UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ
3 2106 00120 4244

JQ
763
1960
S8

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA
SANTA CRUZ

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MARHAEN AND PROLETARIAN

SOEKARNO

TRANSLATION SERIES

Modern Indonesia Project

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

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MARHAEN AND PROLETARIAN

by

President Soekarno Sukarno

Speech before the Indonesian Nationalist Party
at the Party's Thirtieth Anniversary
at Bandung, July 3rd 1957

TRANSLATION SERIES

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

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

JQ
763
1960
S8

PREFACE

Although Indonesia's President and principal nationalist leader has visited the West--several Western European and Latin American countries as well as the United States and Soviet Russia, his ideas are not widely known in these countries, and indeed, have often been incorrectly understood. Some of Soekarno's writings and speeches have been translated and published for limited distribution by various departments of the Indonesian government, but a number of the most important have appeared so far only in Indonesian.

When in mid-February, 1959, I asked President Soekarno what he considered to be his most important address in recent years, he said without a moment's hesitation: "My lecture in Bandung in July, 1957 to the Thirtieth Anniversary Meeting of the Indonesian Nationalist Party." He went on to say that as an expression of his political philosophy he considered this to be one of the most important speeches of his entire career. For those who have followed the development of President Soekarno's political thinking, it is clear that this is indeed an address of signal importance--an exposition of his political ideas at a critical juncture in Indonesia's post-war history. In addressing what had then emerged as Indonesia's largest political party, President Soekarno made one of his fullest criticisms of parliamentary democracy--as he has come to see it, and especially as it has operated in Indonesia. This was an occasion on which he stated with particular forcefulness his conviction that Indonesia would have to pursue a different course if she were to realize the economic and social ideals that were borne by the revolution. He was speaking at the time when a new organ of government was about to be set up in accordance with his political philosophy--a National Council, which he saw as substantially supplementing what he regarded as an inadequate parliament, and whose establishment would be one of the first major steps in the direction of what he has termed "Guided Democracy".

In view of the importance of this address by Indonesia's President, it is my hope that the Cornell Modern Indonesia Project can make some contribution to

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a broader understanding of contemporary Indonesia, and in particular the views of President Soekarno, by having it translated and published. I should like to express to Mrs. Claire Holt our appreciation for the excellent translation which she has prepared.

George McT. Kahin
Director

Ithaca, New York
May 25, 1960

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

Like most of President Soekarno's speeches, this address is interspersed with Dutch, English, French and other foreign words, phrases or whole quotations as well as with words in some of the regional languages of Indonesia, in this case Sundanese and Javanese. Usually, but not always, the foreign language expressions are explained or paraphrased by the speaker in the next following passage(s).

Underscoring of words in the text of the translation indicates the use of a foreign language, including English, in the original Indonesian version; points up the introduction of an expression in one of the regional languages (e.g. Sundanese or Javanese); or preserves an idiomatic expression in the Indonesian language (e.g. gotong rojong).

Items placed between square brackets [ ] are additions by the translator which might be helpful in clarifying the implied meaning. Similarly, a few explanatory footnotes have been added by the translator.

Round brackets ( ) which do not occur in the original text have been used instead of the dashes which set off asides or lengthy explanatory passages that interrupt the principal line of discourse.

Acknowledged with thanks are some valuable suggestions made by Daphne Whittam who read the final draft of the edited translation.

Claire Holt

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Brothers and Sisters* All:

I should like first to express my thanks for the gift of this very beautiful painting, given to me by the Indonesian Nationalist Party as a memento of the time when, thirty years ago, my friends and I set up the Indonesian Nationalist Party.

I am very happy this evening to be able to attend the gathering in this hall commemorating the thirtieth anniversary of the Indonesian Nationalist Party or the thirtieth birthday of Marhaenism. I was asked by the party leadership to speak here; it was asked that this address be a discourse and even the word "lecture" was used. God willing, I shall fulfill that request. My discourse or lecture will deal with the motives, the reasons, why thirty years ago I and several friends set up the Indonesian Nationalist Party; and the motives or reasons why I created that which is now known as Marhaenism.

You know that I am not now a member of any party: I am not now a member of the PKI (Indonesian Communist Party), not a member of Masjumi, not a member of Nahdlatul Ulama /Association of Islamic Scholars/, not a member of the PNI /Indonesian Nationalist Party/. I am a citizen of the Republic of Indonesia named Soekarno who at this moment happens to hold the position of the first President of the Republic of Indonesia. So when I lecture to you as I will in a moment about the motives and reasons why, thirty years ago, I and several friends established the Indonesian Nationalist Party, providing a basis for this new movement of Marhaenism, this lecture will be given in no other spirit but as a remembrance.

PORTRAIT OF 1927

Moreover, I also intend to draw a portrait, a portrait of our conditions, of our struggle, of our ideals, of our desires in 1927. This is your portrait, the year of 1927, this is your picture. And then, Brothers and

---

* The Indonesian saudara-saudara, while indicating brothers and/or sisters, also means near-relatives.

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Sisters, when I have painted that portrait of 1927, I shall invite you to look at yourselves today in this looking glass, this reflector, this large mirror; compare what you see with the portrait I give you, of that year of 1927. And I shall leave it to you, Brothers and Sisters, to draw your own conclusions. Will the face that you see in this mirror of 1957 be the same as the face of the portrait of 1927? If it is the same--it is fortunate, praised by the Lord. If it is not the same, I shall beg you to engage in self-correction.

For, Brothers and Sisters, as I have said over and over again, not only is our revolution not yet completed, but our ideals have not yet been attained. What we aspired to, what we longed for, what we desired in the year 1927 has not yet been achieved. Do not imagine, Brothers and Sisters, that now, that we have the Republic of Indonesia, whose territorial jurisdiction extends over almost the whole Indonesian archipelago from Sabang to Merauke, we can now say that all of our ideals have been achieved. No! For if all of our ideals had been achieved, I would not be saying that our revolution is not yet completed.

Permit me, Brothers and Sisters, to depict for you the motives and reasons why I and several friends set up the Indonesian Nationalist Party on 4 July 1927.

Earlier, my beloved friend Soewirjo has described so clearly how the Indonesian Nationalist Party came to life, under the saddest of conditions, in an atmosphere where the whole of the Indonesian community and the People of Indonesia lived in mental confusion, lived with a sense of loss of leadership and of leaders. Those words of Mr. Soewirjo are true, Brothers and Sisters. Mr. Soewirjo told you that in 1927 we had repeatedly stressed Indonesia merdeka sekarang: Indonesia independent now! Yes, Mr. Soewirjo further said that in that year we also stated that independence was only a golden bridge.

Indeed, Brothers and Sisters, if you ask me what were the bases for the formation of the Indonesian Nationalist Party thirty years ago, then I should speak of three matters:

First, the aim. An aim which may not be changed--which may not be changed today, which may not be changed in the days ahead. And what is that aim, Brothers and

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Sisters? It is nothing else but a society which in today's terminology is called a just and prosperous society, and which, in the terminology of 1927, was called a society of sama rasa sama rata*. This aim must remain fixed, Brothers and Sisters, and it may not be altered.

Second, the Indonesian Nationalist Party from 1927 onwards insisted that an absolute condition (said to be the most important condition in 1927, but in fact being an absolute condition) for achieving this objective, was national independence. Indonesia Merdeka, Independent Indonesia, was even called for by the Indonesian Nationalist Party in the words "Independent Indonesia Now, Now, Now". Three times now!

Third, it is already clear, the aim is a just and prosperous society, or an egalitarian society, or, in words better known by the whole world, a socialist society, in the pure sense.

REVOLUTIONARY MASS ACTION

To attain a socialist society, or an egalitarian society, or a just and prosperous society, we had to cross a golden bridge, named Indonesia Merdeka, Independent Indonesia. There arose the question, how to attain an Independent Indonesia. And it was the Indonesian Nationalist Party that gave to this a firm answer: through revolutionary mass action.

Because, Brothers and Sisters, there were those, especially at that time, who said we could attain national independence without revolutionary mass action, but that it could be won through education, through negotiations with the Dutch, through playing parliament in the Volksraad, and, moreover, as you know, Brothers and Sisters, the Dutch as a result of pressure from the Volksraad in the month of November 1918, had even given their well-known November Promises: "De November-beloften van 1918". There were people who supposed that independence or, at the very least, extension of political rights, could be attained merely by requests, by petitions.

---

* Sama Rasa Sama Rata: Literally: "same feelings, same level", i.e. equality in rights, obligations, and status, etc. In other words, an egalitarian society.

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

In newspapers, in meetings, in the Volksraad or in other councils, it was later stated that independence or extension of political rights might be given as a gesture, out of goodness of heart.

I remember, Brothers and Sisters, when I was only 17 years old I heard of the existence of the "November-beloften" /the promises of November, 1918/, in which the Dutch promised the People of Indonesia an expansion of political rigths; I still remember how many leaders rejoiced thinking: Ah, now certainly it will come about that we will get an extension of rights which will ultimately bring us to an Independent Indonesia. At that time I, as a youth of 17 years, had already begun to shake my head. No! Independence would not be attained this way. And I said outright at that time to the late Hadji Umar Said Tjokroaminoto that I did not believe that the November promises would be fulfilled.

And in fact, Brothers and Sisters, those November promises were not fulfilled. What was the reason? The reason was that the November 1918 promises were given by the Dutch at a time when the Netherlands was in great danger. The first world war was then raging at its worst. Communications between the Netherlands and Indonesia may be said to have been entirely cut and, added to this, there was in the Netherlands a strong movement amongst the workers--a movement intent even on overthrowing the Netherlands royal dynasty. It was under these conditions, Brothers and Sisters, that the November promises were made. On the one hand, requests from the People of Indonesia for extension of rights; on the other hand, pressure from the workers in Holland itself, pressure to overthrow the dynasty; and the disruption of communications between the Netherlands and Indonesia caused by the first world war.

It was under those circumstances, then, that the November promises were made. But when the war was over, when the relations between the Netherlands and her colony could be restored, when conditions considered normal at that time became normal again, when the workers' movement in Holland had subsided, the promises of November 1918 were completely forgotten. It was exactly as Mr. Pieter Jelles Troelstra, a leader of the workers in Holland said: The November promises were promises forced by conditions. Troelstra, in a vigorous speech in the Second Chamber of the Dutch Parliament said:

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"Het was het hoogte punt van't internationale gebeuren, toen de splinters van stukgeslagen tronen het volk van Nederland om de ooren vlogen en de donder van buitenlandsche revoluties over zijn velden rolde."*

At that time Troelstra said: The splinters of thrones, friends, to the right and left of the Netherlands fly around the people of Holland. And the people of Holland hear the rolling, the detonations, the explosions of revolutions abroad. The existence of these conditions, friends, the revolution in Germany, the revolution in Russia which gave birth to the Soviet Union, moreover, pressure from the workers (in the Netherlands) who sought to overthrow the royal house, demands of the People of Indonesia through parliamentary means, the rupture of communications between Indonesia and the Netherlands, caused the Dutch to make the November promises. What Troelstra said was exactly right.

That happened in 1918, Brothers and Sisters. But, in spite of these experiences of 1918, there were still many among the leaders of Indonesia who thought that National Independence could be attained by asking, by petitioning, even by begging. But the Indonesian Nationalist Party in 1927 asserted that National Independence could not be attained by such methods, but must be won by means of revolutionary mass action.

These are the three /principles/, Brothers and Sisters: the aim, a just and prosperous society; the conditions to attain it--via the golden bridge; and the only means by which the golden bridge could be won--revolutionary mass action. These were the three fundamentals of the Indonesian Nationalist Party, Brothers and Sisters.

MARHAEN AND PROLETARIAN

And now it may be asked, what is it that is called "mass"? What is mass action which is revolutionary--revolutionary mass action? What is said to be the mass, what is called "the masses"? It is here, Brothers and Sisters, that there arises the idea of Marhaen, the concept of Marhaen.

---

* Literally: "It was the climax of international events when the splinters of demolished thrones flew around the ears of Netherlands' people and the thunder of foreign revolutions rolled over its fields."

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

When Mr. Soewirjo said a while ago: the people of Indonesia, the Indonesian masses are primarily Workers and Peasants, that is true. I ask that stress be put upon the word "primarily", because what I meant by the term "masses" in 1927 was not solely workers and peasants (even though primarily they are workers and peasants), for, apart from the workers' and peasants' groups there are yet many other groups who are neither workers nor peasants.

For example, Brothers and Sisters, the "tukang roda" (a Bandung term*) are not workers, are not peasants; to what group do they belong? The street vendors who put up the wayside stalls, they are not workers nor peasants; what group includes them? Formerly, in 1926, there was a term well-known in Indonesian circles, that is the term "Proletariat"; the meaning of this term was often not understood. The term proletariat was used in 1926 to describe the whole of the poor, the common people; but they are by far not all proletarians.

Heh, abdi mah proletar /"I am a proletarian"/ but the man who says that may not be a proletarian at all. For instance, Brothers and Sisters, once a farmer from Tjidjerokaso said "I am a proletarian", but he was not a proletarian; or a small vendor with a food-stall at the Idjan crossroads said:"I am a proletarian"--but he was not at all a proletarian. To whom then does that term proletariat apply? In 1927 in my lecture courses, especially in those for the cadres, I stated that a member of the proletariat is a person who sells his labor-power to another, without himself owning the means of production. The proletariat are the workers who do not participate in ownership of the means of production. But our nation, Brothers and Sisters, is composed of tens of millions of people not all of whom are covered by the term proletariat. There are great numbers indeed who are not laborers, very many who do not sell their labor-power to others.

Formerly I explained to my comrades, my old friends, why I used the term "Marhaen". It was for no other reason but that on a certain day I was walking in the rice

---

* "Tukang roda" or "tukang betjak", tricycle-carriage drivers.

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

fields to the south of Tjigereleng, and I came across a man hoeing the field, and I asked him: "Brother, who owns this field?" "Gaduh abdi" /I own it/ he said. And so he participated in ownership of the means of production, owning that rice field. "And the hoe, who owns that?" "Gaduh abdi". "These tools, who owns these?" "Gaduh abdi". "But, Brother, you live in poverty?" "That's right, I live poorly." And I thought to myself then, this man clearly and certainly is not a member of the proletariat, he is a pauper, he is poor, he suffers much, he has not enough to live on, but he is not a member of the proletariat, for he does not sell his labor-power to another without participating in ownership of the means of production. His rice field is his own property, his hoe is his own, his sickle is his own, his rake is his own. Everything is his own property; the crop of his rice field is for his own use. But still he is a pauper, he is poor. Nevertheless he is not one of the proletariat, he is a small farmer, a very poor farmer, barely making a living. "Tani sieur", I said at that time "Tani gurem".* He is not one of the proletariat. Then, Brothers and Sisters, I asked him "What is your name?" "I am Marhaen**," he said. He said that his name was Marhaen. I had an inspiration: Now, this name I will hold to; I will use this name to describe the destitute People of Indonesia.

And of poor Indonesians there are not one million, not two million or three, but almost the whole of the Indonesian People are paupers. Almost the whole of the People of Indonesia are Marhaen! They are the poor common people, yes, the poor worker, yes, the poor peasant, yes, the poor fisherman, yes, the poor clerk, yes, the poor stall vendor, yes, the poor cart driver, yes, the poor chauffeur—all of these are embraced by the one term, Marhaen.

TRADE IMPERIALISM AND INVESTMENT CAPITAL

Why are almost all of the people of Indonesia poor? That is something I explained in my lectures at that time. I explained that Dutch imperialism, which had

* Tani sieur (Sundanese); Tani gurem (Javanese: Literally, a chicken-flea peasant, i.e. a peasant with a plot of land no larger than a flea.

** Marhaen, pronounced Mahr-hah-ěn.

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

been operating in Indonesia for decades, even for hundreds of years, had a different character, a different nature than, for instance, British imperialism. At that time I told members of the Indonesian Nationalist Party: British imperialism, for example, which operated in India, had the character of a mercantile imperialism--a trade imperialism, in order to sell British-made goods in India. And in order that the People of India should be able to buy those British-made goods, British imperialism in India at that time did not impoverish the People of India too much. It still took care that some purchasing power did exist amongst the Indian people; for, a population which is completely pauperized is not able to buy goods. It was because of this, Brothers and Sisters, that in 1927, 1928 and 1929 I said: "British imperialism provided education for the People of India quite early." Schools were established in India, even colleges and universities were set up in India just in order to maintain some purchasing power among the Indian people. And, therefore, the Indian people were not made too poor.

As a reaction to British imperialism in India (and of course there was a reaction, for all people eventually desire independence...as I said in 1927: even the worm will turn, let alone man, when trodden upon over and over again, he will certainly revolt at last), as a reaction to this imperialism, the People of India began a movement known as the Swadeshi movement. In order to counteract the imports from Britain, the Indian people declared that they would not buy British goods: The People of India started the Swadeshi movement, made their own goods, wove their own cloth, spun their own thread, even set up their own factories. This Swadeshi movement was a logical consequence of the nature of British imperialism which was "trade-capitalistic".

But what was the nature of Dutch imperialism in Indonesia, Brothers and Sisters? Dutch imperialism in Indonesia was not, I said, first and foremost a merchant imperialism, (though it had some aspects of trade, Brothers and Sisters, and of no mean dimensions--but it was still not primarily mercantile imperialism). The Dutch imperialism which operated in Indonesia was primarily of the kind that Hilverdink called "finance capital". The Dutch brought money to Indonesia, not to give to the Indonesian people--"Here's some money for you...." Oh, no! But money to invest in Indonesia, in the form of

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

factories, in the form of estates, in order to squeeze out, to dig up, to scratch up all the kinds of riches there are in Indonesia. Capital, investment-capital, was introduced into Indonesia, was made to work in Indonesia like an all-powerful giant, I used to say. This money worked in Indonesia, scraping up Indonesia's wealth to be taken to Holland and to be sold in Europe, to gain profits in Europe which were brought again to Indonesia to be planted in Indonesia, in order to dig up Indonesia's wealth once more. And that wealth was taken again to Europe, sold in Europe, and bore profit in Europe. And that money became finance capital again, was once more brought to Indonesia, planted in Indonesia, used in business in Indonesia. Round and round in this fashion for decades, even for centuries, Brothers and Sisters.

Now the consequences of investment capital are different from those of trade imperialism. What does investment capital seek? You wish to set up a sugar refinery, for example, so you need land on which to plant sugar-cane; and it is desirable that the rent for the land should not be too high. People who are clever, people who are intelligent, people who understand their own interests, ask high rents for land. And, therefore, the People of Indonesia were not taught; a knowledge of their own interests, and their possible advancement was withheld from them, in order that land rents might remain low. What does a sugar refinery need? A sugar refinery needs workers, workers to work in the refinery, workers to work in the cane fields. In order that they might not demand higher wages, these workers were not provided with skills. Always their wants and necessities were suppressed. Thus the tendency was different, Brothers and Sisters.

Whereas trade imperialism still gave some small heed to the purchasing power of a people (I don't say that trade capitalism makes a people free and independent, not at all, but merely that it somewhat maintains the purchasing power of a people)--whereas trade imperialism acted thus, the imperialism of investment capital suppressed the needs and the skills of the people. It needed cheap rents, it needed cheap labor. Therefore, a process took place in Indonesia called the "pauperiserings-proces"--the pauperization of the Indonesian people. So that--as I explained in my defense speech in the Landraad court in Bandung, later printed as a book, "Indonesia Menggugat" /"Indonesia Accuses"/--Indonesia came to be "small" in style--everything became

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

small-styled. For example, no assistance was given to increasing needs. Everything was constantly pauperized. Everything came to have the stamp of smallness: the small worker--a pauper; the small farmer--a pauper; the small fisherman--a pauper; the small cart-and-horse owner--a pauper; the small employee--a pauper. Everything was small. And this applied not only to the proletariat alone (that is, the workers who sold their labor-power without participating in ownership of the means of production), it applied to the whole of society.

It was in this connection, Brothers and Sisters, that I said that the whole of society suffered pauperization, and I needed a name for all those who were pauperized. A name for the worker and the peasant, for the fisherman and the carter, for the low-ranking policeman and the children of the troops of the former Indies army, as well as the reporters, and the stall-keeper, yes, for every kind of all these small people.

It was lucky, praised be the Lord, that one day I had an inspiration when I was talking to Marhaen south of Tjigareleng. He seemed to become a symbol of the small man of Indonesia. A symbol of the power of the Indonesian people. A symbol of the explosive force, the explosive material for achieving Indonesia Merdeka Brothers and Sisters.

I said a while ago that British imperialism, the trade imperialism in India, could eventually be beaten by the movement led by Mahatma Gandhi, characterized by swadeshi and satyagraha (that is, civil disobedience), as the people of Central Java say: hambalela--swadeshi, satyagraha; it was especially this swadeshi which constituted strong competition by the Indian people themselves capable of counteracting the imports from Britain. It was by such means that the people of India eventually won Indian independence.

But we, the Indonesian People, Brothers and Sisters, we could not achieve Indonesia's independence by means of swadeshi. No--because we did not have the material with which to build a great movement capable of beating imperialism here. We could not overcome a strong investment-capital system merely by a swadeshi movement--no! And for that reason, Brothers and Sisters, the Indonesian Nationalist Party emphatically stated in 1927: The only power which can throw off Dutch imperialism in Indonesia

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

is revolutionary action by the masses. A mass action by all of Indonesia's Marhaens, who are tens of millions strong. And this, Brothers and Sisters, happened after 17th August 1945, when all of Indonesia's Marhaens, yes, those who were young men and women, who were workers, who were peasants, rose and acted.

I remember the year 1928, Brothers and Sisters,--at that time there was a certain Dutch Resident in Bandung who, on one of the Dutch holidays, with the Dutch Indies employees before him, with the gentlemen of the estates before him, with a picked group of subservient people before him, Brothers and Sisters, made a speech in the building which is now the Governor's Residence and where I am to spend this night. He spoke there, pointing to the tri-colour, the red, white and blue of the Netherlands; he said to the assembled ladies and gentlemen: "Zie, daar wappert onze drie-kleur. Daar wappert onze vlag. En zij zullen op ijzer bijten, die die vlag trachten neer te halen." Meaning: "Look, there flies our tri-colour. There flies our flag. And whoever may seek to lower it shall bite upon iron." "Zij zullen op ijzer bijten, die onze vlag trachten neer to halen." Oh yes, Brothers and Sisters, we the People of Indonesia did indeed bite upon iron, but it was not our teeth that were smashed, Brothers and Sisters, not our teeth, but the iron itself was crushed to bits! And why was the iron crushed, Brothers and Sisters? Because we took revolutionary mass action.

Thus, I have elucidated three principles--the aim of a just and prosperous society, and egalitarian society, a socialist society. This remains fixed! But the bridge to it, the golden bridge, Indonesia's Independence, its construction is not yet completed today, Brothers and Sisters. And even the incomplete structure is becoming chipped, and some of its pillars are beginning to crumble away. Not only is it being damaged by the actions of those others, the subversive foreigners, but also amongst our own people, too, there are fools who would damage the pillars of that bridge; and so our golden bridge is not yet perfected.

Revolutionary mass action, Brothers and Sisters, is the way, the one and only way, to attain, to erect, to create, to build this golden bridge.

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

So much, Brothers and Sisters, for the past. The aim is clear, similarly the absolute precondition for Indonesia Merdeka, that is the golden bridge, is clear too. We have already undertaken the mass action.

BUILDING, ORGANIZING AND DESTROYING

And now, having attained Indonesia Merdeka since 17th August 1945,--as Pak 'Wirjo said a while ago--now that we are independent, we enter a new phase. Pak 'Wirjo said that earlier there was phase of demolition, of destroying, but that the present phase is one of organization and construction.

Perhaps a slight correction is in order. Our duty today, Brothers and Sisters, is not only to build and to construct. Our duty is still to destroy, we still have a duty to tear down. Because, as I said this morning to the students who came to the Istana Merdeka /"Freedom Palace"/ in Djakarta: "Do not imagine that colonialism no longer exists in Indonesia. Is there no longer any imperialism in Indonesia? Now that we have the State of the Republic of Indonesia, may we say that colonialism is dead?" "No," I said, "Colonialism is not yet dead, imperialism is not yet dead!"

We must continue the struggle to destroy imperialism and colonialism. It is clear, Brothers and Sisters, that we live today in a world different from the one before we had the Republic. But, we still need to ponder several matters. Just as an example, Brothers and Sisters, in '27, '28, '29 I asserted that what we call a sama rasa sama rata society, a just and prosperous society--socialism, cannot be attained by a policy of liberalism, cannot be achieved by a liberal economy which was earlier criticized also by Pak 'Wirjo. This is true, certainly it is so. Let us not imagine that we can establish a just and prosperous society--equality--socialism, by pursuing a policy of liberalism in the form of parliamentary democracy.

I asserted this in 1927, 1928, 1929, 1932 and 1933, Brothers and Sisters. We cannot attain our ideals of a socialist society, of equality, of a just and prosperous society by parliaments. Cannot, because what is called parliamentary democracy, I said, is the result of the growth in Europe of a bourgeoisie over several

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

decades. Political liberalism, economic liberalism, are the political and economic philosophy of an opkomende bourgeoisie, of a rising bourgeoisie.

And later, when the bourgeoisie is on the brink of perishing, Brothers and Sisters, this bourgeoisie tries to save itself by another method, no longer by means of parliamentary democracy, but by means of fascism.

The political philosophy of a bourgeoisie, while it is growing, while it is strong, is liberalism. Its political philosophy is parliamentary democracy. A bourgeoisie which is on the decline, which is almost dead, which needs to save itself, a moribund bourgeoisie, tries to save its life by fascist means. In 1928, I clearly wrote in the magazine "Suluh Indonesia Muda" /"Torch of Young Indonesia"/ that fascism was "een laaste reddingspoging van het kapitalisme," that fascism was a last attempt of capitalism to save itself.

But I repeat: parliamentary democracy is the philosophy of a rising bourgeoisie and of a bourgeoisie which is strong, Brothers and Sisters. How could we hope to set up and run a socialist society with parliamentary democracy and a liberal policy? No, Brothers and Sisters!

I explained it in my lectures at that time, telling for instance, the story of the French Revolution. The slogan of the French Revolution was "Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité". Egalité and Fraternité are slogans for equal rights and brotherhood; Liberté is for independence, freedom. Those were the slogans of the rising bourgeoisie. I explained that prior to the ascendency of that bourgeoisie, power in France was held by the feudal group and the church group. They were called the first power and the second power; the first power was the feudal lords and the second was the church. At the time when the bourgeoisie was about to rise, it could not rise freely because of the laws of the state, the laws and regulations in force in the country. These did not benefit that bourgeoisie, they did not give opportunities to that bourgeoisie. Every law was made in order to protect the first class and the second class.

I even remember, Brothers and Sisters, that in one of my lectures I repeated the words of a French king who said: "Le loi c'est moi." I am the law of the state!

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Le loi c'est moi, in order to safeguard feudalism. Le loi c'est moi in order to safeguard the tweede stand /lit: second class or estate/, the church. The bourgeoisie which sought to rise could not do so, Brothers and Sisters, it had no space in which to grow. Therefore, there came the French Revolution, I said. The French Revolution with its awful sacrifices. The French Revolution under the leadership of Danton, Robespierre, of Marat, of Mirabeau, of Theroigne de Mericourt, of Babeuf and of others. The French Revolution was in essence nothing else but a revolution of the bourgeoisie trying to rise and using slogans which could attract the people.

The French Revolution eventually achieved a system called the system of parliamentary democracy, after it had gone on for decades. Indeed, I have said a number of times that no revolution can be finished in a year. Each great revolution takes many decades. To return to the French Revolution, when did that revolution begin? If we reckon from "de eed in de kaatsbaan" /"the tennis-court oath"/, then it began in 1789. But if we reckon from the philosophies which preceded the French Revolution, the philosophies of Rousseau, Montesquieu or of Voltaire, it began before 1789. But, taking "de eed in de kaatsbaan" of 1789 as the beginning, when did it end, Brothers and Sisters? It ended by the middle of the 19th century. For more than seventy years the French Revolution continued, to win parliamentary democracy. Parliamentary democracy to assist the growth of a national bourgeoisie, to help the national bourgeoisie to achieve a position in the field of production.

And now we would use this parliamentary democracy to win socialism, Brothers and Sisters? We cannot! I repeat with deepest conviction, Brothers and Sisters: --impossible! Because parliamentary democracy grew out of the philosophy of political liberalism, and liberalism is the enemy of socialism. It is impossible, Brothers and Sisters.

PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY AND SOCIO-DEMOCRACY

In 1927, the Indonesian Nationalist Party for the first time heard from me the term socio-democracy. What is the meaning of socio-democracy, Brothers and Sisters? Nowadays one often hears socio-democracy, socio-nationalism. What is the meaning of socio-democracy?

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Socio-democracy is in fact the challenge to parliamentary democracy. Precisely because we know that parliamentary democracy is unable to establish, to create, to build socialism. Therefore, and just for that reason, we are instituting a democracy that differs from that parliamentary democracy, namely a socio-democracy.

Remember my lectures! I once said: don't imagine that we can set up a just and prosperous society solely with political equality. Oh yes, a policy of liberalism does give equality in the political field. Every person has the right to exercise his vote, his political vote; every person has the right to become a member of parliament, to be elected a member of parliament and to elect members of parliament. Every person, yourselves, the General, the Soldier, the Clerk, the Fisherman, the Worker, the Farmer, the man, the woman, the rich, the poor, all of them have the right to vote and to be elected to the House of Representatives. They are equal in the political field. That political equality is even inscribed in golden letters in their Constitution, written down in the constitution of their state: every citizen who reaches such and such an age may enter the political field. However, Brothers and Sisters, while the poor worker has the same right as his employer, while the soldier from the ranks has the same right as his general, while the fisherman who eats only once a day has the same right as the capitalist who lives in a fourteen story building, poverty, friends, still reigns. In the hovels the women still lament, in the shacks mothers still weep because, lacking food, their breasts give forth milk no longer. But in their constitution, Brothers and Sisters, the letters are inscribed in gold--there is no discrimination between citizens so long as they are of such and such or such and such an age,--all are equal, they may vote for and be elected as members of parliament.

Very much to the point are the words of Charles Fourier, one of the leading socialists of the mid-nineteenth century: "Men kan de honger van een bedelaar niet stillen door hem een grondwet in de hand te stoppen.": "One cannot fill the stomachs of hungry beggars by stuffing a constitution into their hands."--"Men kan de honger van een bedelaar niet stillen door hem een grondwet in de hand te stoppen." Well, this has been my conviction since 1927, Brothers and Sisters. We cannot create a just and prosperous society by parliamentary democracy alone. This is why I said in my lectures: let us aim

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

not only at political democracy; we must also create economic democracy; not only equality in the political field but also equality in the economic field. Political-economic democracy, political democracy and economic democracy side by side. This is what the Indonesian Nationalist Party calls socio-democracy. And only if we continue to remember this, continue to hold fast to faith in socio-democracy will you be able to save this people. Why then is it that amongst us at this present time, Brothers and Sisters, there are those who still cling to parliamentary democracy?

I use the term "socio-democracy" deliberately. Alternatively, the term of a socialist, a man from Vienna, whose name was Adler could be used. He was not a communist, nor was he a "soft" socialist; he was neither a member of the Third International nor yet of the Second. At times it was teasingly alleged that he was a member of the Second-and-a-half International--an intermediate International, between the Second and Third. Adler used a new term, Brothers and Sisters--he said: we should aim not solely at political democracy, but we should aim at, what he called, "sociale democratie", i.e. social democracy.*

Now whoever hears me say social democracy should remember what I said when as President, not as Bung Karno, I installed the Minister for Social Affairs, Mr. Moeljadi Djojomartono. At that time I reminded people that the word social has a very extensive meaning and concerns the whole of society. Social democracy or sociale democratie is our objective, Brothers and Sisters. This is not "Social-Democracy", as I said at Madiun several weeks ago. "Social-Democracy" is one of the currents of socialism. There are many currents in socialism. There is religious socialism, there is the socialism called utopian, there is nihilist socialism, there is communist socialism, and there is a socialism

* The speaker here and below differentiates between social democracy (social as an adjective, cf. Adler) and Social-Democracy as a compound term for one of the socialist trends. In Dutch and Indonesian which he uses the terms are: sociale democratie and demokrasi sosial respectively for the former, and Social-Democratie and Sosial demokrasi for the latter.

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

which calls itself "Social-Democracy". Thus Social-Democracy is one of the currents of socialism. But what I mean is not that: what I mean is "sociale democratie", which we call socio-democracy.

THE REVOLUTION DEMANDS "THINKING AND RETHINKING", "SHAPING AND RESHAPING"

If we are now convinced, Brothers and Sisters, that we cannot attain the ideals of socialism merely through parliamentary democracy, let us now review the present conditions, Brothers and Sisters.

At present we already have the state of the Republic of Indonesia, we have been independent now for as long as almost twelve years--how do we stand? It is evident now that within the eleven years of our independence, we have not yet been able to provide prosperity and justice for the People. Our ideals to create a just and prosperous society have not been achieved at all. For this reason, Brothers and Sisters, it would be well for us to reconsider our life within the present structure and methods of government. And, truly, revolution requires us at all times to reflect upon everything. In a revolution, as I said at Madiun, we must think and re-think, we must traverse the road of thinking and re-thinking. Think again and think again, and not only think but form--shape is the English word--and if necessary re-shape. Shaping and re-shaping and again re-shaping. Shape something, and if it is evident that the form is wrong, discard it, get rid of it, replace it with a new form, re-shape it. If this be wrong, discard it, replace it with a new form. If that be wrong, replace it with a new form again.

Truly, Brothers and Sisters, revolution is a tremendous process which takes decades, as I said before. Shaping, re-shaping, thinking, re-thinking. Revolution is not a graven idol, once made, semuhun dawuh*, there it sits unchanging. Oh no! A revolution is something alive, something dynamic.

* A Javanese expression of submission or blind obedience as "yes, my lord" or "as you please (command), my lord", etc.

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

A revolution, I say, is a great symphony, a great symphony of destructive and constructive forces. Destructive and constructive forces! A great symphony between the forces which destroy, crush and turn things to dust, and creative, constructive forces; a simultaneous action of two mighty processes. Therefore, in a revolution let us not hesitate to think and re-think, to shape and re-shape.

Let us, Brothers and Sisters, review our life within the structure of the state, our parliamentary democracy. Is this enough, Brothers and Sisters? Have we been able to establish a just and prosperous society with this, our system of parliamentary democracy, which we have used during these last eleven years? Have we? Brothers and Sisters, I say: No we could not. Because parliamentary democracy is an outgrowth of liberalism, and a policy of liberalism cannot possibly bring socialism, or a society of sama rasa sama rata /equality/. And therefore we must re-shape, re-shape and re-shape. We must look for something else. Don't be afraid to search for something else if you are truly a revolutionary. Those who are afraid to seek something new, something different, they are inert wooden figures, Brothers and Sisters, people without a dynamic spirit. Shape and re-shape. Think and re-think.

THE FOUR FREEDOMS

Brothers and Sisters, in Serang and in Madiun a while ago I expounded the differences between the ideals known in the western world and the ideals of the nations of the eastern world which are now independent. At that time, I took as an example the so-called Roosevelt doctrine. A former president of the United States of America named Roosevelt propounded his famous doctrine, namely the Four Freedoms: freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, freedom from fear. Of these four, "freedom of speech" is freedom to state opinions; "freedom of worship" is freedom to follow any religion a person chooses; "freedom from want" is freedom from poverty, freedom from destitution; "freedom from fear" is freedom from the feeling of fear. For, in the fascist world men are overcome by fear--fear of their own neighbors lest they be denouncers, fear of the concentration camp, fear of the lash of the reactionaries, fear of punishments, fear of everything--even fear of their superiors, of their own "in laws", mothers, fathers, and children, lest they

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

be spies. Well, it is freedom from this feeling of being afraid, Brothers and Sisters, which Roosevelt called "freedom from fear". Four freedoms. Consider especially the first and the third, freedom of speech and freedom from want. Examine them carefully, Brothers and Sisters! In the world of parliamentary democracy it is the first of these which is implemented, freedom of speech. It is this which gives equal political rights to all men. Freedom of speech, the fact that people may express their opinions, express their criticisms, may become members of parliament, may choose members of parliament--freedom of speech. How about freedom from want? No! Freedom from want is not too effectively implemented. However, there are countries where this freedom from want is in fact given priority. Freedom from want is given priority, although freedom of speech has not been implemented at all times.

Just for example, Brothers and Sisters, we can see plainly that in the United States of America priority is given to freedom of speech, and freedom from want comes later; whilst in the Soviet Union and in the Peoples Republic of China what is given priority, what is sought first is freedom from want; freedom of speech, desnoods /if need be/ comes later. I have discussed this with Madame Soong Ching Ling, the widow of the late Dr. Sun Yat Sen, about whom I used to tell in the courses concerned with the movement in Tiongkok/China/. (Mr. Tjidjerokaso calls it not Tiongkok,but Ongkiok.) I used to give lectures about China, about Dr. Sun Yat Sen, and here was his widow--Madame Sun Yat Sen, or Madame Soong Ching Ling. When I was in the Peoples Republic of China several months ago, I asked Madame Soong Ching Ling: "Madame, are you a member of the Communist Party?" No! "No, Brother, I am not a member of the Communist Party." She was not a member of the Communist Party. "Why sister,"--indeed, I addressed Madame Soong Ching Ling as Sister--"Why, Sister, but you help the present government, the government of the Peoples Republic of China today?" "Yes, I help the present government of China 'full-hearted'," she said, i.e. with full conviction. "Is it true that the present Chinese government is concerned first with freedom from want?" "Yes, of course that is true. It is this which should be given priority, freedom from want; to try as hard as possible, to plan, to make every possible effort, to spend all available energy so that the people can be freed from poverty." "Oh, and how about freedom of

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

speech?" "Yes, we will arrange that and give freedom of speech--but the other comes first." It is the same as in the Soviet Union, Brothers and Sisters, which gives priority to freedom from want, which gives priority to efforts to secure freedom from want; freedom of speech, desnoods /if need be/, comes later.

I asked Madame Soong Ching Ling: "Why do you give priority to freedom from want?" Her reply was most striking. She replied in English: "Yes, my brother, because the stomach does not wait." Yes, my younger brother, the reason is that an empty stomach cannot be ordered to wait. One can say to others: next year is time enough for you to express your opinions, you will get your freedom of speech next year, or five years later, or ten years later, only then may you express your opinions, at present you just have to obey, just to follow, just to keep quiet. One can say such a thing. But one cannot say to a poor man: Wait, wait, wait--don't ask for food now--next year will do, I'll give you food then. Let alone for one year, just order people to wait for one month, and they cannot, Brothers and Sisters. They cannot wait for a single day. The stomach does not wait. Therefore, what is given precedence in their efforts is freedom from want. Later on--desnoods /if need be/, --freedom of speech.

I spoke about this in my lectures in Serang, in Madiun and in other places a while ago--that in the Soviet Union, for example, quite intentionally in the beginning, freedom of speech was completely neglected. It can be said that there is no freedom of speech, even that there is open dictatorship--dictatorship of the proletariat. A dictatorship which can force, compel, make it obligatory for the whole of society to accept decisions.

What about us, Brothers and Sisters? To what should we give priority? We have this party--this PNI, this Indonesian Nationalist Party--socio-nationalism, socio-democracy. In the principles of our present administration we have the Pantja Sila /Five Principles/. Nothing is given priority, and nothing is postponed until later: this comes first and this comes later. No! But, concurrently, freedom of speech and freedom from want, together: politico-economic democracy. This is our endeavor, Brothers and Sisters. This is the core of the political sphere which seeks democracy in the economic sphere also. This politico-economic democracy is called, if we use the term of Adler, sociale democratie.

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL

Well, how can we achieve such a state of affairs? Can it be through parliamentary democracy alone? No, I say, that is impossible! Through parliamentary democracy alone we cannot achieve politico-economic democracy. This is the reason, Brothers and Sisters, why after thinking and re-thinking, I have arrived at the point at which we must re-shape. Shape and re-shape. This, Brothers and Sisters, is at the core of my intention in setting up the National Council, which, God willing, I shall install on the twelfth of this month. For, the National Council is an endeavor to implement, to put into practice, to realize this idea. The idea that within the present world--in the present world of this Republic--we should attempt to achieve a just and prosperous society.

A while ago I spoke about the Soviet Union, Brothers and Sisters. In the Soviet Union or in other states which have only one political party conditions are very easy. In the Soviet Union there is only one party, the Communist Party. One may say that in India there is only one party, the Congress Party; in Burma it may be said that there is only one party, the A.F.L., the Anti-Fascist League. In countries with only one party, shaping and re-shaping, thinking and re-thinking, can proceed easily. For instance, in the Soviet Union, Brothers and Sisters, if it be necessary to re-shape it is very easy; once that single party managed to change its opinion, off starts the re-shaping. Look also at India, Brothers and Sisters; it may be said there is only one party, the Congress Party. If it appears that something is wrong, is not good, something which should be changed, re-shaped--in what way is it done? On a certain day, Nehru says: "I want to give all of my energy, 100 per cent to this party, the Congress Party; I want to leave the government." Two years ago it did happen that Nehru said: "I want to leave the government." His intention was to introduce his ideas into that single party so that later on, because there was only that one party, re-shaping could be effected. Look at conditions in Burma, they are similar; it may be said there is only one party, the A.F.L., the Anti-Fascist League. U Nu said one day: "Things are not right; I am going to leave the government." Why leave? Because he wanted to return to 100 per cent activity within the

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

A. F. L., the Anti-Fascist League; in this way he could influence the A.F.L.; and thus re-shaping could be effected, because there was only one party.

How are things in Indonesia, Brothers and Sister? We have not one party, not two, nor three, nor four, nor five, nor six, nor seven parties--not even ten or twenty or thirty or forty parties! We have more than forty political parties! In addition, there are also some "sieur" /"flea-size"/, parties, "gurem" parties*. Now, in these conditions, Brothers and Sisters, I cannot proceed in the manner of Nehru or U Nu. Moreover, I am now Non-Party. I am not a member of any party. Gek /queer/, there are so very many parties. What is the way? After eleven years it is clear that the policy of liberalism has failed. Indeed, I said some time ago that it would. After eleven years it is evident that parliamentary democracy just cannot bring us to that which is inscribed in golden letters in our Constitution, namely, a just and prosperous society.

Well, what is there to do. Things must be re-shaped. We must re-shape and how are we going to do the re-shaping? I cannot say like Jawaharlal Nehru: Well, I'll leave the government or the Freedom Palace /presidency/. This cannot be done, Brothers and Sisters. Because if I leave--well--these many parties! Which should I join, Brothers and Sisters? Conditions in Indonesia are different from conditions in the Soviet Union or in Burma. Take a look, Brothers and Sisters, how different the conditions are. I'll explain further.

Take, for example, again the Soviet Union. Excuse me--the Ambassador for the Soviet Union is also sitting here. The Ambassador of the Soviet Union. How are conditions in the Soviet Union? They are as in other independent states. There is a government, but how does that government come into being in the Soviet Union? The Soviet Union is composed of a people, a people who number 200 million, and this people elects a grand council, a Supreme Council called the Supreme Soviet. The members of this Supreme Soviet, more than one thousand in number, are elected by a people of two hundred million. The Supreme Soviet elects a Presidium. This Presidium

* That is tiny parties, splinter parties.

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

elects Ministers. There you are--that is the Government. So, look at the Government in the Soviet Union, Brothers and Sisters: it is elected from and by the Presidium, the Presidium is elected by the Supreme Soviet, the Supreme Soviet is elected by the people.

Don't you feel that the Government--or let's say here, the Cabinet--is an extension of the community? The community elects the Supreme Soviet: the Supreme Soviet elects the Presidium, the Presidium elects the Administration.

The government is thus an extract from the community, an extract from the people. For that reason, things are extremely easy, Brothers and Sisters. To put something into effect, the Government takes action and is followed by the whole people. For, is the Government not an extract from the people?

How is our situation here? Our situation is that we have not one party or two or three, but more than forty, as I said.

A while ago, general elections were held to elect parties, that is, general elections for Parliament--the D.P.R. /Dewan Perwakilan Rakjat/ Yes, at that time parties were elected, not persons. That which was voted for was a party; that which was punched /on the ballots/ --what was it? A party--a picture /symbol/ of a party. Thus we voted for parties. This parliament may be then regarded as the choice of the people.

But how is a Cabinet constituted or formed in Indonesia, Brothers and Sisters? For its formation in Indonesia, read such and such an article in the Constitution: "The President shall appoint one or more formateurs." For example, I appoint Mr. Ipik Gandamana. I select Mr. Ipik Gandamana as formateur. He accepts. He conducts consultations, or he does not. But one day he appears at the Freedom Palace bearing a list of names: "Here, Father President, is the list of names of ministers I propose to you." I look at it. Oh yes, that list is acceptable. I say to Mr. Ipik Gandamana: "All-right". I accept this composition. I swear in the group of persons to become the Cabinet. The Cabinet goes to work, that is, the Cabinet formed by Mr. Ipik Gandamana. From time to time a formateur fails. Let's take it that the formateur does not fail (observe that from time to time he does not fail because there is no horse trading involved.) Will you please pay close attention to this

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Cabinet of Mr. Ipik Gandamana's making. How are its relations with the Parliament? Parliament does not feel that it has made this Cabinet. Parliament even peers watchfully at this Cabinet, the Cabinet formed by Mr. Ipik Gandamana in accordance with the Provisional Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. As President, I have the prerogative to appoint a formateur. This formateur proposes the composition of a Cabinet. I endorse its composition and thus it becomes the Cabinet. Hah, and this Cabinet, Brothers and Sisters, is glowered at by Parliament--watched suspiciously all the time. Always watched. If it makes a small mistake it is criticized; a small mistake--criticism; another small mistake, and it falls. Crisis. Ipik Gandamana's Cabinet has fallen. I appoint another formateur. This time I appoint, for instance, Mr. Gatot Mangkupradja. "Gatot, will you accept or not if I appoint you formateur? Will you form a Cabinet?" There comes a day when he too brings a list. I approve, and I install it. Gatot Mangkupradja's Cabinet goes to work. But it too is distrusted by Parliament. A mistake--criticism; a mistake--it's criticized; another mistake--crisis. Maybe I should call in the press? "Gatot has fallen Mr. Soekrisno, I appoint you as formateur Will you accept or not?" Soekrisno says: "All right, Pak /Father/, I'll form a Cabinet." Mr. Soekrisno forms a Cabinet according to the same procedure, but Soekrisno's Cabinet too, is mistrusted by Parliament. And so it goes on and on, Brothers and Sisters.

There is always mistrustful watching, between Parliament and Cabinet. This is the greatest shortcoming of our governmental structure. For this reason, I, who feel responsible as a citizen of the Republic of Indonesia, like you, too, who feel responsible, like General Nasution who also feels responsible, like Pak Roeslan Abdulgani who feels responsible, like Pak Soewirjo who feels responsible, like Brother Manuabe who feels responsible, like Brother Chairul Saleh who feels responsible, like all of you who feel responsible. I make bold to state: this system is not good. It must be changed.

Shape and re-shape, shape and re-shape, shape and re-shape--en ik heb de moed--/and I have the courage/--thanks be to God--to re-shape. Whether it be accepted or not by the People of Indonesia, I leave that to them, Brothers and Sisters. But I propose this re-shaping from a full sense of responsibility. What is this re-shaping, Brothers and Sisters? This re-shaping is needed

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

because, yes, things have miscarried so badly, things have gone too far. I propose that between Parliament and the People a bridge be created, namely the National Council. A National Council which is composed in the first place of outstanding men of the functional groups of society. This National Council is the bearer of all the wishes of the community. This National Council is an extract from the community. On the other hand, this National Council also activates the whole community, becoming a mighty bridge, (as I said in the speech when I submitted "Bung Karno's Concept" to the people), a mighty bridge between the Government (as an extract from Parliament, because it is this Parliament which must watch over the Government), and Society. This is the heart and core of my purpose in setting up the National Council.

It is entirely wrong when people say that this National Council is merely to settle regional problems. Altogether wrong! Yes, indeed, I say, the problem of the regional territories is certainly a difficult problem. Indeed we must solve the regional problems, certainly the problem of the regions must be normalized by the Republic as quickly as possible. Certainly! But do not think that I have proposed the creation of the National Council solely to solve regional problems. No, not at all! Whoever wishes to understand my proposal--the Lord be praised, the government has already accepted the proposal for the National Council--he must understand my whole line of thought, beginning with the breakdown of the political system of liberalism. Understand this, Brothers and Sisters, understand--this is the basis of my proposal to set up that National Council. It means that the liberal policy will not be sufficient and will not be able to bring us to what is written in our Constitution, namely a just and prosperous society.

Because our system, as written in the Constitution --namely parliament, formateur, constitutional president, and the rest of it--is in fact a reflection of the policy of liberalism, I have proposed the establishment of the National Council.

And I am convinced, Brothers and Sisters, utterly convinced, that we will proceed towards improvement, proceed towards improvement through the existence of this National Council. Because, with the existence of this National Council there has been created, as I said a

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

while ago, a mighty bridge between the Government and society. Is it my conviction that only through the National Council will it be possible to resolve the problem of the regions? That is a different matter, Brothers and Sisters, a different matter. The problem of the regions is only one out of scores, hundreds, possibly thousands of problems which we must resolve. This problem of the regions is only one out of many tasks which confront the government and people of Indonesia at this moment.

But it is clear to me, Brothers and Sisters, that through the present system we shall not attain what we desire, that is the ideals of our revolution of 17th August 1945, nor even our ealier ideals. Once this fact is realized, Brothers and Sisters, perhaps people will be more tolerant towards me. For indeed, I am proposing something altogether new. Yes, something new; I do not deny this. I call this a new style; certainly it is new. And whoever in a revolution is unwilling, is not bold enough to undertake innovation, he does not have a revolutionary spirit, I say.

Brothers and Sisters, today we are commemorating the thirty years since the emergence of Marhaenism. Once again I say to you: In the first part of this address I showed you a portrait of 1927; this was your portrait in 1927, my portrait in 1927, the portrait of Bung Gatot in 1927, the portrait of Bung Sujudi in 1927, of Pak Madroi in 1927, of Bang Samiun in 1927, the portrait of Marhaen in 1927. This was your portrait.

Now Brothers and Sisters, let us all look in the mirror. As I said a while ago, look at your face today. Is it the same, or not, as the portrait of 1927? If it is the same, thanks to God who be praised, I say. If it is not the same, then--self-correction! Change yourselves! Change the sphere of your thoughts! Change your actions! For, truly, our revolution is not yet completed. Our ideals have not yet been attained. We now have a state, and a state which is based upon what I called in the book "Lahirnja Pantja Sila" /The Birth of Pantja Sila/, the essence of all the feelings and sentiments which for decades, for hundreds and thousands of years, have dwelt in the soul of the People of Indonesia. Did I not say in the book "The Birth of Pantja Sila" that Pantja Sila /the Five Principles/ could be compressed into three, into Tri-Sila, namely the Belief in God, Socio-nationalism and

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Socio-democracy? Did I not say this Tri-Sila could be compressed further to become one, Eka Sila, namely, Gotong-rojong*? Thus, if I propose, for example, a Gotong-rojong Cabinet** together with this National Council which is also based upon Gotong-rojong, I have neither strayed nor deviated from our original ideals.

There are those who say: "Oh, Bung Karno, he now has become a communist." Especially since I returned from my journey to the Soviet Union and to the People's Republic of China, and expressed my highest appreciation for what I saw in the Soviet Union and in China, people are saying: "Bung Karno has become a communist." I am not a communist, I still hold to Pantja Sila, I am still the Soekarno of 1927, Brothers and Sisters!

The Soekarno of 1927 has not changed, praised be the Lord, Brothers and Sisters. I look at my portrait of 1927 and I look at my portrait of today in 1957--it is still the same as in 1927. Who has changed, Brothers and Sisters? They say I have become a communist! What stupidity! This terminology is all too well known. Formerly, when we used to say: "Indonesia Merdeka Now", --"Indonesia Merdeka Now",--Indonesia Merdeka Now" /"Independent Indonesia Now"/, we were said to be communists too. All is communist, everything is communist, everyone is a communist, until, as I said in the Empress cinema, if one is angry with his wife because her sauce isn't savoury enough--she too is a communist! Yes--indeed, indeed it is like that. Today the same thing is being repeated again. No, not at all! I am still /as I was in/ 1927. Of course, there probably are changes or errors. No human being, Brothers and Sisters, is free of mistakes. And if there are mistakes in me, Brothers and Sisters--God, the Supreme Who be praised, willing --if you will point them out to me, I will engage in self-correction.

---

* Gotong-rojong (pronounced gotong royong) is the old Indonesian concept of mutual assistance, cooperative endeavor, etc.

** Soekarno's idea of a gotong rojong cabinet was one that would include all four of the major political parties of Indonesia: P.N.I. (Nationalist Party), Masjumi, Nahdatul Ulama, and the P.K.I. (Indonesian Communist Party).

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

But steadfastly, we all hold to our aim. This aim is fixed. Do not deviate from this aim. Has the golden bridge been finished? Do not lose sight of it. Revolutionary mass action for our task of upbuilding--have we deviated from that? Revolutionary mass action for the task of upbuilding, Brothers and Sisters, as depicted for instance in my accepted proposal to set up the "Petera" Ministry, the Ministry for Pengerahan Tenaga Rakjat--"Assembling the People's Energies", for upbuilding. Whoever holds to the principle of revolutionary mass action, will understand the need for this Petera Ministry. People who do not understand the need for the Petera Ministry are not mass-revolutionaries!

Brothers and Sisters, I repeat: If I look at my face in the mirror, "Eh", I can say, "I am still the same." The Soekarno of 1927 is the Soekarno of today. My feelings? Yes indeed, Brothers and Sisters, it may be said here: At first hunted by the Dutch, and finally the first President of Indonesia. I was not the only prey of the Dutch--indeed no. There were comrades who were wanted by the Dutch much more than I. For me, how many years in jail, Brothers and Sisters? Only a total of a little more than three years. How many years was I in exile? Nine and a half years, Brothers and Sisters. But there are comrades of ours who were kept in exile in the midst of the jungle for tens of years. There are comrades of our who were kept in jail for tens of years. There are comrades of ours who were shot down by the Dutch. There are comrades of ours who died upon the gallows. What is my small sacrifice compared with the sacrifices made by our comrades in order to achieve Independent Indonesia and to realize a just and prosperous society?

INDONESIA--A MYTHOS*

I am now called the first President of the Republic of Indonesia only because of the people. This morning I again repeated this to the students: "I became the President of the Republic of Indonesia," I said, "because of the People. Without the People, without the marhaen, I am nothing." I gave them my ideas about Marhaenism,

* While using the Greek form for myth, mythos, Soekarno seems to imbue this term with the meaning of a sacred source of inspiration.

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

as well as about the need for a golden bridge, about the need to spur revolutionary mass action, in all sincerity, out of devotion to our Native Land and People, devotion to Indonesia--that Indonesia which, for me, as I said in Serang and Madiun, is something which I could almost call a mythos. In 1927 what was Indonesia for me and for you, Brothers and Sisters? Remember my speeches, Brothers and Sisters, both in the Empress cinema and also before the Court, when I told you what Indonesia was? Was Indonesia just a chain of islands, from Java with Sumatra, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, Bali, Lombok, Sumbawa, Flores, Sumba, to the other islands, the Moluccas, and Irian? Is only that Indonesia? Is Indonesia only what is drawn on the map, Brothers and Sisters? Is that Indonesia?

No! Indonesia is not only that. Indonesia for us, Brothers and Sisters, is all of nature which enchants us. We listen to Indonesia when we listen to the soft voice of a singing bird. We listen to Indonesia when at Tjilauteureum we hear the waves of the Indian Ocean pounding on the beach. We listen to Indonesia when we hear the wind sighing in the jungles of Mt. Burangrang. We feel that we drink Indonesia when we drink the waters of the village well. We feel part of Indonesian nature when we see the flowers along the roads. We feel we are part of Indonesian nature when we hear the sweet Indonesian songs. It is even more than that, Brothers and Sisters--and, therefore, in 1945 I proposed to the People of Indonesia that we should use the Pantja Sila /Five Principles/ and, as the first principle, Belief in God. God who is glorified in all of nature, God the One, this God who for me is mirrored also in Indonesia, Brothers and Sisters. I do not say that God is Indonesia; not at all. But when I recall the five years of my life in Flores, how, as I sat on the shore at sundown, Brothers and Sisters, I listened to the wild roar of the waves dashing upon the beach, and as I sat alone lost in thought on that Flores shore, I heard not only the sea. It was as though I heard the sea chanting a song of praise to God Almighty: Oh God my Lord, you have given our people such beauty as this. If I recall when I was in Bengkulu, I would often leave the town and enter the jungle; the breeze would rustle softly through the trees, leaves would fall to the earth. That wind, Brothers and Sisters, rustling softly in the forest, that wind, to my ears, was singing soft praises, Indonesia's praises to the Almighty.

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Indonesia for me is a mythos, Brothers and Sisters--not merely Java plus Sumatra plus Kalimantan plus Bali, Lombok and so on. No! Indonesia, as I said is--yes, its soil--that is Indonesia; its beautiful mountains of glorious shimmering blue, those are Indonesia; the white bulging clouds are Indonesia; the dome of the blue sky above our earth is Indonesia; the radiance of the eyes of little children by the roadside is Indonesia; the songs chanted at Tjilauteureum, Brothers and Sisters, these are Indonesia; the savoury foods we eat are Indonesia. All of this is Indonesia for us. Indonesia for us is the totality of all the feelings that live deep in our hearts and which make us ready to struggle, ready to work our fingers to the bone, ready to make sacrifices, ready to go to the gallows, ready to be exiled to the jungle for tens of years, this is Indonesia, Brothers and Sisters.

REMEMBER YOUR OATH--BE TRUE TO YOUR IDEALS

For this Indonesia we should all feel responsible, Brothers and Sisters. Once again: responsible! Responsible to the utmost. If you feel fully responsible, Brothers and Sisters, you will never be tardy in doing whatsoever be needful. Therefore, you, the people of the Indonesian Nationalist Party, my comrades of long ago, my friends, remember your oath of 1927. If you desire to put yourselves at the service of Indonesia you must be steadfastly devoted to this single ideal. Be faithful always to your oath made at that time, Brothers and Sisters.

Let us continue onwards, in order to attain what we have cherished as our ideals and what we have proclaimed, and what we have worked for, and what we have organized for, since thirty years ago.

Thank you.

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0
Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

JQ763 1960 S8
3 2106 00120 4244

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ

This book is due on the last **DATE** stamped below.

DEC 3 '76
DEC 2 REC'D
JUN 15 '80
Jul 3
OCT 12 1980 REC'D
APR 4 '89
JUN 14 1989 REC'D
SEP 21 1989
OCT 14 1989
NOV 20 1989 REC'D
MAR 6 '90
APR 6 '90

MAR 30 1990 REC'D
DEC 13 '94
DEC 15 1994 REC'D

50m-1,'69 (J5643s8) 2373—3A,1

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Generated on 2025-02-19 16:32 GMT / https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106001204244
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#cc-by-nc-nd-4.0

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA