working together are bound to produce some good results and it is with this optimistic prognostic that I end my tribute to a great organisation, and call on you to pledge your support of an organisation which stands for peace and goodwill in a troubled world.

## PRIME MINISTER'S ADDRESS AT THE OPENING OF ASEAN MEETING

*Opening statement by the Hon'ble Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra, at the ASEAN Foreign Ministers' Meeting at Cameron Highlands on December 16, 1969:—*

Let me at the outset extend to you all the warmest of welcomes to our country. The mountain air outside may be a little chilly but I assure you that it does not reflect in any way the warmth of our feeling and our pleasure that you, our close friends and neighbours in Southeast Asia, have come to meet here on this important occasion of the Third ASEAN Ministerial Meeting. I am particularly pleased to welcome you to Cameron Highlands because it was here in April 1962 that ASA, the precursor of our present organisation ASEAN met in a special session of the Foreign Ministers, which was the first working session of the organisation at Ministerial level. That meeting set in train a great number of projects and plans for the benefit of the countries of our particular region of Southeast Asia. I am hopeful that the fruitful and constructive outcome of that meeting is a happy augury in the attainment of a similar objective at our present meeting.

A gathering such as this provides the opportunity of renewing old friendships and making new ones. It is some time since I have had the pleasure of meeting and discussing matters of mutual concern with my old friends, Dr. Adam Malik, the Foreign Minister of Indonesia, Mr. Rajaratnam, the Foreign Minister of Singapore and Tun Thanat Khoman, the Foreign Minister of Thailand, one of the keen and enthusiastic promoter or sponsor of Southeast Asian regional co-operation and one of the original movers for the formation of ASA and ASEAN, and I look forward to frank and useful discussions with them. I also look forward to the participation in our discussions of General Carlos Romulo, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, who is — if I may so put it — an old friend in a new surrounding. This is, I believe, his first visit to Malaysia as Foreign Secretary and I would therefore especially like to extend a warm welcome to him and to express the hope that he will find his stay among friends here a happy one. This is the first time that we have the pleasure of welcoming observers from Vietnam and Laos and present here today with us as official guests of the Malaysian Government, are Mr. Tran Van Lam from the Republic of Vietnam and Mr. Khamphan Panya from the Kingdom of Laos.

It is now some two years since the Ministers of our five respective Governments met in Bangkok to sign the historic ASEAN Declaration, which itself had its genesis in the earlier Bangkok Declaration which established ASA in 1961. Under the

brisk and imaginative leadership of Dr. Adam Malik, a great deal of the spade work of preparation and planning was done when the Standing Committee was at Jakarta in the year following the signing of the ASEAN Declaration. In the last one year, however, when the Standing Committee was brought to Kuala Lumpur, we must frankly note that there has been much less activity. In fact, except for meetings held in the last month or so, there has been no ASEAN meeting at all since about September last year. I do not regard this however as any indication that ASEAN was dead or dying because the ideals and compulsions which brought us together would always remain uppermost in our hearts and minds. Rather, it has been a dormant period, a period of suspension in the activity of ASEAN, something which ASA had earlier experienced. It gives us room for thought as to the value of ASEAN and to plan for its success. We have therefore at this meeting a number of subjects to discuss and let us enter into it with whole-hearted determination.

I feel it is only right that we should make our stand clear with regard to ASEAN, so that there can be no doubt as to the benefit of having this organisation for the promotion of social and economic understanding among us — the countries in Southeast Asia. It is a matter of paramount importance that we should get together and work together for the common good of member-countries in particular and of the region in general. The combined size of Southeast Asian countries is small and for us to live in isolation will make it even smaller in the eyes of the world. On the other hand, the potential wealth of the countries of Southeast Asia is comparable to the richest in the world. Therefore so much advantage or good can be derived from joint co-operative effort of all the countries concerned. But the main trouble with people of Southeast Asia is that we tend to overlook the importance of the role we must play but instead we find delight in indulging in pretty squabbles.

Looking back at the experience of ASA and then of ASEAN over the years, I should like to speak openly and frankly on this matter. It is no use talking platitudes when the fate of our people depends on what we jointly can do for them. For us to achieve any success in regional co-operation, there must be genuine good faith, goodwill and understanding among us all. We must truly be good neighbours, who have feelings of mutual respect and friendship for one another, who are open and frank with each other and who entertain no ill-will or covet any design or selfish motive in our dealings with each other. ASEAN cannot succeed if there is any suspicion and mistrust among its members. Without genuine goodwill among us, the edifice of ASEAN which we are attempting to build will have a foundation of shifting sand. Let me therefore say frankly that the atmosphere of suspicion and mistrust which clouded over relations with the Philippines last year unfortunately resulted in the suspension of the activities of ASEAN. It is now my pleasure and privilege to announce that as a result of my discussions with General Romulo, it is agreed that in the spirit of goodwill and friendship diplomatic relations between Malaysia and the Philippines will be normalised forthwith and the Ambassadors of the respective countries will be appointed. This shows the great value we place on ASEAN and what we think it can do for the good of our countries and peoples. It is my earnest hope that we have now permanently succeeded in overcoming whatever problem we may have so that we can now embark on a fresh start and forge ahead with our various plans and programmes in regional co-operation.

I should like to mention one other matter which has given me much pain in the last year. I refer to the attitude of a number of the people and the press in some of our member countries to the tragic events which occurred in Malaysia last May. Instead of sympathising with us in our hour of stress and strain, they gloated over our difficulties. Instead of the press at least giving fair and accurate coverage of the disturbances, they gave exaggerated and even invented versions; they gave the most lurid account they could think of and they gave the most outrageous explanations they could find. They were downright unfair in distorting facts for the sake of a good

copy, purposely putting forward the most biased and one-sided explanations they could invent. I regret this exceedingly. Surely there must be increasing awareness in our respective countries that we are inevitably inter-linked? Troubles and instability in any one of our countries must be a matter of concern to all of us and as friends and neighbours we should offer all the sympathy and all the help that we can. Let us hope that the press in our respective countries will help to create a picture of truly good neighbours as among us in the future and that Malaysia's unhappy experience at their hands will not occur again. Indeed, they can play a most useful role in bringing our peoples together and fostering a greater awareness of our common problems and our common destiny.

I should like to turn away from these negative features of the past year and look ahead to the future. In this connection, I wish to refer to the positive and forward-looking statement which Dr. Adam Malik made in a recent article when among other things he was reported to have said:—

“I look far beyond more confederation between Indonesia and Malaysia. I think the survival of the nations of Southeast Asia would depend on their ability to develop beyond the old-fashioned nationalism. We should widen our common interests and our common responsibilities and of course our common loyalties. We should grow beyond our national borders and co-operate for our common security and prosperity”.

I think I should need to explain first of all that confederation between Malaysia and Indonesia is not a subject which is exercising the minds of our respective Governments and according to Dr. Malik he was misreported as having made reference to our association in those terms. That having been said, let me express my complete agreement with the sentiments on regional co-operation which Dr. Malik set forth in the article which I have just quoted above. Indeed we must do all we can to strengthen and develop co-operation among all the countries in the region who share the same ideals of peace and freedom, progress and prosperity, based on complete understanding and goodwill which transcends the narrow confines of our zealous nationalisms or great power associations of the past.

As someone who has long believed in the importance — indeed in the necessity — of regional co-operation, it is a matter of personal gratification to me that we have made some progress in that direction in the last decade, albeit in fits and starts. I well recall speaking in February 1958, at a time when the subject of regional co-operation was less widely accepted than it is today, when I called for a meeting of Southeast Asian leaders in the not too distant future to forge unity in the region. I said then that we were rich in natural resources and we were also rich in the high ideals of justice, human rights, liberty and freedom but at the same time we also had many problems in common and I expressed by belief that the only way we could tackle our problems was by getting together, working together and planning together ever more closely. Almost 12 years have passed since I expressed those sentiments. They have guided the work and the efforts of my Government over the last decade and they will continue to do so in the years ahead. I believe that those sentiments are not less valid today than when I expressed them 12 long years ago.

Indeed, if anything, they may even have greater relevance today. The region of Southeast Asia in which we are placed and from which we cannot escape unlike other powers who have made their presence here from time to time, is going through a period of great stress and change and uncertainty. With British military withdrawal from Malaysia and Singapore and the projected American withdrawal from Vietnam, and with the renewed interest of certain other powers in the region, the years ahead may indeed be years of great challenge. But a time of danger is also a time of opportunity. Can we rise to the challenge and demonstrate that we truly mean it when we say that the peace, progress and prosperity of Southeast Asia is the primary con-

cern of all of us in Southeast Asia? Can ASEAN, this body for regional co-operation which we have created of our own free will, as the result of our own initiative and own method of approach, meet the challenge of the 70s?

Of course the way ahead is full of difficulties, as we only know too well from past experience. In spite of these difficulties, or perhaps I should say because of them — we should all do our utmost consciously to pursue a policy of peaceful co-operation with our neighbours not only in a multi-lateral organisation such as ASEAN but also bilaterally which would include bilateral co-operation with countries that are not at the present time members of ASEAN. In this way we would bring about an atmosphere of goodwill and mutual trust and harmony among the countries of the region and we would create an enmeshing network of bilateral arrangements between and among the different countries of Southeast Asia which is itself a form of regional co-operation. For far too long our countries and our peoples have looked outside the region for assistance and have felt more drawn to those countries outside the region with which for historical and other reasons they have been associated. The formation of ASA in 1961 and of ASEAN in 1967 have reversed this tendency. It is also my hope and my dream that one day we might put ASEAN on a practical and organised basis by establishing a permanent Secretariat.

We the countries and peoples of Southeast Asia must practise self-help, we must live together in peace and harmony, we must co-operate together and rely on each other for sustenance and strength before we can expect to receive assistance from our other friends.

This organisations of ours, ASEAN, and before her, ASA, have been buffeted and tossed by many devious and evil forces in the last few years. Despite the time we have lost as a result of these difficulties, I believe we have come out all the stronger for these experiences, even more strengthened in our conviction of our common destiny and our common responsibilities to forge a harmonious, peaceful and prosperous region of Southeast Asian nations. As we stand today on the threshold of the 70s, I believe we have emerged from our experiences in the past decade with the right blend of imagination and realism to achieve the objectives which we have jointly set ourselves.

I now have pleasure in declaring open the Third Meeting of the Foreign Ministers of ASEAN.



The Third Ministerial Meeting of ASEAN was held in Cameron Highlands, Malaysia. It was at this mid-December 1969 meeting that Malaysia and the Philippines announced the immediate normalisation of diplomatic relations. Picture shows Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman addressing the opening session of the meeting.

## ASEAN MEETING: TUN RAZAK'S STATEMENT

*The Deputy Prime Minister, Tun Abdul Razak bin Hussein, made the following statement at the Third ASEAN Ministerial Meeting at Cameron Highlands on December 16, 1969.*

On behalf of the Malaysian Delegation and on behalf of the Government of Malaysia, I wish to sustain and support the statement expressed by the Prime Minister in extending our warmest and sincere welcome to our distinguished guests from our neighbours and the many able diplomats, experts, including golfers, they brought along with them to this Conference — the 3rd Ministerial meeting of ASEAN.

I would like to take this opportunity to welcome Mr. Adam Malik once again to this country. Mr. Adam Malik is an ardent believer of regional co-operation and his tireless efforts and boundless energy have contributed towards the strengthening of this Organisation.

It is my personal wish to meet His Excellency Mr. Carlos Romulo who is paying his first official visit as Foreign Secretary to this country. His vast and rich experience in international affairs will no doubt be a great asset to this Conference as well as to this Organisation of ours.

We are all delighted to hear the announcement by the Prime Minister that the Philippine and Malaysian Governments had agreed to normalise relations and exchange Ambassadors. It is, in my view, the happiest news for this Conference and, I am sure, will go a long way towards generating a happy and cordial atmosphere in our deliberations. In coming to this happy decision, the two Governments obviously had the interest of ASEAN uppermost in their minds.

I am equally happy to see once again Mr. Rajaratnam from our close neighbour, Singapore. Mr. Rajaratnam is a regular visitor to Malaysia. He is also a strong and firm believer in regional co-operation.

I am also pleased to see my good friend and distinguished colleague, Tun Thanat Khoman, who, as you know, has been Foreign Minister of Thailand for many years and he is a long-standing figure in regional co-operation.

I should also like to welcome as our official guests at this Conference His Excellency Mr. Khamphan Panya, the Foreign Minister of Laos, and His Excellency Mr. Tran Van Lam, the Foreign Minister of Vietnam. The presence of the representatives of these two Asian countries clearly shows the interest that these two countries, in particular, and the rest of Asia, have in the aims and purpose of ASEAN.

Distinguished Colleagues:

It is a real pleasure for me to welcome you to Cameron Highlands with its refreshing and cool air and informality which I hope will generate a happy and cordial atmosphere to this meeting of ours. Cameron Highlands is indeed and appropriate place for our meeting because, as our Prime Minister has explained, it was here in April 1962 that the first working Session of ASA met at ministerial level. As this place is essentially a holiday resort and accommodation and other facilities are limited, I would like to apologise if there are any shortcomings in arrangements we made for this Conference.

It is now just over two years since we last met in the great and beautiful city of Bangkok to launch this Organisation of ours, ASEAN. At that meeting I stated that our Association had already recorded an achievement in that the work of bringing our countries together had been characterised by informality, by sport-shirt diplomacy and by an unusual lack of oratory.

I said then also that I would like to regard this as an established ASEAN tradition that we speak little in public but do much quietly. Looking back over these two years, we have followed this tradition closely — our officials had met in various committees for long hours and had achieved much for our Organisation but in quiet and with little publicity.

Today, again we meet amidst surroundings of informality of a hill resort where we hope to spend part of our time in informal discussion as well as in relaxation. I feel strongly that this tradition of informality of ASEAN should be continued because it is only by mixing together and discussing in an informal and friendly atmosphere that we can rebuild, as the Prime Minister said, the genuine good faith, goodwill and understanding among us. After all, a regional organisation such as ours cannot be expected to achieve anything unless it is based on a foundation of real feeling of goodwill, mutual respect and understanding and friendship for one another.

Therefore, this informal gathering and efforts to achieve a meeting of minds on matters of common interest are essential towards the building of trust and confidence which must be the foundation of the progress of ASEAN.

Distinguished Colleagues:

Our Organisation is just two years old. It had been well and truly launched, but it also had its teething troubles. But, one thing is clear and that is during the last two years, it started to transmit its message of regional co-operation and development to all our people and to this region of Southeast Asia. It is, therefore, our duty now to fulfil this message — to embark on a programme of action which is realistic and, at the same time, imaginative so that step by step, we shall build the edifice of regional co-operation and regional solidarity.

Distinguished Colleagues:

With the establishment of ASEAN, we have taken a firm and bold step forward towards building and strengthening regional co-operation of this region of Southeast Asia.

We in Malaysia have always believed strongly in regional co-operation and we see no other choice for newly developed countries of Southeast Asia but to shape our own destiny together and to prevent external intervention and interference.

Most of us have been dominated by colonial powers either directly or indirectly and even today we are not entirely free from the struggle for domination by outside powers.

Therefore, unless we are conscious of our responsibilities and ready to take decisive and collective actions to prevent the growth of inter-regional conflicts, our nations will continue to be manipulated against one another. The colonial powers have retreated from this region and the vacuum left by them must be filled by the growth of our own collective power and collective will to survive and prosper; otherwise, our future, individually and jointly, will remain dangerously threatened.

### Distinguished Colleagues:

While we are having our deliberations here, we are actually seeing the close of the present decade and the coming of the 70's. I have not doubt that the 70's will bring new problems and greater challenge to all of us.

We, therefore, must have the determination and the will to meet this challenge and demonstrate clearly that we in Southeast Asia have the capacity of shaping our destiny in our way and that we are determined to achieve peace, progress and prosperity for all of us in this region.

We in Malaysia have always attached the greatest attention to working together with our neighbours in whatever field of co-operation which could bring about mutual benefit and prosperity to this region — in economic field with personal contacts, mutual consultation and exchange of views among the leaders, experts and technocrats from the respective country, new ideas and technique brought to light in development in the effort of achieving economic progress and economic expansion.

Being developing countries, our most important problem is to raise the standard of living of our people to give them a better deal and a better way of life. Here, we in Malaysia, believe that we can only achieve our goal of economic development if we can look beyond our borders and work together regionally or internationally. By concerted actions, by pooling our resources to define lines of action, we would be better able to come to grip with economic problems.

With this in view, Malaysia initiated a number of regional seminars on development and had established a Centre for Development Studies which organised from time to time regional seminars on development. That is why I heartily welcome President Marcos' proposal made during his visit to Malaysia in January 1968 that there should be established an economic development council for Southeast Asia, and I would request that this be studied by the Secretariat and brought under the wing of ASEAN.

Looking at the record of last year and this year, I believe ASEAN is steadily moving forward though somewhat slowly but surely. Our officials and experts have met on many occasions to plan and consult one another.

At this meeting, we are laying another structure of foundation to ASEAN with the signing of the agreement on ASEAN Fund and mass media and other activities. With the establishment of the modest ASEAN Fund, we will be able to embark on the exercise of identifying projects and to work out bigger projects for ASEAN. With the implementation of the projects and programmes of mass media and other activities, ASEAN would be more understood and its presence felt among the masses and that through sports and games and other activities involving our youth in schools and universities, the spirit of regional co-operation will be established in the minds of the younger generations and perhaps in their generations the impact of ASEAN will be felt even greater.

### Distinguished Colleagues:

Our Organisation was launched on the 8th of August 1967. The first two years of its existence have been years of planning and preparation. The years ahead should be years of implementation, of translating our plans into action, of providing quick and fruitful results for all our people to see. Our region of Southeast Asia contains vast potential — potential for prosperity and progress.

As I said before and I say it again that the key to the success of our Organisation, the peace and stability of our respective country and our region lies in our ability to surmount the backwardness of our people and to promote their welfare and their well-being. I would like to stress again that our collective efforts to eradicate poverty, disease and ignorance should be our main pre-occupation and we must meet the hopes and aspirations of our people and give them a new deal with all our energies and our resources.

Let us, therefore, steer this ship of ours ASEAN with vigour and determination towards the goal that we have firmly and clearly set ourselves.

## ASEAN MEETING: JOINT COMMUNIQUE

*The following joint communique was issued at the end of the Third ASEAN Ministerial Meeting in Cameron Highlands this afternoon, December 17, 1969:—*

The Third ASEAN Ministerial meeting was held at Cameron Highlands on the 16th and 17th December 1969. The meeting was attended by His Excellency Dr. Adam Malik, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, the Hon'ble Mr. Carlos P. Romulo, Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, His Excellency Mr. S. Rajaratnam, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Singapore, His Excellency Tun Thanat Khoman, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Thailand, and His Excellency Tun Abdul Razak, Deputy Prime Minister of Malaysia. The Foreign Minister of the Kingdom of Laos and the Republic of Vietnam were present as official guests of the Malaysian Government. The meeting was chaired by His Excellency Tun Abdul Razak and the Hon'ble Mr. Carlos P. Romulo was elected Vice-Chairman.

The meeting was declared open by the Honourable the Prime Minister of Malaysia, Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-haj. In his address, the Prime Minister extended to all delegates present the warmest of welcomes to Malaysia and remarked that it was a matter of paramount importance that ASEAN countries should get together and work together for the common good of the group in particular and of the region in general. He announced that as a result of a discussion between him and the Hon'ble Mr. Carlos P. Romulo, Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, in the spirit of goodwill and friendship and because of the great value Malaysia and the Philippines placed on ASEAN, it was agreed that diplomatic relations between Malaysia and the Philippines would be normalised forthwith and that the Ambassadors of their respective countries would be appointed. The meeting warmly welcomed this happy development.

Throughout the course of deliberation, an atmosphere of cordial friendship and understanding prevailed and, cognizant of the common interests and common goal of member countries, the Ministers reaffirmed their determination to fulfil and to realise the laudable aims and purposes of the ASEAN Declaration in order to ensure peace and prosperity for all the peoples in the region. Renewed determination was expressed to strengthen further the Organisation and to take vigorous action to implement the projects which had been approved by the Ministers.

The Ministers accepted the Report of the Standing Committee in Kuala Lumpur. The Report covered the activities and embodied recommendations submitted by the eight *ad hoc*, permanent and other committees of ASEAN during the past year. It

The Third Ministerial meeting of ASEAN brought together Foreign Ministers of Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand and the Philippines to seek ways and means of bringing about togetherness among member nations. Picture shows (from left) Tun Thanat Khoman (Thailand), Tun Abdul Razak (Malaysia), Mr. Carlos P. Romulo (The Philippines), Tun Adam Malik (Indonesia) and Mr. S. Rajaratnam (Singapore).



showed the extent and scope of the progress achieved in the implementation of projects considered by the committees. Some of the projects were bi-lateral in nature while other were multi-lateral in nature. These projects and recommendations were formulated and implemented to fulfil the aims and purposes of ASEAN in the economic, cultural, technical and administrative areas of co-operation.

The Ministers approved all the 98 recommendations contained in the Report, covering projects for co-operation among ASEAN countries in the fields of commerce and industry, tourism, shipping, civil aviation, air traffic services and meteorology, transportation and communication, food supply and production, including fisheries, mass media, cultural activities and finance.

The Minister also agreed to transform the *ad hoc* committees on finance, commerce and industry, tourism, transportation and communications, into permanent committees in response to a need for their continuing function.

The Ministers signed two agreements, namely, an agreement for the establishment of an ASEAN Fund and an agreement for the promotion of co-operation in mass media and cultural activities.

They also agreed to hold the next Ministerial meeting of ASEAN in the Philippines and, consequently, the seat of the Standing Committee for the next year would be in Manila.

The Ministers expressed their sincere appreciation to the Government and people of Malaysia and the ASEAN National Secretariat of Malaysia for the warm and generous hospitality and the efficient facilities provided for the meeting.

## PRESENTATION OF CREDENTIALS IN MALAYSIA FOR 1969

- January 15 His Excellency Mr. G.J. de Cragg, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Netherlands, presented Letters of Credence to His Majesty the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong at Istana Negara, Kuala Lumpur.
- His Excellency Mr. Amin Magzoub Abdoun, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Sudan, presented Letters of Credence to His Majesty the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong at Istana Negara, Kuala Lumpur. (Resident in New Delhi)
- January 22 His Excellency Tan Sri Abdol Hossein Hamzavi, P.M.N., Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Iran, presented Letters of Credence to His Majesty the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong at Istana Negara, Kuala Lumpur. (Resident in Bangkok)
- February 26 His Excellency Mr. Jean Bourgaux, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Belgium, presented Letters of Credence to His Majesty the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong at Istana Negara, Kuala Lumpur.
- His Excellency Dr. Werner Sautter, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Austria, presented Letters of Credence to His Majesty the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong at Istana Negara, Kuala Lumpur. (Resident in Bangkok)
- June 24 His Excellency Mr. Karl Borge Raavad, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Denmark, presented Letters of Credence to His Majesty the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong at Istana Negara, Kuala Lumpur.
- June 24 His Excellency Mr. R.L. Hutchens, High Commissioner for New Zealand, presented Letters of Credence to His Majesty the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong at Istana Negara, Kuala Lumpur.
- June 25 His Excellency Shri K.C. Nair, High Commissioner for India,

presented Letters of Credence to His Majesty the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong, at Istana Negara, Kuala Lumpur.

- July 16 His Excellency Mr. J.R. Rowland, High Commissioner for Australia, presented Letters of Credence to His Majesty the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong at Istana Negara, Kuala Lumpur.
- August 27 His Excellency Mr. Maurice Baker, High Commissioner for the Republic of Singapore presented Letters of Credence to His Majesty the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong at Istana Negara, Kuala Lumpur.
- October 8 His Excellency Mr. Jack W. Lydman, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America, presented Letters of Credence to His Majesty the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong at Istana Negara, Kuala Lumpur.
-



The Malaysian Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman (second from right) having discussions with the visiting Soviet Minister for Foreign Trade, Mr. N.S. Patolichev (left). Looking on is Mr. Y. Vislousov, (second from left) an interpreter, and the Minister of Commerce and Industry, Tan Sri (Dr.) Lim Swee Aun (right).



Signing of a joint communique to set up diplomatic relations and trade agreement between the Government of Malaysia and the Socialist Republic of Romania. Picture shows the Deputy Prime Minister Tun Abdul Razak bin Hussein (right) signing for Malaysia while his Romanian counterpart, Mr.Gheorghe Radulescu, signing for his country.

# DIARY OF EVENTS FOR 1969

## JANUARY

- January 2 The establishment of diplomatic relations between Malaysia and Bulgaria.
- January 7 — 15 The Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference was held in London.

## FEBRUARY

- February 24 — 28 Mr. N.S. Patolichev, the Minister of Foreign Trade of the U.S.S.R., arrived in Kuala Lumpur for a 5-day official visit to Malaysia.

## MARCH

- March 20 — 22 Mr. Gheorghe Radulescu, the Deputy Prime Minister of the Socialist Republic of Romania, who led a 10-man delegation arrived in Kuala Lumpur for a 3-day visit to Malaysia.
- March 22 Signing of a joint communique to set up diplomatic relations and trade agreement between the Government of Malaysia and the Socialist Republic of Romania was held in Kuala Lumpur.

## APRIL

- April 3 — 6 The Fourth Ministerial Conference for Economic Development of Southeast Asia was held in Bangkok.
- April 6 — 12 Their Majesties the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong and the Raja Permaisuri Agong paid a State visit to Iran;
- April 12 — 14 An unofficial visit to Switzerland; and
- April 14 — 19 A State visit to the Federal Republic of Germany.
- April 21 — 28 | The International Islamic Conference was held in Kuala Lumpur with 100 delegates and observers from 23 countries.
- April 26 The Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman met the Head of the Al-Fatah delegation, Mr. Abu Hisham, who requested permission to establish an office in Malaysia for the purpose of collecting funds and securing assistance for the Arab refugees who have been driven from their homeland. The Prime Minister agreed in principle.



Their Majesties' State visit to Iran. Picture shows (from left) Their Majesties the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong of Malaysia, the Shahanshah of Iran, the Raja Permaisuri Agong of Malaysia and the Shahbanou of Iran.

April 29 — Their Majesties the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong and the Raja Permaisuri Agong paid a State visit to the Republic of Korea at the invitation of His Excellency President Park Chung-hee and Madam Park.

May 30 — 31 **MAY**  
Mr. David Thomson, New Zealand Defence Minister arrived in Kuala Lumpur for a two-day visit to Malaysia. He had talks with the Malaysian Ministers and defence officials.

June 9 — 11 **JUNE**  
The 4th Ministerial Meeting of Asian and Pacific Council opened at Ito in Japan. The Minister of Commerce and Industry, Enche Mohd. Khir Johari, led the Malaysia's 3-member delegation to the Meeting.

June 19 — 20 The Five-Power Defence Talks was held in Canberra.

June 21 The British Defence Secretary, Mr. Denis Healy paid a short visit to Malaysia after the five-power defence talks in Canberra.

June 26 A Trade Agreement between the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Malaysia was signed in Kuala Lumpur.

June 26 The Malaysian Government announced it would send an observer to the Consultative Council of Non-Aligned Nations in Belgrade on July 8, 1969.

June 30 Mr. W.A.C. Mathieson, leader of the four-man British aid-survey team, arrive in Kuala Lumpur for talks with the Malaysian leaders on British aid to Malaysia in view of the British withdrawal.

### **JULY**

July 4 — 8 Mr. Habib Bourguiba, Jr. Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Tunisia, arrived in Kuala Lumpur for a 5-day official visit to Malaysia.

July 7 The signing of Malaysia/Tunisia Cultural and Consular Agreements was held in Kuala Lumpur.

July 24 — 26 The Conference of Malaysian Heads of Missions in Asia and the Pacific was held in Kuala Lumpur.

### **AUGUST**

August 2 The Malaysian Government accepted the appointment of His Excellency Mr. Maurice Baker, as the new Singapore High Commissioner to Malaysia in succession to His Excellency Mr. Lien Ying Chow.

August 8 The Deputy Prime Minister, Tun Abdul Razak bin Hussein and his wife attended the 150th anniversary celebrations of the Republic of Singapore.

August 12 The Malaysian Government announced the appointment of Mr. Lim Taik Choon, as Malaysia's first resident High Commissioner to New Zealand. He was formerly Executive Director of the Asian Development Bank in Manila.



Their Majesties' State visit to Federal Republic of Germany. Picture shows (second from left) President Dr. Heinrich Lubke, His Majesty the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong, Her Majesty the Raja Permaisuri Agong and Frau Lubke.

- August 12 The Malaysian Government accepted the appointment of Mr. Gyanendra Bahadur Karki as the new Nepalese Ambassador to Malaysia to succeed Mr. G.B. Yakthumba.
- August 27 — 30 The Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman opening a 4-day Cultural Conference attended by delegates from 12 countries, said more emphasis should be placed on common heritage, rather than the differences of the people of Southeast Asia in the search for regional co-operation.

### SEPTEMBER

- September 5 Their Majesties the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong and the Raja Permaisuri Agong received in audience the Cambodian Minister of Education and Culture, Dr. Vann Molyvann and his wife at the Istana Negara, Kuala Lumpur.
- September 7 An Air Services Agreement between Ceylon and Malaysia was signed at Colombo.
- September 8 Malaysia was invited to sit on the Preparatory Committee Meeting at foreign ministers level, of the proposed Islamic Conference on the issue of Baitul-Maqdis Jerusalem in Rabat, Morocco.
- September 12 Malaysia protested against burning of Al-Aqsa Mosque at UN Meeting.
- September 15 — 17 The First Meeting of the ASEAN Permanent Committee on Communications, Air Traffic Services and Meteorology was held in Kuala Lumpur.
- September 16 An Air Services Agreement between Malaysia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic was initialled in Kuala Lumpur, following the successful conclusion of negotiations between delegations from both countries.
- September 17 Singapore's Minister for Interior and Defence, Mr. Lim Kim San, accompanied by the Republic's Minister for Law and National Development, Mr. E.W. Barker, called on the Deputy Prime Minister, Tun Abdul Razak bin Hussein, to discuss matters on defence and common concern.
- September 18 While on a fact-finding tour of Southeast Asia, ten British Members of Parliament, led by Mr. Joseph Harper, paid a 2-day visit to Malaysia. They called on the Deputy Prime Minister, Tun Abdul Razak bin Hussein and Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tan Sri Muhammad Ghazali bin Shafie in Kuala Lumpur.
- September 21 — 29 Mr. M.R. Kuzmin, First Deputy Minister of U.S.S.R. Ministry of Foreign Trade, led an 8-man trade delegation to visit Malaysia, in connection with the Soviet Trade and Industrial Exhibition held in Kuala Lumpur.
- September 22 — 24 The Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-Haj, attended the Islamic Summit Conference at Rabat, Morocco, to discuss the burning of the Al-Aqsa Mosque and the subject of the Holy City of Jerusalem.
- September 22 A Joint Statement was issued by the Indonesian and Malaysian delegations after the talks on the delimitation of the Continental shelf between the two countries.



Signing of the Malaysia/Tunisia Cultural and Consular Agreement between the Deputy Prime Minister of Malaysia, Tun Abdul Razak bin Hussein (centre) and the visiting Tunisia Secretary of State for Foreign affairs Mr. Bourguiba Jr. (left).

## OCTOBER

- October 1 Australian Defence Minister, Mr. Allen Fairhall, arrived in Kuala Lumpur for discussions on defence and to hand over a gift of 10 Sabre jets to the Royal Malaysian Air Force.
- October 1 — 5 Her Excellency Tun Farideh Diba, mother of Her Majesty the Shahbanou of Iran and President of the National Parent-Teachers' Association of Iran, arrived in Kuala Lumpur for a 5-day official visit to Malaysia.
- October 8 — 11 The Rt. Hon'ble the Lord Mayor of London, Sir Charles Trinder, G.B.E. and Lady Elaine Trinder paid a visit to Malaysia.
- October 27 The signing of the Continental Shelf Agreement between Malaysia and Indonesia took place in Kuala Lumpur.
- October 27 The Malaysian Government announced the appointment of Enche Mohd. Sopiee bin Sheikh Ibrahim as Malaysian's High Commissioner to Pakistan.

## NOVEMBER

- November 4 — 6 The Five-Power Defence Talks which was held at Permanent Secretaries' level met in Kuala Lumpur.
- November 18 — 20 An ASEAN Meeting of Mass Media Officials was held in Kuala Lumpur to consider effective ways of promoting Mass Media and related activities among the member countries. There were proposals on co-operation in the fields of radio, television, film and other cultural activities.
- November 21 Malaysia and Bulgaria initialled an Air Services Agreement in Kuala Lumpur.
- November 25 — 27 An ASEAN Meeting on Civil Aviation was held in Singapore.
- November 27 An Air Services Agreement between the Government of the U.S.S.R. and the Government of Malaysia was signed in Kuala Lumpur.
- November 28 —  
December 4 Dr. Phan Quang Dan, Minister of State of Republic of Vietnam paid a six-day official visit to Malaysia.

## DECEMBER

- December 16 The Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman announced normalisation of diplomatic relations between Malaysia and the Philippines broken 17 months earlier over Manila's claim to Sabah.
- December 16 — 17 The Third ASEAN Ministerial Meeting was held at Cameron Highlands, Malaysia.
- December 16 — 18 Cordial consultations were held between the Indonesian and Malaysian Aeronautical Authorities in Jakarta for the purpose of reviewing existing bilateral air arrangements within the framework of the air services agreement between Indonesia and Malaysia signed on May 6, 1968.
- December 27 Malaysia established diplomatic relations with Hungary.