

PAST AND FUTURE

An address, delivered by

Mohammad Hatta

upon receiving the degree of doctor honoris causa
from Gadjah Mada University at Jogjakarta
on November 27th 1956.

TRANSLATION SERIES

MODERN INDONESIA PROJECT

Southeast Asia Program
Department of Far Eastern Studies
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Price—\$1.00

SEAP Publications

CMP #22

File Copy

Do not remove from room 213
640 Stewart Avenue

PAST AND FUTURE

An address, delivered by

Mohammad Hatta

upon receiving the degree of doctor honoris causa
from Gadjah Mada University at Jogjakarta
on November 27th 1956.

TRANSLATION SERIES

Modern Indonesia Project
Southeast Asia Program
Department of Far Eastern Studies
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York
1960

© 1960 by Cornell Modern Indonesia Project

PREFACE

A few days before his resignation as Vice President of the Republic of Indonesia, Mohammad Hatta was awarded an honorary degree by Gadjah Mada University. He chose this occasion to make one of his most important addresses of the last few years. It is one of the clearest recent expositions of salient aspects of his political and socio-economic thinking. It is also significant because of its incorporation of many of his criticisms of political developments in Indonesia and of the political philosophy of certain other prominent Indonesian leaders at one of the critical periods of the country's post-revolutionary history. Although the address was made more than three years ago, the views it incorporates are essentially the same as those presently held by Dr. Hatta.

Except for the deletion of introductory remarks wherein Dr. Hatta expressed his gratitude to Gadjah Mada University for awarding him the degree of Doctor Honoris Causa, the address stands as he delivered it on November 27, 1956.

George McT. Kahin
Director

Ithaca, New York
May 25, 1960

Zum Werke, das wir Ernst bereiten,
Geziemt sich wohl ein ernstes Wort;
Wenn gute Reden sie begleiten,
Dann fließt die Arbeit munter fort.

(SCHILLER)

Ideals and realities are closely connected in their evolution, whether both follow the same direction, or are related to each other as a given situation and the reaction it evokes. Confronting realities - particularly very bitter ones - people often conceive of ideals as a cure for their wounded spirit, ideals that give them hope for the future and inspire them to do everything in their power to determine their own destiny. In the place of the Netherlands Indies with all its misery and tyranny, we envisaged and promised ourselves a Free Indonesia, based on justice and prosperity, free from suffering. These were the ideas that came to life and gradually gained strength in the minds of the younger generation of Indonesians from the time that they became aware of their tasks as children of the national community.

In general the Indonesia of those days can be described as follows: Its social structure contained two contradictory types of basis of living, collectivism and individualism. Collectivism was the basis of the old Indonesian society and individualism was the spirit of Netherlands Indies society which was grafted on top of Indonesian society. In contrast with social developments in Western countries, the structure of feudalism was here not replaced by capitalist organization but dominated and controlled from above. Faithful to the principle of rationality, which was both its incentive and the basis of its calculations, the capitalism which came to Indonesia in the role of aggressor, plunderer and holder of political power, did not destroy the existing feudal organization, but utilized it as a means for controlling the productive power of the entire population.

The economy of Indonesia then consisted of several kinds of mixtures of collectivism and individualism. On top of the economy of the people, which to a large extent was still based on gotong-rojong, mutual assistance, grew a capitalist economy with all the stages of its development. In the midst of an economy that was inspired by the "Idee der Nahrung" - only interested in providing for the daily necessities of life - economic structures were set up that were guided by the profit principle, by the desire for greater wealth. According to Bruno Hildebrand's theory of stages the development of the economy of a community takes place in three consecutive stages of Naturalwirtschaft, Geldwirtschaft and Kreditwirtschaft. When applying this theory to Indonesia, we find that these three stages were concurrently present in this country. In the West the development of the economy

stretched out lineally in time; here it consisted of vertical layers, with the result that the third stage, by its superior strength, oppressed the weaker stages and prevented their progress. Moreover, for the greater part, these three separate stages coincided with the different racial groups of the population.

In the sphere of barter or semi-barter economy (Natural-wirtschaft), which by then had already become a thin layer, one found exclusively the various Indonesian ethnic groups. This is where gotong-rojong prevailed in its pure form, a system of working together in the form of social cooperation. In the sphere of money economy, which had spread into the villages, Indonesians played a considerable part, and for the remainder, and on the higher levels, the Chinese. The sphere of credit economy, which completely dominated the lower stages, was generally speaking in the hands of white men, who used the Chinese as their tools in their dealings with the lower spheres, reaching down into the Indonesian community.

From the viewpoint of the capitalist economy which invaded this country, Indonesia was a huge estate, the exploitation of which was based on two highly profitable factors, a rich soil and a supply of cheap labor, two factors that strengthened its international competitive position. Production was not carried out in order to supply the domestic needs of the country itself, but was completely geared to the world market, thereby ensuring the highest possible profit. As an outlet for industrial goods from the Netherlands, Indonesia was not yet very important. Its primary economic function was exclusively that of a producing country. This is why the economy of the Netherlands Indies could be characterized as an "export economy."

As to its political structure, the Netherlands Indies was a police state, a type of state organization in conformity with the purpose of the colonizing power to exercise complete political, economic and social control. Under these conditions there was no room for democracy. Everything was organized hierarchically, the executive corps (pangreh pradja), the police, the army. Fundamental to the system was the position given to the rationalized organization named Inlands Bestuur, Native Government, culminating in the Bupati or Regent. Over and above this Regent a powerful system of Europees Bestuur, European Government, had been established, which issued all the orders that were to be passed down and had supervision over the officials of the "native government." In this setup it was not competent and idealistic native officials who were appreciated but rather those who were proficient in carrying out orders.

This is the reason why the Indonesian community, oppressed as it was, could not develop properly. The deeper capitalism penetrated into the Indonesian community, the worse became the living conditions of the people, who had no more powers of resistance left. The foundations of the community were destroyed by the three types of exploitation that were perpetrated successively over three centuries, the system of the Oost-Indische Compagnie (East-India Company), the so-called "culture system," and the system of private initiative. And in all these extortions the colonial government acted wherever necessary as "the natural guardian of colonial capitalism," in the words of J. E. Stokvis.

Listen also to how aptly Dr. J. H. Boeke describes the social destruction caused by colonial capitalism in Indonesia.*

The individualizing liberal principles, the penetrating capitalism have demolished fundamentals and driven the economically weak into a merciless social struggle in Indonesia, perhaps to an even greater extent than in Europe. We all know that the capitalist system in its full growth has invaded Indonesia like a foreign conqueror and succeeded in conquering it in a few decades. Even more drastic than in Europe has been the disintegrating effect in the colonial territory of a policy that was based on the interests of those who were well-equipped, knowledgeable and always ready to fight. The economic policy which opened up Indonesia to tough-minded capitalists, the communications policy which shortened distances and abolished isolation, the system of free trade which intensified competition in internal commerce, the taxation system with its increasing emphasis on money and individual assessment, the western legislation and administration of justice, the educational policy - all this has exercised a disintegrating influence on the native community and its social organs, to which the weak force of the numerous people was not equal. All this has broken down the existing social organization without replacing it with a new organization, has pulverized without moulding anew, created misery without generating new strength, and the result has been a degradation of the human spirit.

* "Auto-activiteit naast autonomie" (Auto-activity next to autonomy), discourse by Dr. J. H. Boeke at the meeting of the Indisch Genootschap, the Netherlands, on October 13th 1922.

This is not the pronouncement of an Indonesian revolutionary, but the result of a scientific analysis by a colonial economist, a man of deep human feelings.

It was this knowledge, together with the facts of daily experience in racial and individual life, that gave substance to the ideal of a future Free Indonesia. And the cognizance of the Dutch colonial aims, in which there was no place whatsoever for aspirations toward Indonesian self-government, reinforced the national spirit. "A Free Indonesia, one and indivisible" and "Struggle on the basis of our own strength" became the slogans of the national movement. Statements by Dutch leaders, such as H. Colijn, who said that it should be made clear to the Indonesian nationalists that Dutch authority over Indonesia was established as firmly as Mont Blanc on the Alps,* only served to add fuel to the fires of Indonesian nationalism, which were already aflame. To smother them was no longer possible!

In this way our pre-war freedom movement gave birth to four of the five principles on which our present State is based: Humanity, the Unity of Indonesia, the Sovereignty of the People and Social Justice. These were the ideals for the future, a reaction to the bitter reality of the people's misery, the constant humiliations, the national extortion and suffering under a colonial and autocratic power.

Free Indonesia had to become a national state, one and indivisible, free from foreign colonial domination in whatever form, political or ideological. The principles of humanity had to be carried out in all segments of life, in the intercourse between individuals, between employers and workers, between the different groups of the population. Though generated by the struggle against colonialism, these humanitarian ideals had not only an anti-colonial and anti-imperialistic character. They were directed towards the freeing of man from all oppression. Community relationships were to be characterized by an atmosphere of family and fraternity. The socialist literature which found many readers, and the labor movement of the West that could be observed from afar and nearby, confirmed these ideals and made them into firm convictions.

This feeling, with which the spirit of the national movement was deeply imbued, was later incorporated as a basic

* H. Colijn, *Koloniale vraagstukken van heden en morgen* (Colonial Problems of Today and Tomorrow), 1928, page 39.

principle in the Preamble of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, in the following words: "Since independence is inherently the right of every nation, any form of colonialism in this world is contrary to humanity and justice and must therefore be eradicated."

The 'Universal Declaration of Human Rights', consisting of 30 articles, was adopted by the United Nations Organization during its meeting in Paris on December 10th 1948. When the Indonesian leaders, who in their younger days had been fighting as pioneers, heard the declaration of article 1 stating that "all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights," it was as if they heard themselves speaking. It gave them the feeling as if people wanted to realize their old ideals in international society. When it was already considered fitting to carry out these ideals internationally, would these ideals be neglected in the national sphere?

There was yet another fundamental question to be solved. Once Indonesia achieved independence, what form of state organization would be best? The experience with the colonial autocratic government in the form of a police state had given rise to the ideal of a democratic constitutional state in the minds of the younger generation of Indonesia. The state, it was believed, should have the form of a Republic, based on the sovereignty of the people. However, the sovereignty of the people, such as envisaged and propagated in the circles of our national movement, was at variance with the concepts of Rousseau, that were characterized by individualism. Indonesia's type of sovereignty of the people had to be rooted in its own society, a society which is collectivist in character. Whatever its other sources, Indonesian democracy should also evolve from indigenous Indonesian democracy. Moreover the national spirit which had grown as a natural reaction to Western imperialism and capitalism, intensified the desire to look in our own society for the foundations on which to build a national state. Western democracy was rejected a priori.

When we study the French Revolution of 1789, which is known as the source of Western democracy, we find that the slogans "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" were not carried into practice.* This is not surprising, because the French Revolution broke out as a revolution of individuals, aiming

* Mohammad Hatta, "Revolusi Perantjis" (The French Revolution), in Kumpulan Karangan (Collected Writings), Vol. IV, pp. 11 ff.

to liberate persons as individuals from the ties of feudalism. The liberty of the individual was given first consideration. When this liberty had been gained, its connection with equality and fraternity was forgotten.

Although the French Revolution aimed at carrying out the ideal of complete equality - which is why, besides liberty for the individual, equality and fraternity were also stressed - the democracy which it practiced brought only political equality.

Politically every individual was accorded equal rights. Rich and poor, men and women, had the same rights to vote and be elected as members of parliament. Beyond these rights, however, there was no equality. As a matter of fact, when the spirit of individualism flared up, kindled by the French Revolution, capitalism thrived increasingly. Class strife became aggravated, oppression of the economically weak by the economically strong became more severe. Wherever there are strongly conflicting interests, wherever there are oppressors and oppressed, fraternity is hard to find. The system of individual economic responsibility resulted in the worker's livelihood being secure only as long as he was strong and able to work. He was dismissed and neglected once he became old and sickly and lost his ability to work.

It is clear that this type of democracy was not in conformity with the ideals of the Indonesian struggle for independence, which aimed at the realization of the principles of humanity and social justice. Political democracy alone cannot bring about equality and fraternity. Political democracy must go hand in hand with economic democracy, otherwise man will not yet be free and there will not be equality or fraternity. Therefore social democracy, covering all phases of life determining human existence, was the ideal of Indonesian democracy. The ideal of social justice was made into a program to be carried out in our future national life.

It was really from three sources that these ideals of social democracy came to life in the minds of the Indonesian leaders at that time. Firstly Western socialist thinking attracted their attention because it advocated and strove toward the principles of humanity. Secondly there were the teachings of Islam, which demand honesty and divine justice in human society, and fraternity among the people as creatures of the Lord, in accordance with the essential qualities of Allah, the Merciful and the Benevolent. Thirdly there was the knowledge that Indonesian society is based on collectivism. These three considerations only served to strengthen the

conviction that the democratic structure that was to become the basis of the future government of Independent Indonesia should be derived from the indigenous democracy prevalent in the Indonesian village.

The old Indonesian states were feudal states, ruled by autocratic kings. Nevertheless, in the villages a democratic system remained in force and lived a healthy life as part and parcel of the adat-istiadat, old usage and traditional custom. This provided sufficient evidence for the conviction that the indigenous Indonesian democracy would have strong powers of endurance, live healthily and be "neither scorched by the sun nor robbed by rain." This is also the reason, why this indigenous democracy was idealized to such an extent in the national movement. Many were the leaders who felt it to be sufficiently complete to become the basis of the government of a modern state. "Take away the feudalism and capitalism which are suppressing it," they said, "and it is bound to blossom forth and live healthily on a solid foundation!"

Social analysis shows that the indigenous Indonesian democracy was able to maintain itself under feudalism, because the soil, the most important factor of production, was the communal property of the village people. It did not belong to the king. And the social history of the Western world shows that in the feudal era the ownership of the land constituted the basis of liberty and power. Whoever lost the title to his land, lost his freedom and became dependent on others; he became the servant of the landlord. Whoever was the owner of a great deal of landed property had power, and the extent of his power was in proportion to the extent of the land he owned.

Because landed property in the old Indonesia belonged to the village community, the village democracy could not be eliminated, regardless of the efforts by the feudal power to suppress it. On the basis of the common ownership of the soil, each individual, in carrying out his economic activities, felt that he had to act in accordance with common consent. Consequently, one finds that all heavy work, that could not be done by one individual person, was performed by the system of gotong-rojong, mutual assistance. Not only were matters which according to the Western judicial system were within the area of public law taken care of in this way, but also private matters such as building a house, working the ricefields, accompanying the dead to the graveyard, and so on. This way of life, based on common ownership of the soil, had created the custom of mutual consultation. All decisions concerning matters of common interest were

taken by mutual consent, or in the words of a Minangkabau saying: "Water becomes one by passing through a bamboo pipe, words become one by mutual agreement." The custom to take decisions by way of mutual consultation created the custom to hold general meetings, in a regular meeting place, meetings which were presided over by the head of the village. All adult and indigenous members of the village community had the right to attend these meetings.

We have not yet mentioned all the democratic elements in the original Indonesian village. There are two further elements, the right to make joint protest against regulations issued by the king or prince, regulations that are felt to be unjust, and the right of the people to leave the territory over which the king has authority, when they feel that they do not like to live there any longer. Rightly or not, these last two rights have often been thought of as the right of individual people to decide their own fate. As is well known, the right to make an ordinary joint protest has been resorted to up to the present time. When it happens that the people strongly disapprove of a regulation issued by the Bupati (Regent) the Wedana (District Chief) or some other authority, one sees a great many people congregating at the particular town or village square, where they will sit quietly for a certain length of time, without doing anything. In the old days it was not very often that the Indonesian people, who are by nature patient and complying, acted like this, but when they did it made the authorities consider whether they had not better revoke or modify their orders.

These five original elements of democracy, the general meeting, mutual consultation, gotong-rojong or mutual assistance, the right to make joint protests and the right to remove oneself from being under the king's or prince's authority, were esteemed within our national movement as solid principles for the social democracy that was to become the basis for the future government of Free Indonesia.

Subsequent analysis, made quietly and free from the desire to idealize everything that is indigenous with us, has shown that the good points of our village democracy cannot all be applied indiscriminately at the level of the state. The system of consultation as it is practiced in the villages means that decisions are taken unanimously, with everyone's agreement, after the matter has been discussed thoroughly. No decision can be taken before unanimity has been reached, and the matter remains a subject for discussion both within and outside the general meeting. It would be impossible to reach such unanimous decisions in a parliament with all its

different parties and political antagonisms. In this matter, whether one likes it or not, one has to accept the system of Western democracy whereby decisions are taken by a majority of votes.

On the other hand, 'agreement' such as is usually imposed in totalitarian countries, is not at all in harmony with the notion of Indonesian democracy, because real agreement can only be arrived at by mutual consultation. Without consultation, where everyone has the right to advance his opinion, there cannot be any agreement. However, in a democratic collective society such as Indonesia has, the mentality of individual persons is different from that in an individualistic society. In all their actions and in voicing their opinions, they are primarily guided by the common interest. Their own interests are completely bound up in the common interest. Therefore it is naturally easier for them to reach agreement. But, although the individual, in his way of thinking and his actions, is guided by the ideals of the common good, he is not a mere object of the collective entity, such as is the case in totalitarian countries. He remains a subject with his own will, able to move about freely and make his own special contacts and to practice differentiation. Socially speaking he maintains his own ideals and devotes his thoughts to his own or the common welfare.

This was the kind of Indonesian in the minds of those who were doing their best to create an appropriate democratic system for the future Free Indonesia. In no case did they want to relinquish the ideals of social democracy that were more or less fundamental to social organization in our original community. In the political field a system of popular representation with consultation was designed, based on the general interest of the community. Extensive autonomy, reflecting the idea of 'government by those governed', would have to be carried into effect. In the economic sector, the national economy would have to be organized on a cooperative basis, and the government would have to have the duty to control or supervise the branches of production of importance to the State and those which vitally affect the life of the people. In the social sector the development of man's individuality would have to be safeguarded. The State would direct its efforts toward the happiness, wellbeing and moral worth of man.

In this way the ideals which were to inspire our struggle for independence and to become the basis for the establishment of a free, united, sovereign, just and prosperous State of the Republic of Indonesia, gradually began to take shape in the bosom of our national movement.

When the question "What should be the fundamental principles of the Indonesian State?" was being discussed in June 1945 in the Panitia Penyelidik Usaha Kemerdekaan Indonesia (Investigating Committee on Steps toward Indonesian Independence), it was generally felt that the Republic of Indonesia, which was to be formed, should not be based on a purely social policy, but should also be morally supported by religion. In the political situation of that time it was felt that it was due to God's mercy that the independence of Indonesia was to be achieved. This idea is also incorporated in the Preamble of our Constitution, where it is stated that "through God's blessings and by His mercy we have arrived at this happy and noble moment in our history." It was the sincere desire of the leaders of all groups not only that everyone in Independent Indonesia should have the freedom to profess his own religion, but also that there should be religious peace. Therefore, at the recommendation of Bung Karno (Soekarno) who formulated the Pantja Sila, or Five Basic Principles, "Belief in the One God" was adopted as the fifth principle.* In this way the ideology of the State was built upon two bases, a political and a moral basis.

By the time of the Charter of Djakarta,** a document which was drawn up by nine prominent men from different groups and of different religions, and which was intended to be the text for the subsequent Proclamation of Indonesian Independence, the sequence of the five basic principles had been changed. The principle of Belief in the One God, originally the fifth and last, was now put on top as the first principle. By the elevation of this moral principle to the uppermost position, the state and its government acquired a stronger foundation, which demanded rightness, justice, goodness and honesty, together with outward and inner fraternity. By a government policy based on high morality, it would be possible to achieve "social justice for all the people of Indonesia," such as is called for in the Preamble to the first Constitution.

The principle of Belief in the One God guides our national ideals toward doing our utmost for the people and the community, whereas the principle of Humanity, its logical continuation, involves carrying this guiding principle into actual

* Ir. Soekarno, Lahirnja Pantja Sila (The Birth of Pantja Sila). See also H. Rosin, Pantja Sila, 1951.

** The text of the Charter of Djakarta can be found on page 17 of the book by Muhammad Yamin, Proklamasi dan Konstitusi (The Proclamation and the Constitution), 1951.

living practice. The principle of Nationality affirms the character of Indonesia as a national state with its own ideology, whereas the principle of People's Sovereignty calls for just government, exercised with a sense of responsibility, in order to achieve the Social Justice, which is incorporated as the fifth principle. Social Justice is thus both guiding principle and objective.

The change in sequence of the five basic principles, though leaving the state ideology unaltered, had the effect of providing state policy with a strong moral basis. Belief in the One God was no longer merely a basis for the maintenance of mutual respect among the various religions, such as was originally suggested by Soekarno. It had become the principle which leads towards rightness, justice, goodness, honesty and fraternity. By adopting this principle, the State was strengthening its foundations. When it is led and guided by these basic principles, the government of the state really may not swerve from the straight path which leads towards the happiness of the people and the wellbeing of the community, toward world peace and brotherhood among the nations of the world. Is it not explicitly stated in the Preamble to our Constitution that it is the purpose of the Pantja Sila that we may enjoy happiness, prosperity, peace and liberty in the community and the law-based state of a completely sovereign Free Indonesia? The task to be performed with these high and pure principles as our guide may hardly be called a simple one. But when we stray from the right path from time to time, through negligence or temptation, we always feel a mysterious pull leading us back to the right way.

On the basis of the Pantja Sila as the State ideology, we drew up a Constitution that was to be the basis of our national policy and government policy, a constitution that could be referred to at any time by the parliament that was to be elected by the people, all of whom had the right to vote on a basis of universality and equality.

This is not the place to review our constitutional development from 1945 to the present time. Suffice it to say that our Constitution contains the basic principles for the development of political democracy (articles 1, 35, 131), economic democracy (articles 38, 37), and social democracy (articles 36, 39, 41, 42), as well as the basic human rights and freedoms.

While recognizing that it certainly has its shortcomings, we may say, generally speaking, that our Constitution is sufficiently up-to-date, that it contains all the ideals that

were alive in our independence movement, incorporating the aspirations of a civilized nation which loves freedom, peace, justice and the common prosperity.

But to what extent have we succeeded in actually putting these ideals into practice?

I am not straying too far from the truth when I say that as long as we were under colonial domination we did not lack ideals, but that these ideals have become rather shapeless since we gained our independence. It would seem that this verse of Schiller is quite apposite to our nation,

Eine grosse Epoche hat das Jahrhundert geboren,
Aber der grosse Moment findet ein kleines Geschlecht.

Will our nation suffer the same fate as befell the French Revolution of 1789, which started out with the slogans "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity," but which in actual practice afterwards brought only freedom to oppress, inequality and strife, and the freedom to live in poverty and wretchedness? What we see around us daily in Indonesia makes it seem that nothing but lip service is given to the Pantja Sila, that it is not being used as a light by which to organize a new society. Every group is competing with every other in a scramble for profits. One's own group comes first; the community as a whole is forgotten. In theory we profess collectivism, but in fact and by our actions we are strengthening individualism. In theory we support social democracy, but in fact and by our actions we are promoting the spirit of liberal democracy. Political parties, which in reality are a means of organizing public opinion in order that the people may learn to feel responsibility as citizens of the state and members of society, have been made into an end in themselves, the state being their tool. In this way it is being forgotten that promoting the interest of a political party at the expense of the people is immoral and incompatible with the Pantja Sila, particularly as regards the principle of Belief in the One God.

Also, membership of a political party is often the criterion for appointing civil servants to posts, both here and abroad, this rather than the principle of "the right man in the right place." Public servants who are not members of any political party, or who belong to an opposition party, feel that they no longer have standards to go by and become disillusioned. This destroys their peace of mind and their zeal for work, and is apt to lead to improper practices and mental corruption. Instead of strengthening the character

of the officials, party politics makes for the opposite and weakens their character. Finally they join a party, not out of political conviction, but merely because they want security.

When one looks at recent developments in our country and society, one gets the impression that after the independence of Indonesia had been achieved, with no small sacrifice, our idealistic leaders and freedom fighters were pushed back, while political and economic profiteers came to the foreground. They have used the national movement and its slogans for their ends and have ridden on the backs of the political parties for these same private ends. This has inevitably resulted in political and economic anarchy, followed in its wake by a reign of corruption and demoralization.

This is the face Indonesia presents today, after having been independent for this number of years. It is clear that it was not this kind of a Free Indonesia that was visualized by our freedom fighters of earlier days.

Everywhere today one finds a feeling of dissatisfaction. It is felt that the reconstruction of our country is not going as it should, that the situation is still far from what we had hoped for, while the value of our money is progressively declining. The gap between the actual state of affairs and our expectations is so great that in disgust people are apt to overlook the constructive things that have actually been accomplished. Just think of our achievements in the fields of education and training programs and in agriculture! However, all these achievements are overshadowed by the many unfinished and neglected projects, which because of their very non-accomplishment are doing untold damage to the state and the livelihood of the people. The depreciation and destruction of capital goods everywhere is even more apparent to the eye. Just look at the deterioration of our roads, of our irrigation system and our harbors, look at the spreading of erosion and all the rest.

The growth of democracy is also being stunted, this by the constant political squabbles. The just Indonesia we are all waiting for is still far away. Establishment of the autonomy of the various territories of Indonesia, on a basis which ensures them their own finances and proper financial arrangements with the central government, has yet to be carried out, in spite of the fact that it is now eleven years since this most important duty of the government was incorporated in the Constitution. Article 131 of our provisional Constitution prescribes that "the regions shall be given the largest possible measure of autonomy to manage their own affairs."

When the Ministry of the Interior finally prepared and subsequently submitted to Parliament a bill on regional government, it was clear that the principles of autonomy were not incorporated in it. Instead of emphasizing the kabupaten (regency) as the unit of autonomy, the bill made the province the important autonomous area and moreover provided for a State Commissioner who could counterbalance regional autonomy. This plan is more like the hierarchical system of the Netherlands Indies than anything imbued with the Indonesian spirit of democracy. The placing of a State Commissioner next to the Kepala Daerah (Regional Head) of the province, which is like placing "a shrimp behind a stone" ("a snake in the grass"), makes one think, whether one wants to or not, of the relationship between the Assistant-Resident and the Regent of colonial days. Psychologically this is a bad arrangement. In the regions it will be regarded as a trick of the central government to hedge in regional autonomy. Why abandon the clearly good system whereby the Governor has two functions forming a trait d'union, the function of Regional Head and that of an official of the central government?

If it is our desire to arrive at a democracy responsible to the people and to carry out the old ideals of "government by those governed", it would be best to place the major emphasis on self-government at the kabupaten (regency) level. In this system the province would become a coordinating body of all the kabupatens in its territory. Consequently the provincial Council of Representatives would not be elected directly by the people, but would be composed of an equal number of delegates, say one or two, from each kabupaten. In this way the province would be a body to effect coordination between the various kabupatens in all matters affecting their common interests. It is true that several hundred people would in this way miss the opportunity to become members of a regional legislative assembly, but the administration of government would be more efficient and democracy, being without too many steps of hierarchy, would be more democratic.

As a result of an emphasis on autonomy for the kabupatens, the kabupaten would be able to provide a lead for the gradual development of village autonomy, and so eventually the villages also would be able to "manage their own affairs" in the true sense of these words.

My purpose in presenting this picture, which highlights the tremendous gap between yesterday's ideals and today's realities, is not to spread a feeling of pessimism. I firmly believe in the power of the regenerative process in our

community. The demoralization which is rife in all phases of life today may retard this process, but it cannot stop it altogether. Our nation is now undergoing a period of trial for freedom and its responsibility for its own destiny. We are conscious of our freedom, but we do not yet feel our responsibility. In the long run it will be realized that there can be no lasting freedom without self-restraint, without a sense of responsibility to the community to which one belongs.

A thoroughgoing social analysis would show that all our rebellions and our splits, our political anarchy and adventurism, and all the steps taken in the economic field which have created chaos are the result of the fact that our national revolution was not dammed up at the appropriate time. Those who say that our national revolution is not yet completed are wrong indeed. A revolution is a sudden explosion of society which brings with it an "Umwertung aller Werte". A revolution shakes the floor and the foundations, it loosens all hinges and boards. Therefore, a revolution should not last too long, not more than a few weeks or a few months. It should then be checked; the time will then have arrived for a consolidation which will realize the results produced by the revolution. What is left unfinished is not the revolution itself, but the efforts to carry its ideals into effect over a period of time after the foundations have been laid. The revolution itself takes only a short time; the revolutionary period of consolidation may take quite a long time, even up to several decades. Thus it was with the French Revolution, with the Russian Revolution, with the Kemalist Revolution of Turkey, and so on.

It is not possible for a revolution to go on for too long, because if it is not checked in time, all the hinges and boards that have come loose will become a jumble and in the end the entire structure will tumble down. In the meantime new elements will come in and take advantage of the chaotic situation. It will no longer be clear where freedom ends and anarchy begins.

In point of fact our national revolution, having continued for several years, ought to be checked. Its energies should be guided in an orderly fashion so as to teach the mass of the people to become conscious of their responsibilities in democracy. Democracy cannot possibly live without a sense of responsibility. Therefore our people, who have never known democracy at the level of the state, must first be trained in democracy.

But, although we had had no prior training or teaching of responsibility under the sponsorship of a government with authority, we wanted in a great hurry to set up a parliamentary democratic government. We wanted to run a parliamentary democracy without democracy and without a parliament! This resulted in the political anarchy which we have gone through during the last few years. This is why the government has lost its authority. The authority of the government has further declined because party politics introduced and maintained the peculiar custom that power is in fact not vested with the responsible government, but with the party councils which are not responsible. In this way the standing of the government has become that of a messenger boy of the political parties. A further effect of this is the fact that the most prominent party leaders are not members of the cabinet. Those who are appointed as cabinet ministers are not too prominent; sometimes they are second or third-rate persons, who have no special knowledge of the tasks entrusted to them. This is the reality we have to contend with now as a result of a false interpretation of the course a revolution should follow and the limit of a revolutionary period, and also as a result of a party system which robs the government of the power it should hold in its hands.

For six years we have practiced a parliamentary democratic form of government, without democracy and without a parliament. Now that we have a parliament today, based on the "will of the people" as expressed in the general elections, so that now we actually have a foundation for parliamentary democratic government, is it possible to go back from here? This would be difficult, unless one wants to be inconsistent. This is a dilemma which is felt acutely at the present time.

Coming now to the end of the discourse, I should like to request the earnest attention of the Gadjah Mada University for the problems of our country and society as I have depicted them just now, for the reality which does not accord with the idealism which has been planted and grows in every pure mind, for the reality of our national policy which is not in harmony with the national ideology, the Pantja Sila, which was adopted as the principle that was to guide us to happiness, welfare, peace and freedom for all the people. May Gadjah Mada University, which was built in the midst of our national revolution in the city of Jogjakarta, a city that has gained historic fame as our capital in the struggle for independence, inspire its students, men and women, so that this student generation may provide our nation with idealistic candidates for future leadership, persons who, on the basis of knowledge

which they have made part of themselves, are able to fashion a harmony between political practice and everyday working philosophy on the one hand, and on the other the great ideals which underlie our national ideology.

Thank you.

