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FOREWORD

This collection of documents constitutes only a small part of the numerous speeches, papers and special statements made available at the Bandung Conference, but it is hoped that it will be found useful by students of Asian affairs until the full proceedings of the Conference have been published. The speeches have been selected from materials available at present in New York and are designed to reflect at least something of the different points of view expressed at the Conference. No claim is made that the selection represents all important attitudes or national policies described at Bandung. The texts have been reproduced from those published in the New York Times or issued by the Indonesian Mission to the United Nations, New York. A considerable number of other Bandung Conference speeches have also been issued by the Indonesian Mission. These include speeches by representatives of Pakistan, India, Burma, Thailand, northern Vietnam and Japan.

A factual and statistical handbook entitled Asia and Africa in the Modern World, prepared by the staffs of the Asian Relations Organization and the Indian Council of World Affairs in New Delhi, was distributed to members of the Bandung Conference. Arrangements have been made for this book, which contains brief descriptions of the countries invited to the Conference, to be distributed in the United States by the International Secretariat of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

William L. Holland
Secretary General

New York
May 26, 1955
Text of the Speech by President Soekarno of the Republic of Indonesia at the Opening of the Asian-African Conference in Bandung, Indonesia, on April 18, 1955.

It is my great honor and privilege on this historic day to bid you welcome to Indonesia. On behalf of the people and Government of Indonesia your hosts I beg your understanding and forbearance if some circumstances in our country do not meet your expectations. We have done our best to make your stay amongst us a memorable one for both our guests and your hosts. We hope that the warmth of our welcome will compensate for whatever material shortcomings there may be.

As I survey this Hall and the distinguished guests gathered here, my heart is filled with emotion. This is the first intercontinental conference of colored peoples in the history of mankind. I am proud that my country is your host, and happy that you were able to accept the invitation extended by the five sponsoring countries. But I also cannot restrain feelings of sadness when I recall the tribulations through which many of our peoples so recently passed. Tribulations which exacted a heavy toll in life, in material things and in things of the spirit. I recognize that we have gathered here today as a result of sacrifices, sacrifices made by our forefathers and by peoples of our own and of younger generations. For me this Hall is filled with and contains the undying, indomitable and invincible spirit of those who went before us. Their struggle and their sacrifice paved the way for this meeting.

It is a new departure in the history of the world that leaders of Asian and African peoples can meet together in their own countries to discuss and deliberate upon matters of common concern. I recall in this connection, the conference of the "League Against Imperialism and Colonialism", which was held in Brussels almost thirty years ago. At that conference, many distinguished delegates who are present here today met to discuss their fight for independence. But that was a meeting place thousands of miles away, amidst foreign peoples, in a foreign country and in a foreign continent. It wasn't assembled there by choice, but by necessity. The contrast today is great. Our nations and countries are no longer colonies. Now we are free, sovereign and independent. We are again masters in our own house. We don't need to go to other continents to confer together.

My thoughts are not, however, wholly on the honour which is Indonesia's today. My mind is in part darkened by other considerations. You have not gathered together in a world of peace and unity and cooperation. Great chasms yawn between nations and groups within nations. Our unhappy world is torn and tortured, and peoples of all countries walk in fear lest, through no fault of their own, dogs of war are unchained once again. The burden resting upon the delegates is not a light one, for I know that questions of life or death of humanity itself must be on your minds, as they are on mine. And the nations of Asia and Africa cannot, even if they so wished, avoid doing their part in finding solutions to these problems.

For many generations our peoples were the voiceless ones in the world, disregarded and living in poverty and humiliation. Then our nations demanded - nay fought - for independence and achieved independence, and with
that independence came responsibility. But we do not regret that. In 1945, the first year of our national revolution, we of Indonesia were confronted with the question of what we were going to do with our independence when it was finally attained and secured - we never questioned that it would be attained and secured. We knew how to oppose and to destroy. But then we were suddenly confronted with the necessity of giving content and meaning to our independence. Not material content and meaning only, but also ethical and moral content; for independence without ethics and without morality would be indeed a poor imitation of what we sought.

How terrifically dynamic is our time! I recall that several years ago I made a public statement on imperialism, which I called the "Life-line of Imperialism". This line runs from the Strait of Gibraltar through the Mediterranean, Suez Canal, Red Sea, Indian Ocean, South China Sea and the Sea of Japan. For most of that enormous distance, territories on both sides of this lifeline were colonies, the peoples were unfree and their futures were mortgaged to an alien system. Along that lifeline was pumped the life blood of colonialism.

Today, there are gathered together in this Hall the leaders of those same peoples. They are no longer victims of colonialism; no longer tools of others and playthings of forces which they cannot influence. Today you are the representatives of free peoples. Yes, there has indeed been a "storm over Asia" and over Africa too.

In the last fifty years there have been more developments and more material progress than in the previous five hundred years. Man has learned to control many of the scourges which once threatened him. But has man's political skill marched hand-in-hand with his technical and scientific skill? The answer is "no". The political skill of man has been far outstripped by his technical skill, and what he has made he cannot be sure of controlling. The result of this is fear and man gasps for safety and morality. Perhaps now in the history of world society, governments and statesmanship need to be based upon the highest code of morality and ethics. And in political terms, what is the highest code of morality? It is the subordination of everything to the well-being of mankind. Many who are in places of high power think, rather, of controlling the world.

Man today is corroded and made bitter by fear, Fear of the future, fear of the hydrogen bomb, fear of ideologies. In your deliberations, don't be guided by these fears, but be guided by hopes and determination, be guided by ideals and, yes, be guided by dreams. We come from many different nations, different social backgrounds and cultural patterns, etc. But what does that matter? Mankind is united or divided by considerations other than these. Conflict comes not from variety of skins nor from variety of religion, but from variety of desires. All of us are united by more important things than those which superficially divide us. We are united by a common detestation of colonialism in whatever form it appears, by a common detestation of racialism and a common determination to preserve and to stabilize peace in the world. I freely confess that as regards these aims, I am not disinterested or driven by purely impersonal motives.
How is it possible to be disinterested about colonialism? For us, colonialism is not something far off and distant. We have known it in all its ruthlessness and we have seen the immense human wasteage it causes, the poverty it causes and the heritage it leaves behind when it is eventually and reluctantly driven out by the inevitable march of history. We have experienced all this. We cannot yet say that all parts of our countries are already free. No people can feel themselves free so long as a part of their motherland is unfree. There is no such thing as being half free, as there is no such thing as being half alive. We are often told "colonialism is dead". How can we say it is dead so long as vast areas of Asia and Africa are unfree. Colonialism also has its modern dress in the form of economic control, intellectual control and actual physical control by a small but alien community within a nation. Wherever, whenever and however it appears, colonialism is an evil thing and one which must be eradicated from the earth.

The battle against colonialism has been a long one, and do you know that today is a famous anniversary in that battle? On April 18th, 1775, Paul Revere rode at midnight through the New England countryside warning of the approach of the British troops and the opening of the American war of Independence, the first successful anti-colonial war in history. About this midnight ride, the poet Longfellow wrote: "a cry of defiance and not of fear, a voice in the darkness, a knock at the door, and a word that shall echo for evermore". Yes, it shall echo for evermore. But remember that the battle which began 150 years ago is not yet completely won. Therefore, I am not disinterested when I speak of the fight against colonialism.

Nor am I disinterested when I speak of the battle for peace. Not so very long ago we argued that peace was necessary for us because an outbreak of fighting in our part of the world would imperil our precious independence, so recently won at such a great cost. Today, the picture is more bleak. War would not only mean a threat to our independence, it may mean the end of civilization and even of human life. No task is more urgent than that of preserving peace. Otherwise, the rebuilding and upbuilding of our countries will have little meaning. Our revolutions will not be allowed to run their course. What can we do? The peoples of Asia and Africa wield little physical power. Even their economic strength is dispersed and slight. We cannot indulge in power politics. Diplomacy for us is not a matter of the big stick. Our statesmen, by and large, are not backed up with serried ranks of bombers.

What can we do? We can do much! We can inject the voice of reason into world affairs and mobilize all the spiritual, all the moral, all the political strength of Asia and Africa on the side of peace. Asia and Africa 1,400,000 strong - far more than half of the human population - can mobilize what I have called the moral voice of nations in favour of peace. We can demonstrate to the minority of the world, which lives on other continents, that we, the majority, are for peace, not for war. In this struggle, some success has already been scored. I think it is generally recognized that the activities of the five Premiers of the sponsoring countries had a not unimportant role to play in ending the fighting in IndoChina. The peoples of Asia raised their voices and the world listened. It was no small victory.
and no negligible precedent. Why were these five successful? Was it because they were Asians? Maybe that is part of the answer, for the conflagration was on their doorstep. But I think that these five Premiers brought a fresh approach to bear on the problem. They were not seeking advantage for their own countries.

The days are now long past when the future of Asia can be settled by other and distant peoples. However, splendid isolation may once have been possible; it is no longer. As I survey this Hall, my thoughts go back to another conference of Asian peoples. In the beginning of 1949, my country was for a second time since our proclamation of independence engaged in a life and death struggle. Issues were being decided not in the conference chamber, but on the battlefield. Our envoys there were rifles and cannon and bombs and grenades and bamboo spears. We were blockaded physically and intellectually. It was at that sad but glorious moment in our national history that our good neighbour India convened a conference of Asian and African nations in New Delhi to protest against the injustice committed against Indonesia and to give support to our struggle. The intellectual blockade was broken. Our delegates flew to New Delhi and learned at first hand of the massive support which was being given to our struggle for national existence. We were given fresh courage then to press our struggle onwards to its final successful conclusion. Perhaps in some ways the Conference which has assembled here today has some roots in that manifestation of Asian-African solidarity six years ago. However that may be, the fact remains that everyone of you bears a heavy responsibility and I pray to God that that responsibility will be discharged with courage and wisdom.

Let this Conference be a great success. In the spirit of diversity that exists among its participants - let this Conference be a great success. Yes, there is diversity among us. Small and great nations are represented here, with people professing almost every religion under the sun - Buddhism, Islam, Christianity, Shintoism and others. We encounter here almost every political faith - democracy, monarchism, theocracy, with innumerable variants. And practically every economic doctrine has its representative in this Hall - marhaenism, socialism, capitalism, communism - in all their manifold variations and combinations. But what harm is there in diversity, when there is unity in desire? It is a Brotherhood Conference, not an Islamic nor a Christian nor a Buddhist Conference. It is not a meeting of Malays nor of Arabs nor one of Indo-Aryan stock. Neither is it an exclusive club or a bloc which seeks to propose any other bloc. Rather it is a body of enlightened, tolerant opinion, which seeks to impress on the world that all men and all countries have their place under the sun - to impress on the world that it is possible to live together, meet together, speak to each other without losing one’s individual identity; and yet to contribute to the general understanding of matters of common concern and to develop a true consciousness of the interdependence of men and nations for their well-being and survival on earth.

Religion is of dominating importance, particularly in this part of the world. There are perhaps more religions here than in other regions of the globe. But again, each of our countries is true to its religion, has its own history, its own individuality, its own "raison d’etre", its special pride in its own beliefs, its own mission and its special
truths which it desires to propagate. But unless we realize that all
great religions are one in their message of tolerance and in their insis-
tence on the observance of the principle of "live and let live", unless
the followers of each religion are prepared to give the same considera-
tion to the rights of others everywhere, unless every State does its
duty to ensure that the same rights are given to the followers of all
faiths - unless these things are one, religion is debased and its true
purpose perverted.

Indonesia is Asia-Africa in small. It is a country with many
religions and many faiths. But, thank God, we have our will to unity.
We have our Pencak Silat. We practice the "live and let live" principle.
We are tolerant towards each other. "Bhinneka Tunggalika" is the motto
of the Indonesian State. We are one nation. Take the "live and let
live" principle and the "unity in diversity" motto the unifying force
which brings us all together - to seek in friendly, uninhibited discussion
the ways and means by which each of us can live his own life and let
others live their own lives in their own way, in harmony and in peace.
If we succeed in doing so, the effect it will have for freedom, inde-
pendence and the welfare of man will be great for the world at large.
Failure will mean that the light of understanding which seemed to have
dawned in the East - the light towards which looked all the great
religions born here in the past - has again been obscured by unfriendly
clouds before man has had the chance to benefit from its warm radiance.

Relatively speaking, all of us gathered here today are neighbours.
Almost all of us have ties of common experience - the experience of
colonialism. Many of us have a common religion, common cultural roots
and the so-called "underdeveloped" nations have more or less similar
economic problems. Therefore, each can profit from the other's experi-
ence and help. Yes, we have so much in common and yet, we know so
little about each other. If this Conference succeeds in making the
peoples of the East understand each other a little more, appreciate
each other a little more, sympathize with each other's problems a little
more - if those things happen, then this Conference will, of course,
have been worthwhile, whatever else it may achieve.

But I hope that this Conference will do more than reaching only
understanding and goodwill. I hope that it will falsify and give the
lie to the saying of one diplomat from abroad: "We will turn this Asian-
African Conference into an afternoon tea party". Asia and Africa can
prosper only when they are united, and even the safety of the world
at large cannot be safeguarded without a united Asia-Africa. I hope
that this Conference will give guidance to mankind, will point out to
mankind the way which it must take to attain safety and peace. I hope
that it will give evidence that Asia and Africa have been reborn; may,
that a new Asia and a new Africa have been born.

Our task is first to seek understanding between each other, and out
of that understanding will come a greater appreciation of each other,
and out of that appreciation will come collective action. Bear in mind
the words of one of Asia's greatest sons: "To speak is easy. To act is
hard. To understand is hardest. Once one understands, action is easy."

I have come to the end of my remarks. Under God, may your deliber-
tions be fruitful and may your wisdom strike sparks of light from the
hard flints of today's circumstances. Let us remember that for the sake
of all, we Asian and Africans must be united.
We meet today on an historic occasion. A critical juncture has arrived not only in the history of the Afro-Asian region but the history of mankind. Not merely those nations now menaced by the immediate threat of war, but with them, and because of them, the entire human race stands on the brink of chaos, ready at the least miscalculation or lapse of vigilance to plunge forever into abyss. The Great Powers who within recent generations have guided the destinies of mankind have brought themselves and us to this calamity. The danger that confronts us now is one in comparison with which the fall of a dynasty or the disintegration of an Empire is a thing of little moment. The danger is in fact nothing less than the total destruction of that collective civilization which the nations of the world have laboured over the centuries to produce; nothing less than the complete annihilation of mankind.

If this danger is to be averted, it is clear that what is wanted is a shift of emphasis, a change of heart, in the methods whereby the statesmen and leaders of today are trying to preserve what remains of world peace. The argument of physical force must yield to the argument of spiritual power. Hitherto the approach adopted to problems of international peace has been one based on considerations of relative military strength. The old heresy goes - that if you want peace you must prepare for war. As a result, nations have armed themselves to the teeth against neighbours and increased their armed might to a point where the least dispute can trigger a conflagration sufficient to involve the whole world. Today, the nations are indeed prepared for war - and furthermore from the prospect of peace. Their strength brings no security, their armaments no defence.

The pass to which humanity has been brought by the domination and doctrine of force is the most vivid demonstration of the bankruptcy of force. Of what advantage is it to hold sway over vast territories, to have at one's command innumerable armies, to be able at the touch of a button to unleash the deadliest weapons science can invent, if, all this, we are unable to rid ourselves of fear and hysteria and despair?

No one delights in this age of anxiety. All the world wants peace - the big nations no less than small ones. But the great powers have failed to achieve it, and have made it perilously difficult for others to maintain, because their negotiations have been tainted by mutual suspicion and mistrust and their policies governed and conditioned by a panic-stricken race for military superiority. This addiction to the philosophy of fear, this competition in the technology of terror, has led to the inevitable breakdown of every concrete suggestion put forward in the West for the limitation of armaments or for the banning of nuclear weapons. The nations on whom the responsibility has hitherto devolved of preserving the world's present armed truce, or planning its future peace, are at a loss. They are hag-ridden by the demon of progress, the monsters their scientists have created. Neither their science nor their statesmanship can afford them any protection. Their diplomacy has failed in its efforts to devise machinery for the limita-
tions of armaments by mutual consent or to set up an acceptable international authority for the inspection and supervision of nuclear weapons.

In these urgent and vital tasks, where the wisdom of the West has failed, is it possible that the nations of Asia and Africa can hope to succeed? I think it is. Have the nations of this region in fact anything to offer? I think they have. Has the time come to offer it? I think it has. I say then, in all seriousness and in all humility that the peoples of this region have it in their power to apply to the problems of the present day world, and for the first time in history, that traditional respect for the spiritual values of life and for the dignity of the human personality, which is the distinguishing feature of all their great religions,

Since I speak as a Buddhist I will venture to quote from the Dhammapada, the great repository of Buddhist devotion and practice, a verse in which we are vividly reminded of the nature of the spiritual values of which I spoke just now. It reads:

If a man were to conquer in battle a thousand times a thousand men, and another conquer one, himself, he indeed is the greatest of conquerors. (Dhammapada, 103).

A continent, or an assembly of nations from different continents, which accepts this philosophy and attempts, however imperfectly and unsuccessfully, to practice it, can speak with authority in the councils of the world and has a right to be heard. And this authority, this right to be heard, is not diminished or abated by the fact that some of the countries concerned, my own among them, are small, and all are relatively weak, impoverished and underdeveloped.

The countries of this region have a further claim upon the attention of the mighty and upon the deliberations of the peacemakers. We of Asia and Africa have a common interest in peace, and a common desire to achieve it, though some of us differ as to how it should be done. Not one country in this whole region manufactures nuclear weapons; most of them are ill equipped even with the conventional implements of war that date from the pre-atomic age. When the great powers of the West talk peace, their chances of agreement are weakened by the fact that each suspects the others strength. We, by contrast, come to the Conference weak and relatively unarmed. We have no thermonuclear bombs in our pockets, no weapons of chemical or bacteriological warfare up our sleeves, no plans for armament factories or blueprints for ever more deadly methods of genocide in our brief cases.

We have, however, I venture to believe, something which the great and the mighty lack. That something is the strength of our weakness - the ability which our very defencelessness confers to offer ourselves as mediators in the dispute between the giants of Communism and anti-Communism which, if fought out to an end, will deluge the world in blood and leave the earth infected with atomic radiation for generations yet unborn or never to be born.
I urge then that on behalf of the nations represented here, comprising as they do some two-thirds of the population of the world, we here and now offer formally our services as mediators. I am confident that all of you assembled here will wish to make such an offer, and that it will carry to the outside world the weight and cogency of our unanimity. In a world driven to the verge of madness by the omnipresent spectres of fear and violence and hatred, from which it is unable to escape, it is our historic privilege and our solemn duty to offer the hope, however belated and remote, of a way out.

Moreover, I am confident that among us in this region can be found a group acceptable to both parties in the great world dispute, and capable as an impartial intermediary of working out a plan for peace and creating suitable machinery to implement it. I am confident too that to such a group we can delegate the authority to speak on behalf of Afro-Asia as a whole, and that the authority so delegated will not lightly be disregarded abroad.

A few months hence the Charter of the United Nations is due to come up for revision. The countries of Asia and Africa will then have an historic opportunity to demand that the U.N.O. be reconstructed so that it can be in fact what it was intended to be in theory - an effective instrument of peace, and not merely a forum for the wrangling of opposed power groups. When the United Nations Organization was originally conceived at Yalta, the Big Three then looked forward to a continuation after the war of the wartime alliance between their countries. This assumption underlay the whole structure of the United Nations, dominated as it was by the five permanent members of the Security Council, each armed with their big stick power of veto. It was hoped that these five countries, with their strength of arms, would be able to intervene unitedly and effectively in any dispute anywhere and act as custodians of the peace.

Now, ten years after the United Nations was founded, the wartime alliance has broken up into two hostile camps, which themselves threaten the peace they were intended to safeguard. They are both armed with the most terrifying weapons of destruction that man has ever possessed and they seem more likely to use them to annihilate the world than to preserve its peace. It is not the United Nations which has preserved the uneasy peace of the last decade. In all the major issues of world politics, such as the Korean and Indo-Chinese disputes, negotiations for settlement have had to be carried on outside the framework of the United Nations. And the new Asia and Africa can justly take pride in the not unimportant role that some of the nations of this region have played in helping to bring these settlements about. But as the time approaches to revise the Charter, let us face the fact that the United Nations Organization no longer reflects the realities of world politics today. What is needed, and what we of Asia and Africa can appropriately demand, is that the United Nations Organization should be so reconstituted as to become a fully representative organ of the peoples of the world, in which all nations can meet on free and equal terms.
The time has gone by when the function of small countries in world affairs could be summed up by the words used by one of the war leaders at Yalta: "The eagle should permit the small birds to sing and care not whereof they sing".

Today, on the contrary, the salvation of the world depends not on the great powers, but on the lesser countries of the world. And I am sure that if Asia and Africa put forward an unambiguous and united demand for the reconstitution of the United Nations, by abolishing the veto and converting the Security Council into a fully elected body responsible to the General Assembly, it will meet with powerful response from all the smaller nations of the world.

Such a reform will also throw open the United Nations to these countries, whatever their political character, who are at present being kept out by the exercise of the veto by the great power or another.

And for my part, I am strongly of the opinion that a place should be found within the United Nations, at least as associate members, for these peoples who are still subject to colonial rule. Though they might have to be represented initially by nominees of the imperial powers let us hope it will not be long before colonialism is cast into the junk-heap of history, and those peoples are able to take their place in equality and with pride beside the other independent nations of the world.

The Asian and African countries, if they stand together, can unquestionably make their voice heard in world affairs and serve as the mediators and the guardians of world peace. But the rest of the world will not listen to us unless we are ourselves united in goodwill and free from mutual conflicts. We have to prove by example to other nations that our own international disputes can be settled without resort to force. This Conference will be missing a great opportunity if, before we part, we do not pledge ourselves solemnly and wholeheartedly, to abjure war as a means of settling differences, to resolve all disputes by peaceful negotiation and to abstain from any form of interference in each other's internal affairs. What does this involve in practice? I think it requires, apart from the mutual pledges I have indicated, that we should set up some adequate organization to which any disputes arising between any of us can be referred for peaceful settlement. When we have removed whatever sources of mistrust, suspicion and fear that subsists between ourselves, then, and only then, can we stand before the rest of the world and speak to them loud and bold the message of peace, armed with the authority of moral force.

We, the nations of the new Asia and Africa, whatever our language, whatever our faiths, whatever our form of government, whatever the colour of our skin — black, brown or yellow — have one thing in common: we are all poor and underdeveloped. Centuries of servitude and stagnation have left their mark, a dire heritage of poverty and ignorance, upon the masses of our peoples. All our ideologies and religions urge us, in the name of social justice and human compassion, to rid our countries of this evil of poverty, the times demand of us that we should do it, and also in the name of peace. Poverty is the greatest of social evil from which all others spring. Poverty creates envy between countries and covetousness of each other's possessions; it sets individual against individual and
nation against nation. From economic plenty, on the other hand - not the plenty achieved by the exploitation of men or nation, but the plenty attained by mutual co-operation for the common good - from such plenty springs both national and international peace. It is my earnest hope, therefore, that this Conference will give rise to effective and concrete proposals for economic co-operation within our region, so that we may all march together towards the common goal of prosperity.

As I conclude, the subject of peace is very much in my thoughts and very near to my heart as a follower of one of the great religions to which Asia has given birth. The heritage of Buddhism is one of the most precious possessions of my country and it is a heritage which we share with several other countries represented at this Conference. Indeed, whatever religion we profess, we cannot but be at one on the question of peace. For the great teachers of all religions are agreed that it is through compassion, peace and goodwill that mankind can find salvation. As a Buddhist, I should like to quote to you the words in which the Enlightened one expressed this fundamental truth.

"Not at any time are emnities appeased here through emnity but they are appeased through non-emnity. This is the eternal law."

In whatever terms we choose to formulate it, it is this message above all that we can offer to a world which appears to be bent on destroying itself through mutual emnities. Here is a wisdom which draws its power from the spiritual inheritance of our countries but which has never been more significant or urgent than it is today for all mankind. If we can conduct our discussions here in its light and by its guidance, if we can maintain and consolidate the goodwill that has brought us here together today, if we can show it forth, in practice as in precept, as an example to all nations and disseminate its spirit among them - then surely Bandung will be a name to reverberate in history and earn the gratitude and blessings of ages to come.
Opening Statement by the Honorable Carlos P. Romulo

I am proud to bring to this Conference the greetings of the President and people of the Republic of the Philippines.

We of the Philippines have a profound sense of the great historic events dramatized by this unique gathering; we were, may I remind you, the first of the new nations to emerge in the great re-arrangement of the world which began after the end of the Second World War. Our Republic came to being, freely and peacefully, on July 4, 1946. Since that time we have watched with proud solicitude and a feeling of oneness the establishment of the other independent nations of a free Asia, so old and yet so new. We have in these nine years taken our stand firmly behind the struggle of every people to become master of its own fate, to enjoy its own identity, to be responsible for its own acts, to join in the immense task of building a new structure of human well-being and free institutions, the task, indeed, of changing the face of the world. To the peoples of Africa, already setting forth on this same path, we pledge our friendship and all the moral and practical support within our power to give as they join us of Asia in the great universal effort to better man's estate.

We come as members of one great family long separated from each other. In this family reunion we are here to talk of man's estate. But I do not think it will serve us well to have come here from our many corners of the earth to shroud the truth about man's estate in platitudes, propaganda, or easy self-deception. The world is too harsh a place for this, our problems too great, too perilous, too complicated to allow us this luxury.

This Conference will justify itself if we share our views frankly and realistically as brothers should. We will serve each other if we examine ourselves, if we state the issues and problems plainly as we see them, if we clarify, as far as we can, our needs, our choices, our goals — and our obstacles. Let us seek a true meeting of minds on those we share in common and where there are differences, let us try at least to understand them.

All who are represented here are certainly concerned with the issues of 1) colonialism and political freedom; 2) racial equality; and 3) peaceful economic growth. The history of the world in our time turns on the ways in which these issues are met and resolved, or not met and not resolved. We are part, all of us, of a time of great transformation, for each of us and for all the people on earth. It is a trying, difficult, dangerous time — but with it all a good time to be living in. Never before, surely, have so many people been consciously a part of the history through which they were living.

We in this room are, for our brief moment, a part of this history. How do we see it? How do we understand it?
To begin with, the very fact that we have come together here in this manner illustrates the great new fact that these issues of freedom, equality, and growth are no longer merely national problems but world problems. Indeed, the United Nations was created as an attempt to grapple with this great new fact. In one sense this Conference suggests that for the peoples of Asia and Africa the United Nations has inadequately met the need for establishing common ground for peoples seeking peaceful change and development. But I think we must also say that if the United Nations has been weak and limited in its progress toward these goals, it is because the United Nations is still much more a mirror of the world than an effective instrument for changing it. It has been in existence only nine years and through that time always subject to all the pressures and difficulties of national rivalries and power conflicts, large and small. It is a place where man, not quite yet a reasonable animal, is trying very hard to become one.

We do not have to be satisfied with the rate of progress being made. But neither can we be blind to the great changes that have taken place in so short a time. The world is a very different place from what it was a scant fifteen years ago and hence the United Nations is a very different body from the old League of Nations. A primary difference is the presence of the new spokesmen for Asian and African people who never allow the Western representatives to forget that the United Nations Charter pledged the freedom and self-determination of all peoples and that there are peoples in Asia and Africa who take that pledge with literal seriousness, and who will not rest until it is redeemed.

The majority of independent nations represented here won their independence only within the last decade. Who would have been bold enough, twenty years ago, to predict that this would be so? Who will be bold enough now to say how soon or how slowly those peoples in Africa strong enough to win it will acquire the right to face their own problems in their own way on their own responsibility? The handwriting of history is spread on the wall; but not everybody reads it the same way or interprets similarly what he reads there. We know the age of European empire is at an end; not all Europeans know that yet. Not all Asians or Africans have been or are still aware that they must make themselves the conscious instruments of historic decision.

Political freedom has been won by many different means. The British surrendered power in Southern Asia because they knew they could no longer maintain it and were wise enough to base their action on reality. The French and Dutch had to be forced to the same conclusion. The United States has at times appeared to us lacking in consistency and vigor in upholding the right of non-self-governing peoples to independence. It has on some issues leaned heavily in favor of colonial powers and has sometimes disheartened us because of its failure to make its actions dovetail with its ideals of equality and freedom. We think that this was more than regrettable; we think it has been unwise. Let it be stated in fairness however that uniquely among the colonial powers the United States in our case made a formal pledge of independence, fixed a date for it ten years in advance, and fully and honorably redeemed that pledge. True, we fought ceaselessly for our freedom and never gave up our struggle and we earned it when it came. But we of the Philippines have directly experienced the basic good faith of the United States in our own relationship and we feel that the principles upon which it was based will ultimately prevail.
It is to be hoped, however, that this Conference will help remind all the Western powers that the issue of political independence for subject peoples does not depend on their goodwill or slow access of wisdom or virtue. The age of empire is being helped into oblivion by the aroused will and action of people determined to be masters of their own fate. Those of us here who have already won our independence were only the initiators or this process. All the others, almost all now in Africa, stand at various points along their own roads to full self-determination. There is much, of course, one cannot foresee. But everything we know and understand about history assures us that whatever new travels the future holds, the old structure of Western empire will and must pass from the scene. Will it expire quietly and in dignity? Will it go out crashing violently? That will depend on many things. But the end is not in doubt.

There are at least three things more to be said here about this matter of national political freedom:

First, it is perilously easy in this world for national independence to be more fiction than fact. Because it expresses the deepest desires of so many people in the world, it can be unscrupulously used as a shibboleth, as a façade, as an instrument for a new and different kind of subjection. I know that on this score there are violently different opinions in the world. I can recall how new nations like India, Indonesia and Ceylon were called puppets of imperialism when they were newly born to freedom. And of course, the Philippine Republic has been described by some sources as a mere tool of the United States. On the other hand, there is the way some of us view the position of certain other countries which from our own perspective we consider as subservient to other powers. I wonder if in such countries you could read in the press or hear in the public speeches of their spokesmen any thing resembling the open criticisms and other attacks that were common here in places like India and the Philippines even before independence? I wonder if any of the spokesmen of these countries would ever speak as freely in criticism of the bigger country to which they feel friendly or allied as, say, we in the Philippines speak our minds about the United States? I am sure you will forgive my frankness, but in this land of the ingenious and artistic wayang, of the wonderful Indonesian shadow play and puppet shows, I think we ought to say plainly to each other when we think a puppet is a puppet.

Secondly, is political freedom achieved when the national banner rises over the seat of government, the foreign ruler goes, and the power passes into the hands of our own leaders? Is the struggle for national independence the struggle to substitute a local oligarchy for the foreign oligarchy? Or is it just the beginning of the conquest of real freedom by the people of the land? Is there political freedom where only one political party may rule? Is there political freedom where dissent from the policy of the government means imprisonment or worse? It strikes me that autocratic rule, control of the press, and the police state are exactly the worst features of some colonialist systems against which we have fought all our lives and against which so many of us are still fighting. Is this really the model of the freedom we seek? Or is it the free interplay of contending parties, the open competition of ideas?
and political views in the market place, the freedom of a man to speak up as he chooses, be he right or wrong? I know there are many possible answers to these questions. But for my part and for my people, may I say plainly that we regard the struggle for freedom as an unending, constant, unremitting demand upon us, that with all our acknowledged failings, faults, and weaknesses, we are seeking to build in our land a society in which the freedom of our Republic will truly become the freedom of everyone of its citizens.

Finally, in this world of contending great powers, the independence of the small or weak nation is at best a precarious and fragile thing. Obviously the ultimate greater freedom will lie in a greater coherence, a unifying of regional interests, in the creation of counter-balancing moral, economic and physical strength, in the greatest possible cooperation by all to avert the disaster of a new world war. Let us face squarely up to the fact that within the nation we can regain our self-respect and grapple with our local problems but that for the primary goals of economic transformation and well-being and peace, the nation no longer suffices. Western European man today is paying the terrible price for preserving too long the narrow and inadequate instrument of the nation-states in an epoch when nationalism, as such, can solve only the least of our problems and leaves us powerless to meet the more serious ones. We have to try to avoid repeating all of Europe's historic errors. We have to have the imagination and courage to put ourselves in the forefront of the attempt to create a 20th-century world based on the true interdependence of peoples.

I have said that besides the issues of colonialism and political freedom, all of us here are concerned with the matter of racial equality. This is a touchstone, I think, for most of us assembled here and the peoples we represent. The systems and the manners of it have varied, but there has not been and there is not a Western colonial regime, which has not imposed, to a greater or lesser degree, on the people it ruled the doctrine of their own racial inferiority. We have known, and some of us still know, the searing experience of being demeaned in our own lands, of being systematically relegated to subject status not only politically and economically, and militarily — but racially as well. Here was a stigma that could be applied to rich and poor alike, to prince and slave, boss-man and workingman, landlord and peasant, scholar and ignoramus. To bolster his rule, to justify his own power to himself, Western white man assumed that his superiority lay in his very bones, in the color of his skin. This made the lowest drunk superior, in colonial society, to the highest product of culture and scholarship and industry among the subject people.

I do not think in this company I have to labor the full import of this pernicious doctrine and practice. I do not think I have to try to measure the role played by this racism as a driving force in the development of the nationalist movements in our many lands. For many it has made the goal of regaining a status of simple manhood the be-all and end-all of a lifetime of devoted struggle and sacrifice. Today this type of Western racism survives in virulent form only in certain parts of Africa, notably in the Union of South Africa, but certainly in many other places as well on that vast continent. Against this every decent man on earth has to set his face. In the United Nations, the
Asian and African states have again and again forced this issue on the unwilling attention of the other members. There we could see palpably the extent to which Western men have had to become defensive about their past racist attitudes. Few of the Western countries were willing to go far enough in condemning the racial practices of the Government of the Union of South Africa. They have yet to learn, it seems, how deeply this issue cuts and how profoundly it unites non-Western people who may disagree on all sorts of questions. Again, we can only hope that this Conference serves as a sober and yet jolting reminder to them that the day of Western racism is passing along with the day of Western power over non-Western peoples. Its survival in any form can only hang like an albatross around the necks of those many people in the West who sincerely seek to build a freer and better world.

No less than this can be said. But there is something more too. It is one of our heaviest responsibilities, we of Asia and Africa, not to fall ourselves into the racist trap. We will do this if we let ourselves be drawn insensibly—or deliberately—into any kind of counter-racism, if we respond to the white man's prejudice against us as non-whites with prejudice against whites simply because they are white. What a triumph this would be for racism if it should come about. How completely we would defeat ourselves and all who have ever struggled in our countries to be free! There is no more dangerous or immoral or absurd idea than the idea of any kind of policy or grouping based on color or race as such. This would, in the deepest sense, mean giving up all hope of human freedom in our time. I think that over the generations the deepest source of our own confidence in ourselves had to come from the deeply-rooted knowledge that the white man was wrong, that in proclaiming the superiority of his race, qua race, he stamped himself with his own weakness and confirmed all the rest of us in our dogged conviction that we could and would reassert ourselves as men.

Our quarrel with racism is that it substitutes the accident of skin color for judgement of men as men. Counter-racism would have us do the same: to lump white men by their supposed racial grouping and govern our acts and reactions accordingly. It is our task to rise above this noxious nonsense. We have the responsibility to remain aware that this kind of racist attitude has been the practice not of all white men, but only of some, that it flies in the face of their own profoundest religious beliefs and political goals and aspirations, that in almost all Western lands, and especially in the United States, the internal struggle against racism and all its manifestations has been going on steadily and victoriously.

We have the responsibility to acknowledge more than this; this business of racism, or other things like it, is an outcropping of one of many human weaknesses that we all share. The racism of Western white man has played an especially prominent role in history because the Western man has associated it with the establishment of his great power over so many non-Western peoples. As such, it deserves the special and prominent place it must have in the thinking and feeling of everyone. But we must also soberly ask ourselves: is there a single society or culture represented in this Conference which does not in some degree have its counterpart of this kind of prejudice and ignorance? Where is the society in which men have not in some manner divided themselves for
political, social and economic purposes, by wholly irrational and indefensible categories of status, birth, and yes, even skin color? It was a major part of the greatness of India’s immortal leader Mahatma Gandhi, that he devoted so much of his fruitful life of selflessness and sacrifice to a struggle against precisely this kind of thing in Indian life. Would that we all gave as much time to the mote in our own eye as we give to denouncing the beam in the eye of another!

Surely we are entitled to our resentment and rejection of white racism wherever it exists. But we are also called upon, as honest men who want to better man’s estate wherever and whatever he is, to acknowledge that in degree we all suffer from the same sin of ignorance and immorality. I ask you to remember that just as Western political thought has given us all so many of our basic ideas of political freedom, justice and equity, it is Western science which in this generation has exploded the mythology of race. Let us not preserve stupid racial superstition which belong to the past. Let us work to remove this ugly disease wherever it is rooted, whether it be among Western men or among ourselves.

Lastly, I have said that all of us here are concerned with peaceful economic growth. This brings us closest of all to the hub, the center, the heart of our common preoccupations, because the political forms and methods we seek and choose, the social ideas and ideals we embrace, are all wrapped up in the way in which we strive for growth. Economic growth, economic change, transformation of our backward and inadequate economies — these we all seek. These we must seek, else we stagnate and die. After all, it is precisely because the billion and a half people of Asia and Africa have begun in our time to strive for a better economic stake in life that most of us are here today. This is the great new overwhelming fact of this century, The way in which this is achieved will fix the shape of history for all future men.

We all confront the staggering facts of our economic backwardness. This has been partly due to factors of climate, geography, and the stubborn survival of obsolete social patterns. But it has also in large measure and perhaps decisively been the result of patterns imposed upon us by Western colonialism. This heritage is the heaviest burden we carry with us into the new epoch of national freedom. The great masses of our people live in a state of rural poverty. We need to diversify our economies. We need to industrialize in accordance with our resources and needs. We have to win a more balanced place in the market places of the world. We have to do this in a manner that will effectively raise the standard of living of our people. These are the things we have fought for. For these things above all, we have needed to be free to seek our own way.

But let us not have too many illusions about national independence. We arrive in the world as nations in the middle of the 20th century, not the 19th or the 18th. We have to strive to become nations in a time when history has already passed from the nation to larger units of economic and social coherence: the region, the continent, the world. It is a world as envisioned by Rabindranath Tagore "not divided into fragments by narrow domestic walls...." The idea of national self-sufficiency served the Western world only for a short time as a means to effective growth. Indeed, the great travail of the Western world,
its conflicts, rivalries, and wars have derived in no small degree from the fact that the nation, as such, has outlived its usefulness as an instrument of progress. Not even the great powers of today can stand alone, much less newly emergent states weak in everything but the will to grow. In this 20th century world the sober fact is that a purely national economy is an illusion. We cannot start where, say, England started two centuries ago. We have to make our places in a world that has already made tremendous advances technologically and where economic inter-dependence has become the key to effective economic development and growth.

Considering the present state of the world, with its profound conflicts and insecurities, this may be viewed by some as a crippling disadvantage. But in a very real sense, and a more hopeful sense, it is rather an advantage if we can but grasp it. It means that we need not go through the equivalent of the decades and centuries of ugly, painful, and costly development which occurred in most Western countries. It means that if circumstances favor it, we can make use of the most ultra-modern technologies to transform ourselves more rapidly, to make new and hitherto unforeseen use of our resources. Who knows yet what the new potentialities of nuclear power are going to mean for Asia and Africa? It is obvious that the real world we live in does not at this moment offer much promise of any early opportunity to find out. But here we have one of the real stakes we all share in preserving the peace, in creating international instruments which will put man to work for man's growth instead of his destruction.

Our fate is bound up with the fate of the whole world. National isolation, in any real sense, is an impossibility in our time, whether we think of an ideal world uniting its human and natural resources for the well-being of all, or the real world, deeply divided and groping its way to decisions that will in one way or another affect every person on earth. The fact is that we will need greater world coherence than we have now if we are to thrive. The fact is that the effective mobilisation of world capital and resources will be absolutely vital to us in the process of mobilising our own capital and our own resources. The fact is that these things will depend in great measure on the further course of the conflicts that now govern all world affairs. It is pure illusion to think that we can be independent of these big facts.

But this by no means leaves us helpless to act in our own interest. It does not mean that we have no choice but to leave the great decisions to others. Quite the contrary, because it is precisely in our lands, in our continents, that the most important decisions are going to be made. And it is we who will make them, by what we do or by what we do not do in the coming years.

It could be that Russia's bombs or America's bombs will determine the future shape of the world and the fate of humanity. If it comes to that the tragedy will be total; it will make all we may say or do here or anywhere else quite irrelevant. Reason will die and the survivors will move as best they can into a new epoch of savagery. But I do not think the great decisions will come that way. I think the shape of the world is going to be determined in large measure by the way in which the peoples of Asia and Africa go about the business of transforming their lives and their societies.
What do we want? How do we propose to seek it? These are the questions on which the fate of the world really turns. In not fully understanding this, many in the Western world commit their most tragic blunder. For our part, we of Asia and Africa have to face up squarely to the big choices that lie before us. We have to try to understand as clearly as we can exactly what they mean.

There are certain things in all our minds on this matter. We all want to the best of our power and wisdom to seek change in terms of the genius of our own various cultures and histories. We all want no more foreign exploitation of our wealth for the benefit of foreign interests. We do not want our future development to turn out to be another alien graft on our lives. We want this development to raise the physical and educational standards of our peoples. What roads lead to these ends? How do we begin to face up to these vast and formidable tasks?

There is no magic wand or automatic formula to bring about social and economic change. It means that we have to assume our own heavy responsibilities. It means mobilizing people, mobilizing resources. It means great toil, flexibility, adaptability, intelligence. But it also means defining our goal. Is our goal just so many new industries or factories, new dams or bridges or transportation systems? Or is our goal the betterment and the greater freedom, through these and other things, of the lives of the people?

This is no simple rhetorical question. Wrapped up in it are all the troubled issues of our time. And because according to the joint communiqué of the Bogor Conference "the basic purpose of this Conference is that the countries concerned should become better acquainted with one another's point of view", may I outline for you our views on the possible choices open to us.

There is one road to change which some countries have adopted and which offers itself to the rest of us as a possible choice. This is the road which proposes total change through total power, through avowed dictatorship and the forcible manipulation of men and means to achieve certain ends, the rigid control of all thought and expression, the ruthless suppression of all opposition, the pervasive control of human life in all spheres by a single, tightly-run self-selected organization of elite individuals. I know that an elaborate series of phrases and rationalization are often used to describe this system. But I am concerned not with propaganda myths, I am concerned with realities. I think we all have to be concerned with what this system offers and what it means.

Does the road to greater freedom really lie through an indefinite period of less freedom? Is it for this that we have in this generation raised our heads and taken up the struggle against foreign tyrannies?

Has all the sacrifice, struggle and devotion, all been, then, for the purpose of replacing foreign tyranny by domestic tyranny?

Do we fight to regain our manhood from Western colonial rulers only to surrender it to rulers among ourselves who seize the power to keep us enslaved?
Is it true, can it be true, in this vastly developed 20th century, that national progress must be paid for with the individual well-being and freedom of millions of people? Can we really believe that his price will, on some dim and undefined future time, be redeemed by the well-being and freedom of the yet unborn?

The philosophers of this system have answered this question through their doctrine of the so-called withering away of the state. But the rulers who have established their power in real life and not in the realm of bookish dreams have abandoned this tenet of their faith. We have had ample opportunity to witness over more than a generation now that this kind of power, once established, roots itself more and more deeply, gets more and more committed to perpetuating itself. Moreover -- and the whole logic of human experience throws its weight into the scale -- this system of power becomes inherently expansionist. It cannot accept the premise of peace with opponents outside its borders anymore than it can make peace with opponents inside its borders. It seeks and must seek to crush all opposition, wherever it exists.

This road is open before many of us. The gateway to it is strewn with sweet-smelling garlands of phrases and promises and high sentiment. But once you march through it, the gate clamps behind you. The policeman becomes master and your duty thereafter is forever to say ayee. Even those who enjoy the role of mastery must know that this system devours its own.

No, my friends, I don't think we have come to where we are, only to surrender blindly to a new super-barbarism, a new super-imperialism, a new super-power. We do not want leaderships in our countries subservient to foreign rulers, be they in London or Paris, the Hague or Washington, or we must add, Moscow. I think our peoples want to worship the Almighty and live in accordance with His laws, to better their lot, to educate themselves and their children, raise themselves from the degradation of want and disease and misery, by holding up their own heads and acting freely to achieve these great and difficult aims by their own free means in partnership with similarly dedicated people everywhere in the world.

That is the freedom of the democratic way of life. That is the freedom we want all the peoples of Asia and Africa to enjoy. That is the freedom that President Ramon Magaaysay of the Philippines has in mind when he authored the Pacific Charter which enshrines the dignity of man, his well-being, his security, his progress, his nation's right to self-determination. The Philippine Delegation is here not only to reiterate the ideals of that Charter but to underscore in this Conference that it is the sense of the Filipino people that such right of self-determination includes the right of nations to decide exclusively by themselves their ability to assume the responsibilities inherent in an independent political status. This is the time for Asia and Africa to reassert this principle and serve notice to the world that only by its unqualified acceptance by everyone can there be peace and justice for all mankind.
Supplementary Speech by Premier Chou En-lai, April 19, 1955.

After listening to the speeches delivered by the heads of many delegations, I would like to make some supplementary remarks.

The Chinese Delegation has come here to seek unity and not to quarrel. We Communists do not hide the fact that we believe in communism and that we consider the socialist system a good system. There is no need at this Conference to publicize one’s ideology and the political system of one’s country, although differences do exist among us.

The Chinese Delegation has come here to seek common ground, not to create divergence. Is there any basis for seeking common ground among us? Yes, there is. The overwhelming majority of the Asian and African countries and peoples have suffered and are still suffering from the calamities of colonialism. This is acknowledged by all of us. If we seek common ground in doing away with the sufferings and calamities under colonialism, it will be very easy for us to have mutual understanding and respect, mutual sympathy and support, instead of mutual suspicion and fear, mutual exclusion and antagonism. That is why we agree to the four purposes of the Asian-African Conference declared by the Prime Ministers of the five countries at the Bogor Conference and do not make any other proposal.

As for the tension created solely by the United States in the area of Taiwan, we could have submitted for deliberation by the Conference an item such as the proposal made by the Soviet Union for seeking a settlement through an international conference. The will of the Chinese people to liberate their own territory Taiwan and the coastal islands is a just one. It is entirely a matter of our internal affairs and the exercise of our sovereignty.

This just demand of ours has won the support of many countries. Again, we could have submitted for deliberation by the Conference the question of recognizing and restoring the legitimate status of the People’s Republic of China in the United Nations. The Bogor Conference held by the Prime Ministers of the five Colombo Powers last year supported the restoration of the legitimate status of the People’s Republic of China in the United Nations. And so did other countries of Asia and Africa. Besides, we could have also made criticisms here as regards the unfair treatment of China by the United Nations. But we did not do all this because otherwise our Conference would be dragged into disputes about all these problems without any solution.

In our Conference we should seek common ground among us, while keeping our differences. As to our common ground, the Conference should affirm all our common desires and demands. This is our main task here. As to our differences, none of us is asked to give up his own views, because difference in viewpoints is an objective reality. But we should not let our differences hinder us from achieving agreement as far as our main task is concerned. On the basis of our common points, we should try to understand and appreciate the different views that we hold.
Now first of all I would like to talk about the question of different ideologies and social systems. We have to admit that among our Asian and African countries we do have different ideologies and different social systems. But this does not prevent us from seeking common ground and being united. Many independent countries have appeared since the Second World War. One group of them are countries led by the Communist Parties; another group of them are countries led by nationalists. There are not many countries in the first group. But what some people dislike is the fact that the 600 million Chinese people have chosen a political system which is socialist in nature and led by the Chinese Communist Party and that the Chinese people are no longer under the rule of the imperialists. The countries in the second group are greater in number, such as India, Burma, Indonesia and many other countries in Asia and Africa. Both of these groups of countries have become independent from the colonial rule and are still continuing their struggle for complete independence. Is there any reason why we cannot understand and respect each other and give support and sympathy to each other? There is every reason to make the five principles the basis for establishing friendly cooperation and good neighbourly relations among us. We Asian and African countries, China included, are all backward economically and culturally. Inasmuch as our Asia-African Conference does not exclude anybody, why couldn't we ourselves understand each other and enter into friendly cooperation?

Secondly, I would like to talk about the question as to whether there is freedom of religious belief. Freedom of religious belief is a principle recognized by all modern nations. We Communists are atheists, but we respect all those who have religious belief. We hope that those with religious belief will also respect those without. China is a country where there is freedom of religious belief. There are, in China, not only seven million Communists, but also tens of millions of Moslems and Buddhists and millions of Protestants and Catholics. Here in the Chinese Delegation, there is a pious Imam of the Islamic faith. Such a situation is no obstacle to the internal unity of China. Why should it be impossible in the community of Asian and African countries to write those with religious belief and those without? The days of instigating religious strife should have passed, because those who profit from instigating such strife are not those among us.

Thirdly, I would like to talk about the question of the so-called subversive activities. The struggle of the Chinese people against colonialism lasted for more than a hundred years. The national and democratic revolutionary struggles led by the Chinese Communist Party finally achieved success only after a strenuous and difficult course of thirty years. It is impossible to relate all the sufferings of the Chinese people under the rule of imperialism, feudalism and Chiang Kai-shek. At last, the Chinese people have chosen their state system and the present government. It is by the efforts of the Chinese people that the Chinese revolution had won its victory. It is certainly not imported from without. This point cannot be denied even by those who do not like the victory of the Chinese revolution. As a Chinese proverb says: "Do not do unto others what you yourself do not desire." We are against outside interference; how could we want to interfere in the internal affairs.
of others? Some people say: There are more than ten million overseas Chinese whose dual nationality might be taken advantage of to carry out subversive activities. But the problem of dual nationality is something left behind by old China. Up to date, Chiang K'ai-shek is still using some very few overseas Chinese to carry out subversive activities against the countries where they are residing. The people's government of new China, however, is ready to solve the problem of dual nationality of overseas Chinese with the government of the countries concerned. Some other people say that the autonomous region of Thai people in China is a threat to others. There are in China more than forty million national minorities of scores of nationalities. The Thai people and the Chiang people, who are of the same stock as the Thai people, number almost ten million. Since they do exist we must grant them the right of autonomy. Just as there is an autonomous state for Shan people in Burma, every national minority in China has its autonomous region. The national minorities in China exercise their right of autonomy within China, how could that be said as being a threat to our neighbours?

On the basis of strict adherence to the five principles, we are prepared now to establish normal relations with all the Asian and African countries; with all the countries in the world; and first of all, with our neighbouring countries. The problem at present is not that we are carrying out subversive activities against the governments of other countries, but that there are people who are establishing bases around China in order to carry out subversive activities against the Chinese Government. For instance, on the border between China and Burma there are in fact remnant armed elements of the Chiang K'ai-shek clique who are carrying out destructive activities against both China and Burma. Because of the friendly relations between China and Burma, and because we have always respected the sovereignty of Burma, we have confidence in the Government of Burma for the solution of this problem.

The Chinese people have chosen and support their own government. There is freedom of religious belief in China. China has no intention whatsoever to subvert the governments of its neighbouring countries. On the contrary, it is China that is suffering from the subversive activities which are openly carried out without any disguise by the United States of America. Those who do not believe in this may come to China or send someone there to see for themselves. We take cognizance of the fact that there are doubts in the mind of those who do not yet know the truth. There is a saying in China: "Better seeing once than hearing a hundred times." We welcome the delegates of all the participating countries in this Conference to visit China at any time they like. We have no bamboo curtain, but some people are spreading a smoke-screen between us.

The 1,600 million people of Asia and Africa wish our Conference success. All the countries and peoples of the world who desire peace are looking forward to the contribution which the Conference will make towards the extension of the area of peace and the establishment of collective peace.

Let us, the Asian and African countries, be united and do our utmost to make the Asian African Conference a success.
Statement by Chou En-lai to the Political Committee of the Bandung Conference on April 23, 1955.

Yesterday and today I have heard the views of many delegations and I would like now to put forth proposals of the delegation of the People's Republic of China.

The present world situation is indeed tense but we have not lost hope of peace. As a matter of fact, there are more and more people who stand for peace.

Twenty-nine countries of Asia and Africa came here to this conference and have called for peace. This proves that more than half the world's population which we represent here wants peace and unity.

This manifestation proves our desire receives support from the majority of nations and peoples of the world. It further proves that it is possible to stop the danger of war.

Therefore, in this conference when we discuss the question of promotion of world peace and cooperation we should take the following stand: We should leave aside our different ideologies, different state systems and the international obligations which we have assumed by joining this side or that side. We should instead settle all questions which may arise against us on the basis of common peace and cooperation.

Some of the delegates have expressed the view the term "peaceful coexistence" is a term used by the Communists. We can then change the term. We should not let ourselves have any misunderstanding merely on this question.

The delegate from Lebanon when he mentioned this question, went far into the question of ideology. If we follow that example, our discussions will go on interminably and will prove fruitless ultimately.

Let us use the expression which was used in the preamble of the United Nations Charter: "Live together in peace." We can seek peace and cooperation in accordance with the model of the United Nations Charter.

Secondly, if we talk about cooperation then we, the twenty-nine countries assembled here, should be united in promoting international cooperation and in seeking collective peace. Such a collective peace is not for the purpose of opposing any countries outside Asia and Africa. We are merely starting with Asian-African countries in promoting peace and opposing war.

As far as China is concerned, we are a country led by the Chinese Communist party. We are against formation of ever more antagonistic military alliances in the world because they heighten the crisis of war.

For instance, we are against NATO, the Manila treaty and other similar treaties.

However, if such antagonistic military treaties continue in the world, then we would be forced to find some countries to enter into and sign a similar, antagonistic military alliance in order to safeguard and protect ourselves against aggression.

It is for this reason, basically, that we are against antagonistic military alliances, and now that we have assembled here to discuss problems of common cause and concern and the question of peace we should abandon the idea of such alliances because they are to nobody's good and also it is to no one's good to publicize these treaties.

Let us first of all have unity among us.
The day before yesterday after lunch I paid a visit to the Prime Minister of Pakistan. He told me that although Pakistan was a party to a military treaty, Pakistan was not against China. Pakistan had no fear China would permit aggression against her. As a result of that, we achieved a mutual understanding although we are still against military treaties.

The Prime Minister of Pakistan further assured that if the United States should take aggressive action under the military treaty or if the United States launched a global war, Pakistan would not be involved in it. He said Pakistan and India would not be involved in it just as they were not involved in the Korean war.

I am grateful to him for this explanation because through these explanations we achieve a mutual understanding of each other on collective peace and cooperation.

I am sure the Prime Minister of Pakistan will have no objections to these views of mine. Further, I would like to avoid any misunderstanding. I would like to give an explanation or qualification on behalf of the Prime Minister of Pakistan. He believes the Manila treaty is defensive in character just as General Romulo said, though I do not believe in the explanation he gave.

As for so-called Communist expansion and Communist subversive activities, the delegates here have been quite courteous. They have only mentioned the Soviet Union without referring to China, but China is also a country which owns a Communist party. So we feel also involved in it by implication.

I would here submit that we should adopt some principles which not only China but all of us here can follow. We on our part do not want to do anything for the expansion of Communist activities outside our own country. However, if we do not establish any common principles what are we going to do?

When the Prime Minister of China visited India and Burma they put forward these five principles. They accepted these five principles and made commitments on them. We have done this together with the Indian premier to alleviate doubts which many countries have as regards China.

Ever since we entered into these five principles there are more and more countries who are in favor of them.

Prime Minister Nehru told me Mr. Eden, now the Prime Minister of Britain, even agreed to the five principles. I am very glad to hear that. If Prime Minister Eden was prepared to issue a statement with the Prime Minister of China, I think the Prime Minister of China would be the first to sign that statement giving support to the five principles.

Of course, every delegation here could not agree to the wording of these five principles or agree to all the five principles. Therefore, we can reformulate these five principles to make them agreeable to all the delegates. We can add to these principles or we can subtract from them. In this way we can on the basis of common desire establish these principles with a view to safeguarding collective peace.

There have been some references to some international organizations. The delegate from Iraq mentioned the Cominform. But there are a great number of other international organizations in the world. We are ourselves displeased with those other organizations.
We are displeased, for instance, with the network of the United States Intelligence agency because we have been the victims of that agency. Unfortunately, we cannot raise this question at this conference because although these organizations might have some connection with some of our Asian-African countries, we cannot reach any agreement at this conference on these questions. Besides, this is outside our agenda. This should not be raised at this conference.

On what basis are we going to do all that? The points on which we can all agree are no longer five. They are seven. I hope we can all agree. With this basis of seven points we on our part would like to give our assurances here that we will carry it out. China is a big country and besides, China is a country led by the Chinese Communist party. So some people feel that we will not carry them out. So we give you our assurances and we hope that other delegations will do likewise.

The first point. We respect each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity. We will adhere to this principle. Our relations with Burma have proved that we have respected the sovereignty of Burma. As to respect of territorial integrity, it is stated that China will not and should not have any demand for territory. We have common borders with four countries. With some of these countries we have not yet finally fixed our border line and we are ready to do so with our neighboring countries. But before doing so, we are willing to maintain the present situation by acknowledging that those parts of our border are parts which are uninterrupted. We are ready to restrain our government and people from crossing even one step across our border. If such things should happen, we would like to admit our mistake.

As to the determination of common borders which we are going to undertake with our neighboring countries, we shall use only peaceful means and shall not permit any other kinds of methods. In any case, we shall not change this.

The second point is abstention from aggression and threats against each other. We shall also abide by this principle. There is fear of China on the part of our neighbors. There is Thailand and the Philippines. Since we lack mutual understanding, it is natural that they have this fear. But during our contacts this time, we have made assurances to Prince Wan of Thailand and General Romulo of the Philippines that we will not make any aggression or direct threats against Thailand or the Philippines.

We also told Prince Wan of Thailand that even before borderlines are established between our countries, we welcome a delegation from Thailand to visit our inland province and see if we have any aggressive designs against others. We have told Prime Minister U Nu that we would very much like to pay a visit with him to that border region, but unfortunately we have no time now. We will see next time.

There is a notion between China and the Philippines that we have no common border. In spite of that we also welcome a delegation from the Philippines. We welcome the delegation from the Philippines before the establishment of our border lines to visit especially our coastal region, especially Fukien and Kwantung provinces and to see for themselves whether we are carrying out any activities for purposes of directing threats against the Philippines.
The third point. Abstinence from interference or intervention in the internal affairs of one another. This is a question with which the Indochina states are most concerned. During the time of the Geneva conference we made assurances to Cambodia and Laos. We have also told Mr. Eden, the then Foreign Secretary, and Mr. Kotelov about our assurances. Later we also told Prime Minister Nehru and Prime Minister U Nu about our assurances. This time again we make our assurances to the delegations of Cambodia and Laos.

We earnestly hope that these two countries will become peace loving countries like India and Burma. We have no intention whatsoever to interfere or intervene in the internal affairs of these two neighboring states of ours. This is our policy toward all countries. We are merely mentioning these two countries as an example.

The fourth point. Recognition of equality of races. This point needs no explanation; we have always regarded that different races are equal. New China has not practiced any discrimination.

The fifth point. Recognition of the equality of all nations, large and small. We attach special importance to this question because we are a big nation. It is easy for big nations to disregard small nations and have no respect for small nations. This is the result of tradition.

We are constantly examining our behavior towards small nations. If any delegation here finds that he as representative of China does not respect any of the countries which are represented here, please bring this point out. We will be glad to accept criticism and rectify mistakes.

The sixth point. Respect for the rights of the people of all countries who choose freely a way of life as well as political and economic systems. We think that this is acceptable to all. The Chinese people have chosen a way of life as well as political and economic systems in New China. We will not allow any outside interference.

We on our part respect the way of life as well as the political and economic systems chosen by other people. For instance, we respect the way of life and political and economic systems chosen by the American people. We have also told the delegation of Japan that we respect the choice made by the Japanese people. When the Japanese people chose the Yoshida Government we recognized that Government as representing the Japanese people. Now the Japanese have chosen the Hatoyama Government and we recognize that Government as representative of the Japanese people. The Chinese Prime Minister said the same thing to all the delegates when they visited China.

Point Seven. Abstention from doing damage to each other. Our relations should be mutually beneficial to each other and one side should not do damage to each other. For instance, in our trade, it must be equally and mutually beneficial to one another; neither side should ask for privileges or attach conditions.

China can give assurances in its dealings with the countries represented here and other countries which are not represented here. When entering into peaceful cooperation with all countries, when having economic and cultural intercourse with those countries, she will not ask for privileges or special conditions. We will go on an equal basis.

It is our belief that with these seven points as a basis it is possible to have peace and cooperation among us. It is possible to safeguard peace and, first of all, start with peace among us. In fact, in these seven points we have said in our draft proposal that we Asian-African countries advocate settlement of international disputes by
peaceful means and support all measures that are being taken or may be
taken to eliminate international tension and promote the growth of peace.
In our view this is acceptable.

In this connection we would like to express our gratitude to the
five Colombo powers and to many other countries for the efforts they
have made in facilitating the restoration of peace in Indochina.

Likewise, we would like to thank some of the countries represented
here, especially India, in the efforts they have made for facilitating
and assisting achievement of an armistice in Korea. This has made it
possible gradually to remove the antagonism that has appeared on that
front.

As to relations between China and the United States, the Chinese
people do not want to have war with the United States. We are willing
to settle international disputes by peaceful means. If those of you
here would like to facilitate the settlement of disputes between China
and the United States by peaceful means it would be most beneficial to
the relaxation of tension in the Far East and also to the postponement
and prevention of a world war.
Text of Final Communiqué of Asian-African Conference.
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The Asian-African conference, convened by the Governments of Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia and Pakistan, met in Bandung from the 18th to 24th of April, 1955.

In addition to the sponsoring countries, the following twenty-four countries participated in the conference:


The Asian-African conference considered the position of Asia and Africa and discussed ways and means by which their peoples could achieve the fullest economic cultural and political cooperation.

A. Economic Cooperation:

1. The Asian-African conference recognized the urgency of promoting economic development in the Asian-African region. There was general desire for economic cooperation among the participating countries on the basis of mutual interest and respect for national sovereignty.

   The proposals with regard to economic cooperation within the participating countries do not preclude either the desirability or the need for cooperation with countries outside the region, including the investment of foreign capital.

   It was further recognised that assistance being received by certain participating countries from outside the region through international or under bilateral arrangements had made a valuable contribution to the implementation of their development programs.

2. The participating countries agree to provide technical assistance to one another, to the maximum extent practicable, in the form of:
   Experts, trainees, pilot projects, and equipment for demonstration purposes;
   Exchange of know-how, and establishment of national - and where possible - regional training and research institutes for imparting technical knowledge and skills in cooperation with the existing international agencies.

3. The Asian-African conference recommended:
   The early establishment of a special United Nations fund for economic development;
   The allocation by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development of a greater part of its resources to Asian-African countries;
   The early establishment of an international finance corporation, which should include in its activities the undertaking of equity investment; and
   Encouragement of the promotion of joint ventures among Asian-African countries in so far as this will promote their common interest.
4. The Asian-African conference recognized the vital need for stabilizing commodity trade in the region. The principle of enlarging the scope of multilateral trade and payments was accepted. However, it was recognized that some countries would have to take recourse to bilateral trade arrangements in view of their prevailing economic conditions.

5. The Asian-African conference recommended that collective action be taken by participating countries for stabilizing international prices of and demand for primary commodities through bilateral and multilateral arrangements, and that as far as practical and desirable they should adopt a unified approach on the subject in the United Nations Permanent Advisory Commission on International Commodity Trade and other international forums.

6. The Asian-African conference further recommended: Asian-African countries should diversify their export trade by processing their raw materials whenever economically feasible before export; intra-regional trade fairs should be promoted and encouragement be given to the exchange of trade delegations and groups of businessmen; exchange of information and of samples should be encouraged with a view to promoting intra-regional trade; and normal facilities should be provided for the transit trade of landlocked countries.

7. The Asian-African conference attached considerable importance to shipping and expressed concern that shipping lines reviewed from time to time their freight rates often to the detriment of participating countries.

It recommended a study of this problem and collective action thereafter to put pressure on the shipping lines to adopt a more reasonable attitude.

8. The Asian-African conference agreed that encouragement should be given to the establishment of national and regional banks and insurance companies.

9. The Asian-African conference felt that exchange of information on matters relating to oil, such as remittance of profits and taxation, might finally lead to the formulation of a common policy.

10. The Asian-African conference emphasized the particular significance of the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes for Asian-African countries.

The conference welcomed the initiative of the powers principally concerned in offering to make available information regarding the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes; urged the speedy establishment of an international atomic energy agency which should provide for adequate representation of the Asian-African countries on the executive authority of the agency; and recommended that Asian and African governments take full advantage of the training and other facilities in the peaceful uses of atomic energy offered by the countries sponsoring such programs.
11. The Asian-African conference agreed to the appointment of liaison officers in participating countries, to be nominated by their respective national governments, for the exchange of information and matters of mutual interest. It recommended that fuller use should be made of the existing international organizations, and participating countries who were not members of such international organizations but were eligible should secure membership.

12. The Asian-African conference recommended that there should be prior consultation of participating countries in international forums with a view, as far as possible, to furthering their mutual economic interest. It is, however, not intended to form a regional bloc.

B. Cultural Cooperation:

1. The Asian-African conference was convinced that among the most powerful means of promoting understanding among nations is the development of cultural cooperation. Asia and Africa have been the cradle of great religions and civilizations which have enriched other cultures and civilizations while themselves being enriched in the process. Thus the cultures of Asia and Africa are based on spiritual and universal foundations. Unfortunately, cultural contacts among Asian and African countries were interrupted during the past centuries.

The people of Asia and Africa are now animated by a keen and sincere desire to renew their old cultural contacts and develop new ones in the context of the modern world. All participating governments at the conference reiterated their declaration to work for closer cultural cooperation.

The Asian-African conference took note of the fact that the existence of colonialism in many parts of Asia and Africa, in whatever form it may be, not only prevents cultural cooperation but also suppresses the national cultures of the peoples.

2. Some colonial powers have denied their dependent peoples basic rights in the sphere of education and culture, which hampers the development of their personality and also prevents cultural intercourse with other Asian and African peoples.

This is particularly true in the case of Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco, where the basic right of the people to study their own language and culture has been suppressed.

Similar discrimination has been practiced against African and Colored people in some parts of the Continent of Africa.

The conference felt that these policies amount to a denial of the fundamental rights of man, impede cultural advancement in this region and also hamper cultural cooperation on the wide international plane. The conference condemned such a denial of fundamental rights in the sphere of education and culture in some parts of Asia and Africa by this and other forms of cultural suppression.

In particular, the conference condemned racialism as a means of cultural suppression.
3. It was not from any sense of exclusiveness or rivalry with other groups of nations and other civilizations and culture that the conference viewed the development of cultural cooperation among Asian and African countries.

True to the age-old tradition of tolerance and universality, the conference believed that Asian and African cultural cooperation should be developed in the larger context of world cooperation.

Side by side with the development of Asian-African cultural cooperation the countries of Asia and Africa desire to develop cultural contacts with others. This would enrich their own culture and would also help in the promotion of world peace and understanding.

4. There are many countries in Asia and Africa which have not yet been able to develop their educational, scientific and technical institutions.

The conference recommended that countries in Asia and Africa which are more fortunately placed in this respect should give facilities for the admission of students and trainees from such countries to their institutions.

Such facilities should also be made available to the Asian and African people in Africa, to whom opportunities for acquiring higher education are at present denied.

5. The Asian-African conference felt that the promotion of cultural cooperation among countries of Asia and Africa should be directed towards:

(a) The acquisition of knowledge of each other country;
(b) Mutual cultural exchange and,
(c) Exchange of information.

6. The Asian-African conference was of the opinion that at this stage the best results in cultural cooperation would be achieved by pursuing bilateral arrangements to implement its recommendations and by each country taking action on its own wherever possible and feasible.

C. Human Rights and Self-Determination:

1. The Asian-African conference declared its full support of the fundamental principles of human rights as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and took note of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations.

The conference declared its full support of the principle of self-determination of peoples and nations as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and took note of the United Nations resolutions on the right of peoples and nations to self-determination, which is a prerequisite of the full enjoyment of all fundamental human rights.

2. The Asian-African conference deplored the policies and practices of racial segregation and discrimination which form the basis of government and human relations in large regions of Africa and in other parts of the world.

Such conduct is not only a gross violation of human rights but also a denial of the fundamental values of civilization and the dignity of man.
The conference extended its warm sympathy and support for the courageous stand taken by the victims of racial discrimination, especially by the peoples of African and Indian and Pakistani origin in South Africa; applauded all those who sustained their cause; reaffirmed the determination of Asian African peoples to eradicate every trace of racialism that might exist in their own countries; and pledged to use its full moral influence to guard against the danger of falling victims of the same evil in their struggle to eradicate it.

3. In view of the existing tension in the Middle East caused by the situation in Palestine and the danger of that tension to world peace, the Asian-African conference declared its support of the rights of the Arab people of Palestine and called for the implementation of the United Nations resolutions on Palestine and of the peaceful settlement of the Palestine question.

D. Problems of Dependent People:

1. The Asian-African conference, in the context of its expressed attitude on the abolition of colonialism, supported the position of Indonesia in the case of West Irian (Dutch New Guinea) on the relevant agreements between Indonesia and the Netherlands.

The Asian-African conference urged the Netherlands Government to reopen negotiations as soon as possible to implement their obligations under the above-mentioned agreements and expressed the earnest hope that the United Nations could assist the parties concerned in finding a peaceful solution to the dispute.

2. In view of the unsettled situation in North Africa and of the persisting denial to the peoples of North Africa of their right to self-determination, the Asian-African conference declared its support of the rights of the people of Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia to self-determination and independence and urged the French Government to bring about a peaceful settlement of the issue without delay.

E. Promotion of World Peace and Cooperation:

1. The Asian-African conference, taking note of the fact that several states have still not been admitted to the United Nations, considered that for effective cooperation for world peace membership in the United Nations should be universal, called on the Security Council to support the admission of all those states which are qualified for membership in terms of the Charter.

In the opinion of the Asian-African conference the following countries which were represented in it - Cambodia, Ceylon, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Libya, Nepal and unified Vietnam - were so qualified.

The conference considered that the representation of the countries of the Asian-African region of the Security Council in relation to the principle of equitable geographical distribution was inadequate.

It expressed the view that as regards the distribution of the nonpermanent seats, the Asian-African countries which, under the arrangement arrived at in London in 1946, are precluded from being elected, should be enabled to serve on the Security Council so that they might make a more effective contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security.
2. The Asian-African conference having considered the dangerous situation of international tension existing and the risks confronting the whole human race from the outbreak of global war in which the destructive power of all types of armaments including nuclear and thermonuclear weapons would be employed, invited the attention of all nations to the terrible consequences that would follow if such a war were to break out.

The conference considered that disarmament and the prohibition of production, experimentation and use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons of war are imperative to save mankind and civilization from the fear and prospect of wholesale destruction.

It considered that the nations of Asia and Africa assembled here have a duty toward humanity and civilization to proclaim their support for the prohibition of these weapons and to appeal to nations principally concerned and to world opinion to bring about such disarmament and prohibition.

The conference considered that effective international control should be established and maintained to implement such prohibition and that speedy and determined efforts should be made to this end. Pending the total prohibition of the manufacture of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, this conference appealed to all the powers concerned to reach agreement to suspend experiments with such weapons.

The conference declared that universal disarmament is an absolute necessity for the preservation of peace and requested the United Nations to continue its efforts and appealed to all concerned speedily to bring about the regulation, limitation, control and reduction of all armed forces and armaments including the prohibition of the production, experimentation and use of all weapons of mass destruction and to establish effective international control to this end.

3. The Asian-African conference supported the position of the Yemen in the case of Aden and the southern parts of Yemen known as the protectorates and urged the parties concerned to arrive at a peaceful settlement of the dispute.

F. Declaration of Problems of Dependent Peoples:

The Asian-African conference discussed the problems of dependent peoples and colonialism and the evils arising from the subject to what is stated in the following paragraph, the conference is agreed:

1. In declaring that colonialism in all its manifestations is an evil which should speedily be brought to an end;
2. In affirming that the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitute a denial of fundamental human rights is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation;
3. In declaring its support of the cause of freedom and independence for all such peoples; and
4. In calling upon the powers concerned to grant freedom and independence to such peoples.

G. Declaration of Promotion of World Peace and Cooperation:

The Asian-African conference gave anxious thought to the question of world peace and cooperation. It viewed with deep concern the present state of international tension with its danger of an atomic world war.
The problem of peace is correlative with the problem of international security. In this connection all states should cooperate especially through the United Nations in bringing about the reduction of armaments and the elimination of nuclear weapons under effective international control.

In this way international peace can be promoted and nuclear energy may be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. This would help answer the needs, particularly of Asia and Africa, for what they urgently require are social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.

Freedom and peace are interdependent. The right of self-determination must be enjoyed by all peoples and freedom and independence must be granted with the least possible delay to those who are still dependent peoples.

Indeed all nations should have the right freely to choose their own political and economic systems and their own way of life in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

Free from distrust and fear and with confidence and good will toward each other, nations should practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors and develop friendly cooperation on the basis of the following principles:

1. Respect for the fundamental human rights and for the purposes and principles of the charter of the United Nations.
2. Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations.
3. Recognition of the equality of all races and of the equality of all nations, large and small.
4. Abstention from intervention or interference in the internal affairs of another country.
5. Respect for the right of each nation to defend itself singly or collectively in conformity with the charter of the United Nations.
6a. Abstention from the use of arrangements of collective defense to serve the particular interests of any of the big powers.
6b. Abstention by any country from exerting pressures on other countries.
7. Refraining from acts or threats of aggression or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any country.
8. Settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means such as negotiation, conciliation, arbitration or judicial settlement, as well as other peaceful means of the parties' own choice in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.
9. Promotion of mutual interest and cooperation.
10. Respect for justice and international obligations.

The Asian-African conference declares its conviction that friendly cooperation in accordance with these principles would effectively contribute to the maintenance and promotion of international peace and security while cooperation in the economic, social and cultural fields would help bring about the common prosperity and well-being of all.

The Asian-African conference recommended that the five sponsoring countries should consider the next meeting of the conference in consultation with other countries concerned.